

THE HERMENEUTICS OF F. AUGUST G. THOLUCK
A Study in the Methods of Biblical
Interpretation

by F. Hollingsworth Mitchell, Author

Thesis presented for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy of the University
of Edinburgh in the Faculty of Divinity

September, 1962



Preface

Part I, Chapter I - Tolstoy's Life and Thought

Part II, Chapter II - The Novels of the

Nineteenth Century

Part III - Tolstoy's Novels

Part IV - Tolstoy's Novels

TO MY PARENTS AND

MY BROTHER

Part V, Chapter V - Tolstoy's Novels

Part VI, Chapter VI - Tolstoy's Novels

Part VII, Chapter VII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part VIII, Chapter VIII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part IX, Chapter IX - Tolstoy's Novels

Part X, Chapter X - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XI, Chapter XI - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XII, Chapter XII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XIII, Chapter XIII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XIV, Chapter XIV - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XV, Chapter XV - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XVI, Chapter XVI - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XVII, Chapter XVII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XVIII, Chapter XVIII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XIX, Chapter XIX - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XX, Chapter XX - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XXI, Chapter XXI - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XXII, Chapter XXII - Tolstoy's Novels

Part XXIII, Chapter XXIII - Tolstoy's Novels

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|--------|
| Preface | |
| Part I, Chapter I - Tholuck's Life and Thought | Page 1 |
| Part II, Chapter II - The Hermeneutics of the Nineteenth Century | 34 |
| Part III - Tholuck's Hermeneutics | |
| Chapter III - Presuppositions: Tholuck's Doctrine of Scripture | 83 |
| Chapter IV - Characteristics and Methods | 101 |
| Chapter V - Tholuck's Work in the Old Testament | 119 |
| Part IV, Chapter VI - Tholuck's Exegesis | 148 |
| Part V, Chapter VII - Tholuck's Hermeneutics in regard to his Preaching | 224 |
| Part VI, Chapter VIII - The Followers of Tholuck | 256 |
| Part VII, Chapter IX - An Evaluation of Tholuck's Hermeneutics | 277 |
| Abbreviations | 325 |
| Bibliography | 326 |

PREFACE

Hermeneutics in these days is claiming much attention from Biblical, dogmatic and practical theologians. This is just as it should be, if true and obedient theology depends upon proper exegesis of the Bible, and if the whole life of the Church (the concern of practical theology especially) is to be governed by true and obedient theology. This means that hermeneutics, in a sense, is the connecting link between exegesis and theology, by providing theological rules to keep interpretation on the right track. If this happens, if exegesis is constantly correcting theology and hermeneutics is constantly guiding interpretation, then the practical life of the Church should be well ordered and disciplined. Preaching is important within the life of the Church. Preaching depends upon exegesis, and looks to theology for its rules of interpretation. It is here in preaching and in the congregation's study of the Bible that hermeneutics finds its most practical expression, and it is here also that the rules of hermeneutics are tested and corrected. That is why this discipline of Biblical interpretation is so significant for the life of the Church.

This thesis enters the door to the study of hermeneutics by looking at the works of August Tholuck, a truly remarkable figure, as we shall see.

I must acknowledge my debt of thanks to many people who have helped me along the way. I thank the following professors of

other institutions for their encouragement and help: Dr. J. I. McCord, Dr. D. Ritschl, Rev. J. A. Wharton, all then of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas; Professors K. Barth and O. Cullmann of Basel; Professors O. Piper and J. Barr, and Dr. J. P. Martin of Princeton Seminary. Most especially I am grateful to my two advisors, the Reverend Professors J. McIntyre and T. F. Torrance of Edinburgh, for their careful reading of the first draft of this thesis, and for their helpful advice and encouragement at every step. I am indebted to the Reverend Dr. R. S. Wallace and his family for their kind hospitality during the last few months. I am grateful also for the help given me by the librarian and staff of the libraries of New College, the University of Edinburgh, the University of Basel, and Princeton Theological Seminary; and to my typists, Miss A. Mather and Mrs. J. I. Simpson. I am indebted to Austin Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas, and to the First Presbyterian Church of Shreveport, Louisiana, for grants which I received for post-graduate study. Finally, I am grateful to many fellow students and ministers from and with whom I have learned some theology along the way.

F. H. Mitchell

Edinburgh,

September, 1962.

PART I. Chapter I - Tholuck's Life and Thought

A. Tholuck's Life

1. Tholuck^s as a Man of Piety

Friedrich August Gotttreau Tholuck was born in Breslau, March 30th, 1799. His father was a goldsmith, but contrary to his parents' intention, the young Tholuck did not follow this occupation, but went to the "Gymnasium" and to the University of Breslau. He grew up "alienated from the Gospel"¹, and indeed, until he was fifteen years of age, he knew of only one boy who believed the Bible.² He himself was "want to scoff at Christianity", and upon leaving the Gymnasium, he delivered an oration on "The Superiority of Mohammedism to Christianity".³ Tholuck grew up among the very influences which he later denounced. His Guido and Julius, largely an autobiographical account of his conversion, describes his earlier education:

"The director of the gymnasium, an old man, honoured the pineal gland as the seat of the spirit, and had often discussed the question, whether it would not have been better if the Creator had given man a third hand or a third foot in place of a heart. He had to teach religion; and day by day, without remorse, he hauled into the classroom the skeleton of it, which he had constructed, and rattled the bones, till the pupils shuddered. The other masters were no better: they were linguists without one living word in their entire vocabulary. The preachers of the town were some of them orthodox, others neologian; but both kinds were feeble and insipid. All they had of religion consisted of cold lava collected from other people's volcanoes."⁴

Not only were the schools and Churches of Tholuck's early years given over to dead religion, but also,

"In his home there was nothing fitted to counteract the general impression; for his parents, though they went regularly to church, had no religion beyond what was formal. He remembered, indeed,

1. Tholuck, "Evangelical Theology in Germany, A survey of my life as a teacher of Theology", The History, Essays, Orations, and other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, 1873, p.85. Henceforth referred to as "Alliance".
2. Hodge, A.A., The Life of Charles Hodge, p. 136.
3. Park, E.A., A Sketch of the Life and Character of Prof. Tholuck, (Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet), p.4f. Henceforth referred to as "Life".
4. Stalker, James "Studies in Conversion, vii. Tholuck, The Expositor, iv, 1912, p.162.

seeing in his early days one humble figure from which true religion had looked forth on him now and then: this was a Moravian Brother, who was employed occasionally in menial work about his father's house. But his parents laughed at the child of God, turning his warnings and prayers into ridicule, and the boy too easily followed their example."¹

Tholuck very early acquired a proficiency in oriental languages, and became assistant to a celebrated orientalist, Von Diez, in Berlin.² Through Von Diez, he became acquainted with a circle of Pietists in Berlin led by Baron von Kottwitz, who became a spiritual father to Tholuck; and he came to know Professor Neander, who also helped him to grow in the Christian faith.³

Such pietistic circles Tholuck had never known existed before. At the time of his presence in Berlin, the city was notorious for its unbelief. Though harried by the police, such groups grew in size and number, till, when Tholuck came, there were twenty of them in the city. Those who attended did not renounce the Churches; they went gladly to any Church where a living Gospel was to be heard.⁵ In their own meetings they sang hymns and prayed free prayers; and they read accounts of the evangelical and missionary societies of other lands.⁶

From these groups there came forth a great revival. Concerning a visit Tholuck made to Berlin, Charles Hodge wrote in his Journal for May 12th, 1827,

"... Tholuck ... has had, he says, his heart warmed in Berlin, and has heard many circumstances of an encouraging character, relative to the progress of vital piety in Germany."⁷

1. Ibid., p. 163.

2. Ibid., p. 165f. On Von Diez,

see Leopold Witte, Das Leben ... Tholuck's, I, 55ff., 456ff.

3. Park, op. cit., p. 5. On Neander, see Witte, op. cit., I, p. 84f. On Von Kottwitz, see Stalker, op. cit., p. 167f.

4. Stalker, op. cit., p. 165f.

5. Ibid., p. 166.

6. Ibid., p. 166.

7. Hodge, op. cit., p. 133.

A.A. Hodge describes the circle of Pietists thus:

"It was a wide-embracing bond of friendship in the Lord, of men and women of the most different ages, rank and conditions in life, in the midst of which the Patriarch Baron von Kottwitz moved ~~prominent.~~¹ ~~pre-eminent.~~"¹

So it was into this circle that the young and yet unbelieving August Tholuck moved soon after his arrival in the city of Berlin, and thus he came under the influence of Baron von Kottwitz.

Kottwitz exerted a tremendous influence upon Tholuck's life.² He appears in Guido and Julius as "a venerable saint" who has "become the polar-star of my life".³ Here Tholuck describes the "works of philanthropy and piety" of the Baron, whose "gratification has been to dry up the tears of the afflicted."⁴ Tholuck saw "Christ living in the Patriarch",⁵ and exclaimed, "If such is the blessedness of Christian communion on earth, what will it be with HIM in heaven!"⁶

1. Ibid., p.150. Describing another visit to Berlin, Tholuck writes Charles Hodge: "... On the third day I dined with the Patriarch (Baron Kottwitz), in a great company. O what vivifying power springs from such Christian fellowship." (p. 146, Sept. 22, 1827). Tholuck introduced Charles Hodge to a circle of his Berlin friends. Hodge writes: "Tholuck read and expanded a passage of Scripture; we prayed and sang a couple of hymns. The rest of the evening was spent in religious conversation. My heart was rejoiced at the prospect of having such a place of religious communion accessible every week." (Ibid., p. 148.)

2. Tholuck confesses: "Mein Heiland, welche Irrwege wäre ich gegangen, hättest du mir nicht einen Kottwitz gegeben! hättest du mir nicht gezeigt, dass es nicht Shimäre ist, dass man wirklich sich aufopfern und hingegen kann für die Brüder!" Quoted in Witte, op.cit. I, p. 124.

3. Tholuck, Guido and Julius, p. 208.

4. Ibid., p. 208.

5. Ibid., p. 216.

6. Ibid., p. 217.

Another influence upon Tholuck was Neander, also a member of the circle of Pietists. He taught Tholuck the true value of the Old Testament (Cf. our chap.V, p. .). In the year 1818, the two met together for an evening each week for theological discussion. (Cf. Witte, op. cit., I, p. 104f., II, p. 53.) Kottwitz had also helped Neander in the faith, as well as Olshausen, Rothe, Müller, and Hengstenberg. (Cf. p. Schaff, Germany, Its Universities, Theology and Religion, p. 285.) C. Hodge records that one evening at Neander's house, a debate arose on predestination. "In coming away, Neander shook me very affectionately by the hand, and said to Tholuck, "Tell our friend Hodge, that though we dispute with him, we belong to the

In 1819 Tholuck was appointed Professor Extraordinarius at the University of Berlin, to fill the place De Wette had vacated. This appointment was entirely unexpected by Tholuck. He had continued in Berlin, since 1816, in the study of oriental languages. Preparing himself for an academical chair in that field, he overworked, "began spitting blood", and had to discontinue his studies for more than a year.¹ Tholuck says of this period of his life:

"During this time my conscience suggested the question unto me: Supposing the end of thy life had come, wouldst thou be able to exculpate thyself before Him, who has given thee the knowledge of His Gospel, not only for promoting science, but that thou mightest lead others to the same blissful enlightenment that has been granted thee? Then I made a vow to God within my soul that, if it pleased Him once more to restore me to life, I would devote myself to no other calling than a missionary's life in Eastern countries, a resolution I was chiefly induced to form by reading the Life of Martyn".²

Tholuck volunteered his services as a missionary to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was offered a place in Malta. But then:

"A renewed attack of spitting blood forced me temporarily to renounce the calling I had fixed upon; but just then the Prussian Government inquired if I should feel inclined to accept an Assistant Lectureship on Hebrew and Oriental Literature, on the occasion of Dr. De Wette having to resign his chair in the University of Berlin".³

Tholuck accepted this post, but this by no means meant the abandonment of his missionary zeal. He continues:

"About the same time my health was restored, and I may be allowed to say that thenceforward I adopted for my own life the famous motto of Count Zinzendorf: 'Ich hab nur Eine Passion, und die ist Er, nur Er' (I have but one passion, and that is He, and He alone). To bring back souls to Christ, was from that time the daily, nay the hourly problem as well as the joy of my life. The delivering of lectures on the Old and New Testaments, as well as on the literatures of the Orient and Occident, the composition of critical treatises and of popular books of edification, but,

same Lord, and are one in heart." Hodge, op. cit., p. 165.

1. Tholuck, Alliance, p.85.

2. Ibid., p.85.

3. Ibid., p. 86.

"first of all, the daily intercourse with the youth of the university, filled up every hour of my existence. And yet my thirst for gaining over souls remained unquenched."¹

Tholuck was made Professor Ordinarius of Theology at Halle in 1826, succeeding Dr. Knapp. The theological faculty of Halle were all rationalists, under the leadership of Gesenius and Wegscheider; and they petitioned the government not to appoint Tholuck to Halle.² As this attempt failed, they perhaps consoled themselves with the notion that, as Tholuck was in bad health, he would probably be unable to serve a long tenure.³ But as it happened, he served for fifty years. Tholuck's reception on the part of the students of Halle was by no means warm. His home had to be protected from vandalism by military guards.⁴ He was often shouted down in the classroom.⁵ Among the 900 students of theology in Halle in Dr. Knapp's time, only five believed in the divinity of Christ.⁶ But as Tholuck stayed on, the number of believers increased yearly, until it was apparent that a new spirit had at last awakened in Germany to take the place of a now discredited rationalism.⁷

This appointment to the chair at Halle was not unsought after by Tholuck. He said:

"Every day I prayed to God that He might be pleased to call me to that place where a hundred years before August H. Francke had built his orphan asylum, and had, by his addresses both from the pulpit and from the chair, gathered a faithful community, teaching that the first stage on the way to the tree of knowledge was by the tree of life."⁸

1. Ibid., p.86.

2. Drummond, A.L., German Protestantism since Luther, p.128.

3. Ibid., p.128.

4. Smith, John Pye, "Introductory Preface" to Guido and Julius, p.5.

5. Stalker, op. cit., p. 163.

6. Tholuck, Alliance, p.86.

7. Ibid., p.86f.

8. Ibid., p.86.

And, as Francke before him, so it was also Tholuck's desire to "gather a faithful community", seeking knowledge through life in Christ.

Thus Tholuck's passion to win his students to Christ, stayed with him throughout his long life in Halle, and met with no little satisfaction. Witte testifies that

"... Thousands of thousands call him their spiritual father, their father in Christ. His firmly clinging love embraces young hearts with heavenly power, and wrestles with God for the peace and victory of his students. He ...thoroughly understands the striving of youth, and knows how to hit home conscience, and how to drop healing balm into the wounds inflicted by the word of God. There is nothing like sickness in his spiritual life; Christ and Christ alone... is the love and passion of his heart. Not a theological school did he want to found, no dogmatical or philosophical thesis does he wish to imprint on the mind of his followers...but what he desires is to lead his young friends to Christ the Son of God... Certainty and freedom in Christ, that is the aim of his life, that has been, through the blessing of God, the fruit of his life to the benefit of thousands on both sides of the Atlantic. They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever..."¹

Professor Sears writes from Halle in 1834:

"The uncommon pressure of Tholuck's public labours leaves him no leisure time. But when he walks, which he does twice a day, and an hour and a half each time, he invites three or four students... to accompany him. With these he converses in a manner best adapted to win them to a religious life. With the serious he comes directly to the point. With others he spreads his net wider and through the medium of literary, philosophical, or theological discussion, conducted with vivacity and utmost affection, he steals upon their hearts and holds them his captives. Another company are, for the same purpose, invited to his dinner table; and thus daily he spends several hours, as a friend, patron, and pastor to the more hopeful among his pupils. If they are indigent, he remit

1. Witte, Alliance, p.88f. Elsewhere Witte writes: "Im Übrigen war es auch jetzt der persönliche Einfluss, durch welchen Tholuck im Kreise der Studenten mehr noch, als durch seine Vorlesungen, wirkte. Eine von Monat zu Monat wachsende Schar hielt sich zu ihm. Schon am 16. April 1822 konnte Tholuck in sein^m Tagebuch schreiben: 'Wie viele hat der Herr durch mich schwaches, untreues Werkzeug schon gesegnet! Es ist wohl fünf und zwanzig, und unter denen wohl zehn, denen ich allein den Mann der Schmerzen und den Weg der Einfalt zu ihm zeigen konnte.' An jedem Donnerstag und an jedem Sonntag Abend kamen the Freunde in sein Zimmer. Die Art des Zusammenseins trug ganz den Charakter der Mittwochabende bei Kottwitz, nur dass jede Bewirtung, auch die bescheidene Theetasse vom Alexanderplatze, fortfiel."
Das Leben, I, p.193.

their tuition; and if he publishes a sermon or a pamphlet, the profit goes to them. His extensive and choice library is always at their service."¹

In Stalker's opinion, Tholuck

"...was animated in a supreme degree with the peculiar passion of the revival - that for winning souls. There is no parallel to his efforts in this direction amongst students, unless it be found in the evangelistic work of Professor Drummond in our own time among the students of the University of Edinburgh."²

2. Tholuck as a Man of Learning

1. General Characteristics

Tholuck had many gifts which qualified him to be a man of learning.

He was mentally precocious. He had a great facility for learning languages. He had a retentive memory and a desire to learn.³

With these qualities he amassed a great fund of knowledge and became adept in many languages, especially Hebrew and its cognates, and other Oriental languages.⁴

1. Park, op. cit., p.15.

2. Stalker, op. cit., p.159. Drummond himself (op. cit., p.129) said of Tholuck, "He broke new ground in making his relations with the students intimate. He visited them in their lodgings, took them out for walks, and invited them to his home. His humour and geniality were as conspicuous as his determination to win them for Christ. To poor students and foreigners he gave special attention; nor did he relax these efforts when his classes became uncomfortably crowded...His aim was to lead young men from the tropical jungle of pantheism and the arid desert of rationalism to the green pastures and fresh fountains of the Gospel."

3. Park suggests that Tholuck's excellence as a commentator can "... be anticipated from the fact that his reading has been so various, and his memory is so retentive; from his almost unequalled facility in acquiring language, and his peculiar intimacy with Hebrew and its cognate tongues. He is able to write and converse in a great variety of languages. .. He is, of course, qualified to illustrate the sacred texts by a multiplicity of references; and he quotes with peculiar pertinence and effect from the Oriental, and especially from the Rabbinical writings." op. cit., p.5.

4. Charles Hodge, op. cit., p.117, writes (1827) of Tholuck, then 28 years of age:

"Being a young man and a pious one, and being very fond of exercising himself in English, which is one of the fifteen languages he understands, he puts us entirely on a level with himself, and

Though Tholuck was very learned, he never became coldly pedantic. His imagination was too much alive for that.¹ Nor did he take his erudition so seriously as to be dull or morose. Schaff suggests that one of Tholuck's personal characteristics was a sense of humour that "rests on the conviction of the folly of human wisdom, the weakness of moral strength, and the vanity of all earthly things."² Despite Tholuck's ill health and opposition from enemies, "he attended to his labours joyfully as well as resolutely, like Mercury the celestial messenger who had wings to his feet."³

But his cast of mind was such that he lacked depth and thoroughness. He was not too concerned with accuracy in detail or close, logical argumentation.⁴ He was no analyst. For he saw everything in large outline. This virtue was a great extent and variety of erudition. He was no systematizer, but his views were ingenious. He set masses of thought into motion with a flash of bold and brilliant imagery.⁵ His knowledge encompassed the whole garment of theology.

"is very instructive. I look at him frequently with wonder. Not older than I, he is the author of some of the best Biblical works in Germany, and has a fund of knowledge which few men attain at the end of the longest life."

H.C. Alexander, in The Life of J. Addison Alexander, D.D., I, p.324 says of Alexander and Tholuck: "Indeed these two men were in several respects, very much alike. They were both fond of languages, classical, ancient and modern, and were adepts in them, being able to speak I know not how many of them. I have heard them both speak at least six. Both were great readers, and remembered everything they read. The studies of both had a wide range, especially in all that related to any one of the departments of Theology. When they were together, conversation did not flag for want of topics." (Alexander was in Halle with Tholuck during the summer of 1833, having been sent there by C. Hodge, who wrote for him a letter of introduction to Tholuck.)

1. Drummond, op.cit., p.128f. "Tholuck was fresh, stimulating, and suggestive, free from the professional pedantry of "Gründlichkeit". For prose he offered poetry. He had a genius for striking illustrations, and scintillating quotations..."

2. Schaff, op.cit., p.288.

3. Drummond, op.cit., p.128.

4. Philip Schaff, op.cit., p.298f., remarks (1857) that,

He knew the Bible and also the Fathers, the Reformers, and his contemporaries. Nor did he limit his investigations to theology, but explored, e.g., ancient Greek, Latin and oriental literature of a secular nature. He was interested in everything, and read and remembered everything.

The fruits of Tholuck's gifts were many and good. At an early age ^{he} began to write thoughtful books.¹ His best results were in exegesis, which, it is said, he helped to rescue from Rationalism.² He re-opened the study of the Reformers and Fathers. As a preacher and lecturer he was enchanting and persuasive.³

"Tholuck is not distinguished by depth and thoroughness of knowledge in any single department, as by the astonishing extent and variety of his erudition. Some of his quotations shed no light, but only embellish his learning. He has no compact, logical system of thought, but ingenious views."

5. Park, op. cit., p.31 quotes Julius Müller as follows:

"Everything presents itself to the mind of Prof. Tholuck in large outline. It is foreign from his cast of mind to analyze any subject minutely, so as to exhibit all its elements; to define any doctrine with precision in all its relations. There are always, if I may so express myself, great masses, which he sets in motion so as best to promote his own design... Bold and brilliant images are always at his command. Not only does the Holy Bible open to him its treasure-chambers, but the sages of Greece, the ancient and modern teachers of the Church, the Christian lyric poets, present him their most beautiful flowers, and lay at his feet the most apposite expressions. Nor are allusions to unsanctified poets rejected from his sermons, but the world, willing or unwilling, is made servicable to the sacred orator. There is given to Dr. Tholuck the power of enchantment over mind."

1. Park, op. cit., p.5.

"The mental precocity of Tholuck was nearly equal to that of Gesenius...Tholuck was but twenty-two years old when he published his Hints for the Study of the Old Testament..., and also his *Soufismus*, or Pantheistic Theology of the Persians..., a work which, together with his other productions in oriental literature, has been highly extolled even by his opposers...He was but twenty-three years of age, when he published his Treatise on the Nature and Moral Influence of Heathenism; and an article which Gesenius pronounced the ablest which he had ever seen on the subject."

2. Schaff, op. cit., p.289ff.

We noted that Tholuck was appointed Professor Extraordinarius of the University of Berlin at the early age of 20, and Professor Ordinarius of the University of Halle at the age of 27.

We should expect from such a man, as an interpreter of the Bible, a heavy concentration upon the original and cognate language, a great breadth of materials from which to illustrate, and a treatment of text in terms of broad principles. We shall also look for the colourful imagery and a touch of good humour. We shall not expect, however, a finely analyzed argument, or preoccupation with precise grammatical construction.

2. His Works

We noted that very early in life, Tholuck began to produce important writings in Biblical and oriental studies. When he was 25 years old, he published his Commentary on Romans, which De Wette pronounced superior to any of its predecessors.¹ The next year appeared his A Translation of the Epistle to the Romans (which had 2 German editions), An Anthology of the Oriental Mystic Poems, Guido and Julius (4 editions), and in 1826, the Speculations of the Later Orientalists respecting the Doctrine of the Trinity.² In 1827 Tholuck published his Commentary on the Gospel of John (5 editions), and in 1829 the first of several volumes of sermons.³ In 1830 Tholuck began a periodical, The Literary Advertizer, issued at the rate of 80 numbers per year.⁴

3. Park, op. cit., p.5.

"The same erudition, enthusiasm, and glow of piety which make Dr. Tholuck interesting as a commentator, make him still more so as a lecturer...(His lectures are popular) and they excite the apprehension even in those who resist their argument, that, after all, the 'fanaticism' of Tholuck may be right reason. 'It is a common remark,' says Prof. Sears, 'that if a young man do not wish to become a pietist, let him avoid Tholuck's lecture-room.'"

1. Park, op. cit., p.6.

2. Ibid., p.6.

3. Ibid., p. 7f.

4. Ibid., p.12.

In 1833 he edited a six-volume Calvin's ~~Sermon on the Mount.~~^{Commentary on the New Testament.}¹
Then followed A Comment on the Influence of the Greek Philosophy upon
the Theology of the Mohammedans and the Jews, 1835; Commentary on
Hebrews, 1836; Treatise on the Credibility of Evangelical History,
a reply to Strauss' Life of Jesus; four volumes of sermons, 1834-38
(2 editions), and many articles in periodicals.²

Guido and Julius, or "The Doctrine of Sin and the Propitiator,
or the True Consecration of the Doubter", Tholuck wrote as a refutation
to De Wette's Theodore, or the Consecration of the Doubter (Sceptic),
which had proposed "to instruct a sceptical student how to silence his
reason and appease his conscience, even on the supposition of his being
ordained to the pastoral office."³ Tholuck's way was to lead the
doubter "in the path of a profound investigation...into the moral
state of the mind, and habitual prayer to the most Holy One; - the
path of truth and peace."⁴ The book is also autobiographical:
Julius^{is} Müller, Guido is Tholuck, the patriarch is Kottwitz.⁵

Another writing of Tholuck's which had a corrective purpose was his
Hours of Christian Devotion, in which evangelical piety opposed the
rational sentimentality of Zschocke's Stunden der Andacht.⁶ It
was the feeling of Schaff⁷ that Tholuck's Romans of 1824, though
imperfect and unsatisfactory, struck a new path and began an epoch in
the history of German exegetical literature.⁸ Schaff suggests that,

1. Ibid., p.13.

3. J.P. Smith, op.cit., p.30.

5. Schaff, op. cit., p.280.

7. Ibid., p.291.

2. Ibid., p.14.

4. Ibid., p.30.

6. Ibid., p.287.

8. F.C. Baur and Cremer were

of the same opinion. Witte, op. cit., I, p.336.

in writing commentaries, Tholuck excels Olshausen in learning, but lacks his flow of pious and speculative spirit; he lacks Lücke's polish, but probes more deeply the religious element.¹

Tholuck's most solid, accurate, and thorough work is his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (1845).² Next in quality comes Romans of 1856, which antiquated the earlier editions of that book; Hebrews is not considered to be as exhaustive and thorough as Bleek's, but better for students. The Credibility of the Gospel History is one of the most "learned and triumphant answers to Strauss' Leben Jesu - it bristles with pointed remarks, sparkling wit, and brilliant erudition."³ The Spirit of Lutheran Divines (1852) and The Academic Life in the Seventeenth Century (1853-54) are interesting and graphic, and aim to present an unfavourable picture of orthodox rationalism, in order to instruct and warn against reviving it; for it led to the apostasy of rationalism.⁴

Witte suggests that it was Tholuck's program to write commentaries according to the need for the presentation of particular doctrines.⁵ He wrote, e.g., on Romans to stress its foundation for theology; John for dogmatics; Hebrews for Old Testament and Christology; the Sermon on the Mount for practical theology; Philippians 2:6ff. (a monograph) for Christology; Psalms as a book of prayer.⁶ He was

1. Schaff, op. cit., p.291. For a more complete list of Tholuck's writings see the appendices to Witte, op. cit., I and II.

2. Schaff, op. cit., p.291 Cf. for what follows: Ibid., p.291.

3. Ibid., p.291.

4. Ibid., p.291.

5. Witte., op. cit., I, p.340.

6. This is further illustrated by Tholuck's letter to Menzies: "I wish especially to remark that the work (Romans, 1824) is to be regarded as the work of an earlier period of my life, and as having been intended for a particular purpose. I composed it in my twenty-fifth year, with the special view of commending to the hearts of my countrymen the doctrine of justification by faith, which at the time I perceived to be greatly misunderstood. Other points are laboured with

He was not as much interested to ascertain the sense of the words, as he was to find the "classical, religious, moral truth".

Tholuck wrote to correct others, and he also benefitted by the criticism which others had of his own writings. He was

"surrounded not only by students, who are always sensitive to the rumours of fame, but by professors who are able to point out any weaknesses in a colleague's armour. Tholuck was favoured with plenty of this kind of discipline, some of his Rationalistic colleagues being men of great ability as well as of European reputation, who did not spare his earliest efforts at authorship. But he had good humour enough to profit by such corrections; and his books, which poured in rapid succession from the press, were always improving in ability and learning; till he came, in course of time, to be acknowledged as the principal ornament of the University."¹

The most important example of Tholuck's reaction to criticism is the case which follows. In the wake of the Von Gerlach affair (Cf. next section) in which Tholuck was falsely implicated, C.F.A. Fritzsche of Rostock published 'A Review of the Merits of Mr. Tholuck as an Interpreter' (Halle, 1831) in which he catalogued the mistakes in Tholuck's Romans. Fritzsche intended to show that Tholuck

"committed every moment mistakes, (to irritate Tholuck he called them blunders), of the gravest character, against the canons of language and of interpretation; that he did not know how to place the accent aright, but offended in this respect against the forms of speech and against syntax; that he coined words in a mode which usage did not justify; that he gave definitions, which are not and cannot be sanctioned; that he fell into the most incredible errors in apprehending the meaning of the original, etc.... While all others contended against Tholuck's dogmatic principles, this writer accused him of the rudest ignorance concerning the laws of language and interpretation."²

With good will, Tholuck attempted to defend himself in his 'Review of the Criticism...by Dr. Fritzsche' (Halle, 1832), though he far from succeeded in freeing himself from the errors charged.

less care...Accordingly, it by no means presents what I now consider as the beau ideal of a theological commentary...(The) commentary on the Sermon on the Mount...contains many expositions of the doctrines, and might serve to render the dogmatical part of our theology more accessible to English divines." Quoted in Park, op. cit., p.13.

1. Stalker, op. cit., p.160.

2. Quoted from the Conversations Lexikon der neusten Zeit und Literatur, by Park, op. cit., p.9. The writers are opposers of Tholuck.

Fritzsche came forth with 'Preliminaries, etc.' (Halle, 1832), a particularization of the same errors and the addition of new ones. Tholuck's answer, 'One sober word more' (1832) did not vindicate him, for in both defensive writings, Tholuck chose theological grounds, and Fritzsche's attack was in the philological^{lo} realm. This was an important contest, because the combatants represented extremely hostile parties. Tholuck's enemies concede, however, that

"Though it may be regarded by the rationalists as a fortunate event, that their most influential opponent was thus divested of his false show of learning, yet still this kind of literary warfare this fault-finding (splitterrichterliche) dispute on words, these despicable reproaches for blunders in language, must be regarded as proof of a base spirit in our learned community."¹

Park's conclusion to the matter is as follows:

"That the animadversions of Fritzsche, and more recently of Strauss, were not entirely unjust, is admitted by many of Tholuck's friends; and the influence of them is said to have been decidedly beneficial both to his habits of investigation and his style of writing. But that these attacks were so ruinous to his reputation, as the preceding narrative of the Rationalists would indicate, is not pretended now even by his enemies. They are obliged to concede that the censures heaped upon him were too unqualified and indiscriminate, that his inaccuracies were by no means so gross, nor his faults of style so censurable, as was pretended...The replies of Tholuck...are said by many to be among his happiest efforts. They convict his reviewer of greater inaccuracies than were charged upon himself. His deportment, through the whole conflict, was truly Christian and noble."²

3. Tholuck as a Man of the Church

Witte suggests that,

"Despite Tholuck's sharply pronounced individual piety, he knew himself to be, not a lone Christian, but as one together with the believing members of the Church of all times and places. He served the Church, and the more united were the believers in those days, the more had he occasion to look back and to let come to expression the witness of the deep form of the truth of Scripture made by men of Christian antiquity and by the great students of

1. Park, op.cit., p.10f. Cf. also Witte, Das Leben, II, Chap.4,5.
2. Park, Op.cit., p.11.

"the Bible in the time of the Reformation. This sense of the Church, which more and more became the conscious directive of his life and work, meets us unmistakably as early as in the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. With astonishing breadth of reading and with his tact for the characteristic, he introduces the expositors of earlier centuries, especially Chrysostom, Augustine, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, et al."¹

One of Tholuck's most important contributions to the Church was the part he played in the evangelical revival in Germany. We noted in what a poor state of affairs the Church in Germany found herself under the old orthodoxy, and under rationalism, e.g., as described by Tholuck in Breslau, Berlin, and Halle. But revival came, and Tholuck himself had not a little to do with effecting the change. Witte writes of Tholuck:

"We know that in a great measure the wholesome change from Rationalism to faith which has been granted to our native country with - in the last fifty years is, next to God's grace, owing to the restless zeal of this brave 'miles Christi', a genuine 'good knight without fear and without reproach'. In dark and dreary days he has gallantly borne disgrace for Christ's sake. He, a single man, has won the field in the University of Halle, and his colleagues, one by one, have been forced to yield to his superiority of Christian energy and knowledge."²

Drummond claims that Tholuck "made Evangelical religion a living power in his native land, emancipated from narrowness and provincialism", and that he "regenerated the soul of his people".³ Stalker says:

"...whilst the influence of Schleiermacher was of inestimable value to many who had participated in the Awakening, there is another name more deserving to be associated with the origination of the movement itself - that of Tholuck. The latter was in much more pronounced sympathy with the general European Awakening; he was much more in contact with the men of revival in other countries... For a generation Tholuck was, in the public eye, the protagonist of the Awakening in Germany."⁴

As a man of the Church, Tholuck was interested in the mission of the Church. We noted that in Berlin and Halle he and his students

1. Witte, Das Leben, I, p.341.

2. Witte, Alliance, p.88.

3. Drummond, op.cit., p.127f. He quotes Stalker as follows: "What Wesley did for the Church of England, and Chalmers for the Church of Scotland, and Vinet for the Church of Switzerland, Tholuck may be said to have done for the Church of Germany."

4. Stalker, op.cit., p.159.

held regular meetings in which prayers were said for missions in all lands, and reports were read of missionary activities. Conversion

"awoke in his soul a hunger and thirst for the good of others which made him the friend and champion of every benevolent and missionary undertaking."¹

Indeed, we saw that Tholuck had vowed to go into the mission field himself, and had already received an appointment to Malta, when his health prevented him. As Hodge wrote in his journal, Tholuck

"has himself long cherished a strong desire to consecrate himself to the missionary work. But Providence has as yet closed the way.

Park comments on Tholuck's "missionary spirit" as follows:

"He also conducts a missionary meeting every month, at which he presents the latest intelligence respecting American, English, and other missions. He labours much in preparation for this meeting, and imparts to it a lively interest. This missionary spirit would not be indeed particularly noticeable among American Christians, but it is to be viewed in contrast with the prejudices and the dormancy of even the evangelical party in his own land."³

Tholuck was a preacher, and preached regularly in the University Church in Halle for a great number of years. He was interested in the unity of the Church. He was glad to point out, concerning his own province, that

"Ever since the year 1614, when John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, adopted the reformed confession instead of Lutheranism, which was the established religion of his country, our Prussian sovereigns, with their families, have always professed a spirit of toleration, and have, moreover, exerted themselves to effect a union of the several denominations of the Protestant Church. We may be allowed to say that even among the Prussian people the tendency to union has been constantly increasing, since, in 1817, a 'United Evangelical Church' became the established church of the country."⁴

Tholuck, a Lutheran, was a great admirer of the Reformed Church, and said to Hodge "that there was more vitality among the Reformed than

1. Stalker, op. cit., p.169.

2. Hodge, op. cit., p.122.

3. Park, op. cit., p.15. Cf. Witte, Leben, I, p.218 f., on the interest of Tholuck in the mission to the Jews.

4. Tholuck, Alliance, p.87.

among the Lutherans", and mentioned that in Basel, Bremen, Bonn, and Berlin, where the Reformed Church is influential, "religion is in the most flourishing state."¹

We have noted that Tholuck's "The Spirit of the Lutheran Divines" and "The Academic Life in the Seventeenth Century" were written to warn the Church against reviving Lutheran orthodoxy; for he felt that it led to division in the Church, and loss of vitality. Tholuck, a friend of the Evangelical Union, deplored quarrels and divisions within the Church, and hoped that "high-Church" Lutheranism would fade.²

Another contribution of Tholuck's was his part in founding the "Kirchentag", one of the greatest attempts to stir the people's interest in the life of the Church. It began in 1848 when all Europe shook with revolution, and in the old Church in Wittenberg on which Luther nailed his Ninety-five Theses.³ Four confessional Churches came together to pledge harmony and to form the confederation of German Churches. The "Kirchentag" aimed at revival and the removal of infidelity and vice; it created the "Inner Mission", and continues to this day as a significant part of the life of the Church in Germany.

It was falsely believed by some that Tholuck exhibited an ungenerous spirit against his colleagues Gesenius and Wegscheider in the following instance. Ludwig von Gerlach, associate judge at Halle, and a friend of Tholuck's, exposed in Hengstenberg's Evangelical Church Journal, the views of the two professors, which attacked the Scriptures.⁴ His evidence was from students' lecture notes. This

1. Hodge, op. cit., p.123.

2. Schaff, op. cit., p.294.

3. Ibid., Chap. xxi. Other founders are Nitzsch, Müller, Hengstenberg, Dorner, Ullmann, Hoffmann, Ebrard, Lange, et al.

4. Park, op. cit., p.8f.

expose was felt to be an infringement of the professors' right to freedom and privacy in the lecture-room. Tholuck had not approved of Von Gerlach's article, had tried to dissuade him from publishing it, yet was suspected of having instigated the whole affair. Tholuck wrote to Hodge: "On the whole I have not been able to agree with Von Gerlach's action...I know not whether the cause is really advanced by it."¹

B. Tholuck's Thought

1. Tholuck's Philosophy

At the time of Hodge's visit to Tholuck, the latter held decidedly^d "pantheistic" views. By "pantheistic" we here understand, \Rightarrow that Tholuck posited a continuity¹⁾ between God and man, \Rightarrow and²⁾ between spirit (both divine and human) and matter. That Tholuck was not unfriendly to pantheism, as he understood it, can be shown by the statement of Charles Hodge³⁾ representing Tholuck's opinion to^{be} that "vital religion" in Germany was being helped by the leading adherents of the pantheistic philosophy to entertain a "deep religious feeling", and to see the "insufficiency of the neological systems."² Furthermore Hegel himself attributes pantheistic leanings to Tholuck.³

1. Hodge, op. cit., p.216. Hodge, though acknowledging his unfamiliarity with the case, sided with Von Gerlach and Hengstenberg against Tholuck and Neander. Ibid., p.217.

Tholuck was interested in the Church in other lands. Cf., e.g., his article, "Theological Literature and Education in Italy", Biblical Repository, I, p.177ff, II, p.394ff. Cf. also Hodge, Op. cit. p.208ff.

2. Hodge, op. cit., p.120.

3. Park, op. cit., p.18, quotes Hegel as follows: Tholuck "seems to be seized with a wonderful enthusiasm in behalf of a mystical philosophy, which is to be called, in the usual sense of the term, entirely pantheistic. But yet, whenever he undertakes to philosophize..he does not go beyond the ordinary view taken by the metaphysical understanding, nor beyond its indefinite forms of thought" Tholuck said of Hegel in 1873: "It was the atmosphere of the Prussian Capital, and the union with a pious wife, that impregnated both his mind and his philosophical system with Christian principles". Tholuck, Alliance, p.87.

But more specifically, 1) Tholuck claims continuity between man and God. The conscience of man, he says, is the essence of God.¹ Or again, "the material universe and the soul of man are of the divine essence".²

2) Tholuck suggested that there is continuity between spirit and matter. Matter is "only a different modification of the spirit, the essence of both being the same."³ Or again, "everything in nature (has) Bewusstsyn, consciousness, a sense of life - trees, stones, everything that exists."⁴ Or again, God "is all that is good or beautiful in the universe."⁵

But Tholuck would not prefer to be classed with the pantheistic philosophers - he would choose rather to be grouped with those Christian theologians who "differ from the Pantheists in being persuaded of the personality of the Deity, and the individuality of the human soul."⁶

It would seem from this that Tholuck tries to distinguish himself from the Pantheists by saying that they are impersonalistic, and that he is personalistic. In order to hold personalism together with pantheism, Tholuck attributes 'consciousness' to all things. This is a valid philosophical distinction by which Tholuck can distinguish himself from Hegel, Sch¹eiermacher, and the materialistic pantheists (who believe in an impersonal God-world), but his view has still "pantheistic" tendencies, however personalistic it may be.

1. Hodge, op. cit., p.137.
2. Ibid., p.122.
3. Ibid., p.119.
4. Ibid., p.140.
5. Ibid., p.137.
6. Ibid., p.122.

We shall not go further with this investigation by carrying it into the works of Tholuck themselves. It suffices here only to note the possibility of "pantheistic" tendencies, as defined above, in Tholuck's mind, in order that we may the more readily detect any such motifs when later we examine Tholuck's writings. Perhaps these tendencies will take various forms of blurring the line between God and man, or confusing the Spirit of God with the spirit of man.

The second point is that, for Tholuck truth comes from the inner life of religious experience. Julius writes of this to Guido:

"Guido, believe me, there is a truth, a sacred truth, which is not to be speculated upon, but to be enjoyed¹... The more man learns to trace the operations of the living God as a real personal agent, by marking the diversified experience of his own heart, the more indefatigably will he make out, in the apparently confused mass of this world's events, the 'disjecta membra Poetae', and thus obtain more frequent glimpses of the divine harmony subsisting amidst all the mysteries of our existence."²

What could be the result of such a religion? Tholuck, says Rudolph Otto³, stands

"for that artistic and refined Pietism, which thought it could unite the intellectual culture of contemporary poets and philosophers with the cult of the Lamb. But how appalling is that general softening in brain and thought which affects the age and its theology, as the new sentimentality gains ground! How rapidly the inheritance from the 'Aufklärung' - sternly disciplined thought, method, precise concepts - is dissipated! Tearful devoutness takes the place of scrupulous examination. Only compare Theodore with Julius."⁴

Otto sees Guido and Julius as a "ridiculous dilettantism", an "ostentatious display of scholarship" in which edifying homilies on the "new birth" were substituted for conscientious work and scientific method.⁵

1. Tholuck, Guido and Julius, p.50.

2. Ibid., p.74.

3. Otto, Rudolph, The Philosophy of Religion, 1931, p.216f.

4. Ibid., p.217.

5. Ibid., p.217f.

Tholuck posits the highest truth for that which the human reason or spirit appropriates. He believes that the real essence of the mind itself is actual knowledge, and that it can never fall completely into error. This view depends upon a distinction between reason, which cannot by nature seriously err, and understanding, which is subject to error.¹ The reason or spirit of man cannot fall into serious error because of the source from which it comes. It has its existence in its "Life-in-God", and this means God in us, or the spirit of man in continuity with the Spirit of God.¹ The

"The great and the divine within us we owe, not to (understanding), but to a harpstring of the soul, played from within us, that inward thrill which is the parent of all science, art, and health-bringing invention. It comes into the soul as something given from within; and as man is conscious that he did not create it, to whom is it to be traced unless to the God who impels and urges from within, and thus to inspiration?.... Since Man is born of God, he has an evidence of God, and the foundation of truth for man is the life of God within him."²

This subjectivism is expressed in another way by the term "Anschauung", that the test of all metaphysical truths is the ability to form a distinct image of the subject before the mind. This is intuition. Without an "Anschauung" of any subject, there can be no establishment of its truth. The test of the correctness of any idea, therefore, is the possibility of its forming a clear image in the mind.

Barth compares Tholuck to Schleiermacher. For the former, it is not Discourses on Religion, but Discourses out of Religion.³ It is not ideas about religious excitement, it is religious excitement itself. But like Schleiermacher, De Wette, and

1. Ibid., p.217f.

2. Otto quoting Tholuck, Ibid, p.219.

3. Barth, K., Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, p.462f.

ultimately the Hegelians, so Tholuck holds that that experience is the meeting of man with God, and that the heart is capable for such meeting. Plato's $\mu\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, and Schleiermacher's Discourses were witnesses to the truth of this possibility. "An inner \equiv \wedge disposition of the inner, for the Christian truth, which ~~stands in the vitality~~ ^{consists in} of the original $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ in man", Tholuck finds in the New Testament. That man understands it shows that he is kin to it. Awakening means and was the awakening of that excitement, and the excitement was the excitement of the Christian heart.

Once again the line between God and man is blurred by the positing of a near infallibility of the human reason or intuition to know or feel truth, and the facile identification of the human spirit and the Spirit of God. What effect could this tendency of Tholuck's have upon his interpretation of the Bible? We anticipate a most disastrous one. For we expect that in many places where God is subject Tholuck will be led to begin speaking of man, confusing the two.

Also, we should not be surprised to find Tholuck appealing to highly subjective interpretations of some passages, on the mere grounds that he has intuited and has formed a clear image of what the passage says, or that he has a feeling within that such and such interpretation is true. For, we remember, for Tholuck whatever is arrived at in this way must certainly be the truth. Perhaps these presuppositions will lead him to overlook grammatical and historical considerations in a text, and result in an erroneous interpretation of certain passages.

Stalker suggests a third point in Tholuck's philosophical thought: viz., the consciousness of sin.

"His tendency from boyhood upwards, had been toward Pantheism, and this tendency was strengthened by his wide wanderings in the fields of Oriental Mysticism...To Tholuck's self-centred and towering nature this was a congenial doctrine. But, when he thought it out to the end, he found one rebellious fact, which obstinately refused to be reconciled with the system; and this was the consciousness of sin. He felt himself to be standing alone and condemned, over against the commanding law of God. And the whole structure of Pantheism collapsed when touched with this one confession of conscience, 'I have sinned.'"¹

As Barth put it, Tholuck brought to light a piece of knowledge hid by the eighteenth century and by Schleiermacher, viz., Genesis 3 and Romans 7, the two pillars on which rests the edifice of vital Christianity; "descendite ut ascendatis", sin and reconciliation.² These two pillars are "two straight gates through which man enters into life....This is the fundamental law of Christianity."³

Hodge records how Tholuck stressed the doctrine of sin:

"Tholuck said he thought the doctrine of depravity was the most important doctrine of the gospel, and that he did not believe a Pelagian could be a Christian."⁴

Guido writes to Julius:

"How rich a blessing it has proved to me, that you first called my attention to sin, in order to gain from that point a comprehensive view of the whole gospel!...For there must come, sooner or later, to everyman, a perception of his lost and ruined state. If a man is thus undone, and reduced to nothing in all his own capabilities, works, and very being, so that he feels that he is no more than a miserable, condemned, forlorn sinner, then comes the help and strength of God."⁵

Tholuck had much to say about sin and evil. His was a thorough-going doctrine of original and corporate sin and of total depravity.

1. Stalker, op. cit., p.169. 2. Barth, op. cit., p.467.
3. Tholuck, Guido and Julius, p.78. 4. Hodge, op. cit., p.118.
5. Tholuck, Guido and Julius, p.102.

"But the spirit is a simple substance, and if men have brought into the world with them what is opposed to the divine nature, it must pervade their whole being. Error and delusion have taken possession of the intellect; distress and misery have penetrated the feelings, and thus every son of Adam comes into the world bearing marks of his descent...The evil, the error, and the misery, which are the portion of the whole race, encircle him from his cradle: they flow in upon him by a thousand channels, and excite to action within him whatever is allied to them by education, by instruction, by example, and by the institutions of society."¹

On the problems of evil, Tholuck concludes that the origin of evil is not God, for God does not contradict Himself, nor is evil pre-existent.² He rejects the Pelagian view, that evil naturally accompanies the good, as being pantheistic. But evil is possible in a finite being. God vanquishes evil, He does not give in to it. God has permitted it. It is no accident. It serves God. God redeems men from evil.

Hodge writes that in a discussion on predestination,

"Tholuck remarked that the two extremes were Pelagianism, and the making God the author of sin. Truth lies in the midst. To this I believe all freely assented, predestinarians and anti-predestinarians."³

There appears a basic contradiction in Tholuck's thought.

On the one hand he blurs the line between God and man, but on the other he draws that line hard and clear with his doctrine of sin. Has Tholuck any reconciliation of these views? We shall consider this possibility later.

It might be mentioned as a fourth item that Tholuck may well have been influenced by Hegel's dialectic. In a great many instances he found that "truth lies in the midst", or in a synthesis of anti-thetical propositions.

1. Ibid., p.121f.

3. Hodge, op. cit., p.165.

2. Ibid., pp.50-66.

But first, we noted how highly Tholuck regarded Hegel. He felt that his mind and system were "impregnated with Christian principles".¹ Many views of the two men coincided. Both agreed that reality is mind, by which experience is resolved into consciousness; both had "pantheistic" leanings, and believed in logical evolution. Both tended to blur the line between God and man.

Tholuck took a middle or synthesizing view on many matters. He was known as a "mediating theologian". He was also a "union" theologian. He believed in universalism as a dogmatician, but denied it as an exegete. He understood the history of Israel as the development of ideas.² He spoke of Christ as the synthesis of God's holiness and love.

But this is no serious charge against Tholuck, for several reasons. The positions he took were taken individually in the situation, and there were many instances in which Tholuck represented an extreme. He was not one to take the easiest course, as, e.g., his first years in Halle indicate. He was considered leader of his party, and not on basis of weakness. In matters of the Church, Tholuck's mediating position rendered a great service for harmony. In theology, to hold antithetical points in tension is often our best possibility.

Our final point is that Tholuck was not in doubt about the connection of philosophy and theology. He rejected Schleiermacher's notion that philosophy has nothing to do with religion,³ and Hegel's opinion that theology only expresses philosophical truths in Biblical language.⁴ Tholuck understands that "the theologian differs from the mere philosopher, in respect of the source whence he derives his articles of faith".⁵ Nevertheless, it is important that the theologian be well versed in philosophy, for several good reasons.

1. Tholuck, Alliance, p.87.

2. Tholuck, Hints on the

Importance of Old Testament Study, p.235, 240.

3. Tholuck, Encyclopaedia, p.558.

4. Ibid., p.561.

First of all, the theologian has an historical interest in philosophy because it has in every generation influenced theology, particularly dogmatics.¹ Therefore a knowledge of the philosophical systems of the past is necessary for a proper understanding of the / theologian seeks harmony between his faith and his thought. "His habits of thinking are philosophical."² Therefore he will benefit from familiarity with the current philosophy. He must show that faith is consistent with philosophical truth, and must set his argument forth in a convincing way. If the prevalent philosophy contradicts his faith, then he must refute that philosophy upon its own grounds. "The true philosophical system will not contradict the principles which lie at the foundation of the Christian scheme."² Perhaps an erroneous philosophy will gain prominence for a long time such as the Pantheism of Spinoza, yet, at length, the proper weapons will be discovered for the Christian to refute the error. So it was that Hegel's system disproved that of Spinoza, after the latter had enjoyed almost 200 years of unchallenged reign.²

Tholuck is under no illusion that he or any other theologian is free from the prevailing philosophy of the day. He knows that "his habits of thinking are philosophical". The theologian should understand this. Then he can make philosophy useful to his work. Tholuck lists the advantages which result from a study of the history of philosophy:

5. Ibid., p.208.
1. Ibid., p.208.
2. Ibid., p.213f.

/ theology of those times. Another reason is that the

"First, the science of theology demands an acquaintance with the most important philosophical systems, and the order of their development. Secondly, the best philosophical discipline is found in an investigation of the methods in which one system is evolved from another. Thirdly, the historical view furnishes illustrations of the fact, that every system of philosophy is in a peculiar harmony with the time in which it was produced, takes its form from the peculiar relations of its author, and also that no one system can demand our implicit subjection to it."¹

We feel that here Tholuck is saying something very vital. When we understand that the theology of former times is influenced by the prevailing philosophies, and that those philosophies are shaped by various factors existing at the time, then we have a key for interpreting and appreciating those theologies. But even more important is the lesson we learn from this, that our theology is influenced by today's philosophy, which is in turn shaped by the circumstances of our day and factors in the lives of the leading philosophers of our time. Because our theology is so time-bound, and so permeable to outside (alien) influences, we should understand that what we say theologically is tentative, subject to error, and that our words about God never become infallible, timeless truths - just because of who we are; and even more, because of who He is. Therefore we can take ourselves less seriously, trust God to accept us and our witness, and treat with tolerance and respect the witness of others.

A further point is this. Is it not a result of the Incarnation that theology and philosophy became mixed up together? Is it not the effect of God's coming into flesh that the Gospel becomes entangled with prevailing modes of thought and chooses to be expressed in these very human and earthy forms, and in none other? Is it not the consequence of God's becoming man that God's thoughts are now to take the form of man's thoughts? We believe that the answer in each case is 'yes', even though the Gospel is not to be identified with prevailing modes of thought. even though theology

1. Ibid., p.213f., Italics mine.

is not philosophy.

But the question which we must pose is this: If Tholuck was not alarmed about the interplay of theology and philosophy, was it because he was thinking from the vantage point of the Incarnation, or was it because he was so directed by his "pantheistic" tendencies to confuse God with man? We believe that the latter alternative is true. And we shall not be surprised, in our investigation of Tholuck's writings, to discover him seeking the juncture of God and man not in Jesus Christ in every case, but in some "pantheistic" synthesis in some cases.

2. Tholuck's Theology

Unlike the Rationalists, Schleiermacher, De Wette, and many others, Tholuck may be said to represent a situational theology. For him, the content of all theological statements is conditioned by definite human situations.¹ There are no truths in general.

"In his theological speculations, as well as philosophical, Tholuck is independent and untrammelled. It need not be stated that the spirit of his theology is eminently evangelical... It must be remembered, however, that in his orthodoxy, Tholuck is a German, and not a Briton, or of British descent. He makes no effort to regulate his creed by any of our formularies, but examines every doctrine for himself, as if he were the first man who had investigated it."²

1. Barth, op. cit., p.465.

2. Park, op. cit., p.18. A word of caution should be spoken about Tholuck's independence of creeds and formularies. Under the heading "What is demanded for the right prosecution of Theological Study", Tholuck says, "First, the theologian must believe the doctrines which he studies in their scientific form... Besides, the Evangelical Church (Prussia) positively requires that the theologian shall maintain the faith that is taught in her creed, and obliges him, at his ordination, to take an oath that he will teach this faith. If therefore, as the case often is, the student do not freely adopt the articles of our creed, then it should be the object of his theological study to bring his mind through his doubts into the belief of these articles; and as our church presupposes that these articles are received by every clergyman, so should it be the effort of every clergyman to make himself especially familiar with those modes of discussion, which aim at establishing the doctrines of the Church, and reconciling them with what is known to be true." Tholuck, Encyclopaedia, p.193f.

Tholuck felt that the theologian had a task in apologetics.

"The man who is scientifically educated, feels the imperative need of learning the logical necessity and the inward connection of all the propositions which he believes to be correct. In all ages, therefore, have the men who have enjoyed a philosophical training been sedulous to show the reasonableness of Christian truths, and the connection of one doctrine with another...In the prosecution of these inquiries it is needful, first of all, to examine the grounds on which we may rest our faith in the revelation made by Christ and the apostles. If this faith be shown to accord with the principles of reason, then it is of necessity presupposed, that the contents of the divine revelation are also reasonable; then the teachings of the New Testament are believed, and, after laborious study, are by degrees more and more clearly understood... 'Credo ut intelligam... Fides praecedit intellectum.'"¹

Tholuck does not take apologetics to aim "at nothing but to establish the divine authority of the Christian religion", but he believes, rather, that "The apology for Christian doctrine is given in every theological science which is elaborated in a Christian spirit."² The main questions for apologetics, however, do concern the credibility of Biblical history, e.g.; the person of Christ, miracles, etc.

"This historical and apologetic proof secures faith in the higher dignity of Christ, and also in the authority of the apostles, for it confirms their narratives. If therefore, Christ is the Logos who became man, the inference follows that the doctrine which was taught by himself and the apostles must, in an absolute sense, be conformed to the principles of reason. If it do not appear so to us immediately, it will yet assume such an appearance, when the reason shall have made a gradual advancement. Therefore Herder says, 'Our reason is educated by the divine revelation, and the well educated daughter will not strike her mother in the face.'"³

Here is a rather facile attempt at positing a continuity between Christ as Logos and the reason of this world. There is, for Tholuck, a harmony of revelation and reason.

1. Tholuck, Encyclopaedia, p.555. 2. Ibid., p.556f.
3. Ibid., p.563f.

Tholuck continues - and here we have his anthropology -

"Paul himself speaks of Christianity as *μωρία* in the view of the world, 1 Cor. 1:21; but he says, at the same time, that for the *τέλειοι* it is nothing but *σοφία*; 1 Cor. 2:2. Col. 2:3 ...If now the Christianized portions of our race are the most rational and the most accomplished of all men, should we not, therefore, form a favourable judgment of the Christian religion, which has exerted so favourable an influence upon the world?"¹

Tholuck does not see that the so-called "Christianized portions of our race", "the most rational...and accomplished of all men", are not always to be found with the *τέλειοι*, for the former, as often as not, have to do with "the powers that rule the world" who "never knew God's hidden wisdom", but who "crucified the Lord of Glory" (1 Cor. 2:6ff.). What Tholuck rejects is the Gospel as the *μωρία* of God, a foolishness so far from being continuous with reason, that it offends precisely those "rational" and "accomplished" men, simply because in Christ "lie hidden all God's treasures of wisdom and knowledge". (Col. 2:3). Tholuck is not far from the Rationalists here:

"Rationalism regards many truths as the easy and simple discovery of a sound understanding; but yet these very truths are so easy and so simple, solely because a revelation has educated and improved our rational powers.² ...The sight which we shall enjoy hereafter is different, in various particulars, from the knowledge which we enjoy here. First, our knowledge always has respect to single points of truth, and never to the total unity of it. Sight, on the contrary, embraces all the points of knowledge in one united whole. Secondly, our knowledge is derived from imperfect data, is obtained from a disadvantageous point of view, because our inward experience is yet imperfect; that is, our feelings and volitions are not yet perfectly united with God. In consequence of this imperfect experience, our knowledge, which is founded on this experience, must be of course incomplete."³

1. Ibid., p. 564.

2. Ibid., p. 202.

3. Barth, op. cit., p. 463.

3. Ibid., p. 565 f.

Here would be a good place, we feel, for Tholuck to say that it is sin which has corrupted our knowledge, and that depravity has reached even to man's reason, so that his reason has become un-reason. But he does not say this. He believes that the reason of man can easily embrace the Logos of God, because they are of the same substance. If Stalker insists that Tholuck's consciousness of sin set a limit to his pantheism, we must say that the opposite is equally true: his pantheism set a limit upon his consciousness of sin. Barth is right to say that Tholuck believed man to have a heart capable of meeting God, an "inner disposition for Christian truth, which consists in the original ἀλήθεια in man", unspoiled by sin.¹

As for Tholuck's Soteriology, he stated that his Commentary on Romans was for the purpose of clarifying the doctrine of the justification of the sinner through the grace of God in Christ, freely given by Him, and claimed by faith.² This doctrine Tholuck presents as the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, and the decisive experience of the evangelical Christian.³

Humanity, says Tholuck, must be saved from without; just as the man who fell among thieves cannot save himself, neither can man.⁴ Nor indeed can religious founders, law-givers or philosophers save him. Man requires One who has seen the face of God, the only begotten Son.⁵ Christ was no mere teacher. He fulfilled all

1. Barth, op. cit., p.463.
2. Witte, Das Leben, I, p.340.
3. Ibid., p.340.
4. Tholuck, Guido and Julius, p.110.
5. Ibid., p.112.

righteousness, He bore all sin.¹ Whether God could have accomplished our redemption in some other way, whether we or He is reconciled; such questions are not interesting.² For Tholuck, the one principle which characterizes the Christian religion is,

"that all the truths of the Christian scheme point to the incarnation of God in Christ, and to the redemption which was effected thereby."³

Tholuck considers that Christ is Redeemer in a moral aspect:

"He is their Redeemer, in the first place, because he has brought into the world an absolutely perfect law of morals; in the second place, because he has imparted to (some of) them such an impulse of love, that they fulfil his law with freedom of volition. Without a knowledge of Christ, they are left ignorant of a perfect moral standard. The Saviour has therefore redeemed the human reason in this regard...The moral redemption...which Christ has effected for us does not consist in the fact of his perfecting our rule of duty, but rather in the fact of his so awakening the feelings of love within us that we fulfil the law with freedom of volition."⁴

Since he puts Christ in such a central place, and the redemption accomplished in Him, we shall expect Tholuck to understand many passages if not the whole Bible, in terms of Christ, the Saviour from sin.

To make a conclusion to this chapter, we shall only suggest some things which Tholuck's life, philosophy and theology allow us to anticipate in his hermeneutics. We shall expect Tholuck's expositions to be coloured by deep expressions of piety and faith, with the passion of missionary zeal. We anticipate finding in his writings imaginative insights into various texts, bold figures, a wealth of illustrative material, the expression of broad principles and the lack of analytical detail. We understand him to be a dedicated Churchman consciously doing his task of exegesis within the Church of his own time and of all times, and for the Church.

1. Ibid., p.138, 142.

2. Ibid., p.150.

3. Tholuck, Encyclopaedia, p.187.

4. Ibid., p.568.

N.B. - Other doctrines of Tholuck, e.g., his doctrine of Scripture, Eschatology, Ecclesiology, etc., appear later in this thesis.

We shall not be surprised to find in Tholuck's treatment of Scriptures certain "pantheistic" tendencies to confuse God and man, spirit and matter, God and the world. We think it likely that Tholuck will resort to many highly subjective interpretations, because of his views on the validity of intuition, reason, and feeling. But, in contradiction to his notion of the continuity of God and man, we expect that Tholuck will give a full treatment of texts that have to do with sin, and that he will affirm the doctrine of depravity. We shall not be surprised to see traces of Hegel's dialectic showing themselves in various of Tholuck's writings. We shall also expect comments from time to time on various philosophies and systems of thought, and we shall also look to see glimpses of the philosophies of Tholuck's day appearing in his writings. We anticipate also Tholuck's applying texts to the situation of his own times, and to the people around him. We look for an apologetical interest to express itself in Tholuck's works. And finally, we expect a heavy emphasis upon Christ as Saviour of the world from sin.

In the following survey of nineteenth century hermeneutics we include the names of Schleiermacher, Baur, Hengstenberg, Hofmann, Luecke, and Dilthey; and this shall serve us as background material for our study of the hermeneutics of Tholuck.

Schleiermacher made several innovations in the field of hermeneutics which were derived from his theology in general. His fondness of apologetics is apparent in his broadening of the hermeneutical material to include speech and conversation. This is not surprising, for we can well imagine that clever conversation among his fellow sophisticated intellectuals in the Berlin circle was very important to him. Speaking and thinking are integrally bound up together, he says.¹ Therefore hermeneutics stands with the doctrine or theory of thinking ("Lehre vom Denken"), which is philosophical.² Speech rests on the knowledge of language; therefore hermeneutics and grammar hang together.³ Speaking and thinking are moral acts, in that they express a person's individuality; therefore ethics is involved.⁴ Thus Schleiermacher widens the subject in an entirely novel way, and in this way he can bring to the fore the things which concern him most.

1. Heinz Kimmerle in the introduction to his edition of Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik, 1958, considers this "the most decisively productive thought" Schleiermacher had upon the subject. p.17.

2. Wach, Joachim, Das Verstehen, I, p.111.

3. Ibid., p.112.

4. Niebuhr, Richard R. "Schleiermacher on Language and Feeling", Theology Today, July, 1960, p.155.

We must remember that for Schleiermacher religion means the cultured life. Churches exist as centres of culture to educate the people in the ways of the highest life.¹ The highest life is the composite life, the life which is aware of itself and of common humanity. "Persons", "individuals", are important concepts on the one hand, and so are "community" and "humanity" on the other. This bi-polar awareness, this dialectic, is the "hallmark of selfhood".² Jesus Christ is Revealer and Redeemer precisely because and insofar as He had a heightened self-consciousness and an acute awareness of others.³

But how may this be applied to the written Scriptures? Just as in understanding and interpreting the spoken word, so in understanding and interpreting the written word of Scripture, there must be a "something in common" ("Gemeinschaftliches"), a "connecting point" ("Anknuepfungspunkt"), between the speaker or writer and the hearer or reader.⁴ What is needed to establish this is a grammatical method to know what the words mean, etc., and a psychological method to understand the individuality of the speaker or writer. The latter method requires a divinatory and a comparative faculty. The divinatory intuits the individuality of the speaker or writer; the comparative, the type or kind of person he is.⁵ Schleiermacher, in

1. Ibid., p.164.

2. Ibid., p.159.

3. Ibid., p.165.

4. Wach, op. cit., p.189.

5. Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, pp. 107ff., 119, 138f. Henceforth abbreviated: Herm. This is to be distinguished from Lücke's edition Hermeneutik und Kritik, 1838, henceforth abbreviated Herm. u.Krit. Niebuhr, op. cit., p.159: The divinatory grasps the individuality of the author by transforming the interpreter into the other. This can be done, because everyone carries with him a minimum of all others. The comparative sets the author under a type, but this presupposes

true Romantic form, says that the divinatory faculty is the feminine virtue, and the comparative the masculine.¹

But the psychological technique of interpretation requires a very special person, an artist who has a talent for language ("Sprachtalent") and a knowledge of men ("Menschenkenntnis").² This knowledge of men reconstructs the individuality of the author. Thus Schleiermacher can say that exposition is art ("Auslegung ist Kunst").³

Another strand of Schleiermacher's theology is "the feeling of absolute dependence." "Feeling" and "experience" are important words in Schleiermacher's vocabulary. "Feeling" is the name he gives to consciousness of kind which thinking carries with it.⁴ The Word of God for him is "self-impartment", ("Selbstmitteilung"), the putting forth of one's own excitement or feeling ("Erregung fortzupflanzen"); for God comes to us only through feeling, therefore feeling cannot be challenged as a way of knowing God.⁵ Psychological interpretation is used to find "one's own personal experiences" ("eigene, persönliche Erfahrungen").⁶ Thus no set of hermeneutical rules can govern this, for it depends upon talent for language and knowledge of men, i.e., it is an art.

Joachim Wach claims that Schleiermacher's use of "the mutual enlightenment of the part and the whole" ("der wechselseitigen

the immediate grasping of the identity of the author. The ultimate relation of the two is the nature of the self. Therefore for hermeneutics this two-fold psychological method enables the science of understanding others to be concrete, and yet deal with wholes of meaning.

1. Wach, op. cit., p.141.

2. Ibid., p.115.

3. Ibid., p.114.

4. Niebuhr, op. cit., p.153.

5. Barth, K., "Das Wort in der Theologie von Schleiermacher bis Ritschl", Zwischen den Zeiten, 1928, Heft 2, p.94. Also his From Rousseau to Ritschl, op. cit., p.347ff. In speaking of Christ we are speaking of feeling. Christ is the historical reference

Erhellung von Einzelnem und Ganzem") was an epoch-making distinction.¹ Much of Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik consists of rules derived from it. Quite rightly the context ("Zusammenhang") of a passage is held to be important to the interpretation of the word and expression.² With Schleiermacher we begin with the "preliminary divination of the whole" ("vorläufigen Divination des Ganzen").³

For Schleiermacher interpretation is really a very easy task for the virtuoso with "talent for language" and "knowledge of men", which he himself doubtless fancies he has. Such a one can understand a text subjectively (from the standpoint of the writer as an individual) and objectively (from the stand-point of the community from which he writes) even better than the writer himself.⁴ There are, however, some difficult passages; but this is the fault of the authors themselves. There is a hermeneutical "inspiration" ("Begeisterung"), and the less a text arouses this, the less important it may be.⁵

of feeling (p.349). Revelation is the excitement of feeling in the individual (p.351). There is no ultimate opposition between God and man. Man is the subject, Christ the predicate. (p.354).

6. Wach, op. cit., p.92.

1. Ibid., p.103. Feeling expresses the moral weight of thinking, the outward impetus of reason from the individual toward the community and the dependence of reason in the individual upon a like impetus and feeling in others. Thinking and feeling are co-present functions of the self. Each is a perfectly original expression of the whole self. Feeling includes self-consciousness and consciousness of kind. Schleiermacher, Herm., p.46, says: "Jedes Verstehen des Einzelnen ist bedingt durch ein Verstehen des Ganzen."

2. Schleiermacher's two canons in his section of grammatical exegesis have to do with this: 1. "Alles was noch einer näheren Bestimmung bedarf in einer gegebenen Rede, darf nur aus dem dem Verfasser und seinem ursprünglichen Publikum gemeinsamen Sprachgebiet bestimmt werden." Herm. p.90. 2. "Der Sinn eines jeden Wortes an einer gegebenen Stelle muss bestimmt werden nach seinem Zusammensein mit denen die es umgeben." Herm. p.95.

3. Wach, op. cit., p.101.
op. cit., p.157.

4. Ibid., p.127 Cf. Niebuhr,
5. Wach, op.cit., p.127.

Thus for Schleiermacher the enlightened interpreter in his system clearly presides over Scripture. "Schleiermacher's man does not need to hear, nor has he already heard."¹ He stands in an "excitement" ("Erregung") where there is nothing new to hear. "And so he as a preacher has nothing to say, except what he himself out of his own person has to say."² Thus he controls and rules the Bible. As H.R. Mackintosh observes, for Schleiermacher, "The free man is lord of all things"; but Schleiermacher forgot to add: "and servant of all for Christ's sake."³

Schleiermacher was very fond of understanding things in terms of two complementary factors which compose a circle. We have noticed this, e.g./ outward thinking; thinking is inward speaking. Self-hood is characterised by a bi-polar awareness of self and others, one reacting upon the other. Understanding moves from the divinatory to the comparative, from the individual to the general, and back again, to and fro. The interpreter requires a "talent in language" and the "knowledge of men".⁴ This is similar to Schleiermacher's main division in his hermeneutics: grammatical and psychological exposition. These two themselves are circular, complementary.⁵ The part and the whole mutually enlighten. Schleiermacher mentions other possibilities; the formal and material, the spirit and the flesh, light and darkness, heaven and earth, etc., which he takes to be important complements in the New Testament.⁶ The problem for

1. Barth, "Das Wort...", op. cit., p.157.

2. Ibid., p.95.

3. Mackintosh, H.R., Types of

Modern Theology, p.37.

4. "Man muss den Menschen schon kennen um die Rede zu verstehen und doch soll man erst aus der Rede kennen lernen." Herm. p.44.

5. "Grammat (isch). Der Mensch mit s(eine)r Thätigkeit verschwindet und erscheint nur als Organ der Sprache. Techn(isch). Die Sprache mit ihrer bestimmender Kraft verschwindet und erscheint nur als Organ des Menschen im Dienst s(eine)r Individualität, so wie dort die / in his treatment of speaking and thinking. Speaking is

Schleiermacher in his Speeches on Religion, as in many other places, is "how to make a closed ring, the symbol of eternity and completeness."¹

To put this in another way, Schleiermacher was the peacemaker in the Church.² For him there were no contradictions which could not be reconciled. Truth lies in the middle, "in the prⁱsimplicity of mind of Jesus", in "common feeling", in "the common note." Schleiermacher disliked the Old Testament and John the Baptist, because they were disruptive influences. They divided between heaven and earth, grace and sin. But Christ removed these contradictions.³ Truth is not in a third thing (Hegel), but in the middle of two views. Feeling is the peace between contradictions, it knows the presence of God in human awareness.⁴

This predisposition of Schleiermacher's for circularity and harmony has important implications for his hermeneutics, and takes the form of a distinction between "the sensuous" and "the spiritual", and the need to reinterpret the former in terms of the latter.⁵ Schleiermacher revives Luther's dualism of the two worlds in this sense.⁶ The result of this distinction between "the spiritual" and

Persönlichkeit im Dienst der Sprache. Grammat(isch). Nicht möglich ohne technisch. Techn(isch). Nicht möglich ohne grammat(isch)." etc. Herm p.113.

6. Herm. p.66.

1. On Religion, p.5.

2. Barth, K., Rousseaux, op. cit., p.332.

3. Ibid., p.333.

4. Ibid., p.334.

5. Schleiermacher, On Religion, New York, 1958, p.71:

"The universe p^retrays itself in the inner life, and then the corporeal is comprehensible from the spiritual." Cf. also p.137.

6. Schlatter, Adolph, "Die philosophische Arbeit seit Cartesius nach ihrem ethischen und religiösen Ertrag," in Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie, 1906, v.10, p.520.

"the sensuous" is a re-presentation of the "spiritual sense" of Scripture which Origen, Augustine, Hugo St. Victor et al used to help them over the difficult or contradictory parts of Scripture. This is a way to "spiritualize" passages of Scripture which do not fit into one's system or which offends one's taste, and thus do away with what is objectionable.

For example, Jesus Christ in the Scriptures gave Schleiermacher trouble. He did not know what to do with Him. Perhaps he avoided the offence of a Christology by transforming "pistis" into "gnosis".¹ Jesus Christ is man's ascent from the sensory to the spiritual state.² Thus he spiritualizes Christ, or makes Him a symbol for something. For Schleiermacher, Christ is the exemplar in whom we can participate, He is life itself, the Giver of New vitality, the continuation of creative divine activity.³

Schleiermacher's Romantic harmonising tendency removed all contradictions. Above all, the contradiction between man and God was lost sight of. Therefore Schleiermacher was unable ~~to~~ properly to treat sin and grace. And for this reason he can make no distinction between subjective and objective.⁴

This was a great fault in his hermeneutics. For the Scriptures themselves as bearer of the Gospel contradict and offend men, just because the Gospel is an offence and a scandal, just because man is a sinner. Schleiermacher cannot see this, and therefore the

1. Barth, K., From Rousseau to Ritschl, p.313.

2. Ibid., p.346.

3. Niebuhr, op. cit., p.165f.

4. It is true that he uses these terms, but in a most arbitrary way. Cf. p. 37.

Scriptures suffer misinterpretation at his hands. He **resolves** all contradictions and spiritualises away the unpleasant texts.

Schleiermacher confounded the hermeneutical circle with what Barth calls the circle of subjectivity. The circle of subjectivity is a person's own system of thought or philosophy. It is the circle of human possibilities, where, for example, when a person reads a book, he understands a sentence on basis of the possibilities of meaning of the sentence from his own circle of possible meanings. But Scriptures cannot be read in quite this way. For the Gospel comes crashing into this circle of possibilities to break it up and to widen it, for the Gospel cannot be contained by what we already know.

Thus we have seen that Schleiermacher broadened the subject of hermeneutics to include the relationship of speaking and thinking. He thought of religion as culture and stressed the bi-polar awareness of self and others. He believed that for understanding, a "connecting point" between people was necessary. He approached hermeneutics from its grammatical and psychological aspects. Under the latter he discussed the divinatory and comparative faculties, having to do with the individuality and the type respectively. Understanding, he said, requires an artist with talent for language and knowledge of men. Feeling, for Schleiermacher, has to do with consciousness of kind and it is a means for God's coming to man. He thinks of the Word of God as "self-impartment". By psychological interpretation, he feels, one finds his own personal experience.

Schleiermacher makes much of the "hermeneutical circle", and contributes many positive thoughts on this point. He thinks of interpretation as an easy matter for one who has the talents. In this way the interpreter becomes master of Scripture and has nothing

new to hear from it. Schleiermacher's thinking is often expressed as a dialectic of two complementary factors which compose a circle. He was a harmoniser of any disruptive influences. His distinction between the "sensuous" and the "spiritual" "spiritualized" away many difficulties in interpretation and removed the contradiction between man and God. Thus he confounded the hermeneutical circle with the circle of subjectivity. Schleiermacher made a great impression upon hermeneutics with his apologetical broadening of the base of the material of interpretation, with his emphasis upon feeling, and with his introduction of psychological interpretation.

B. F.C. Baur

Schleiermacher influenced the whole of the nineteenth century's theology. F.C. Baur found in his Glaubenslehre a foundation upon which to build a theology.¹ But Baur opposed Schleiermacher's subjectivity, and believed that it is much more important to see the objective side in theology.² But if Schleiermacher provided the foundation for Baur's theology, it was Hegel who supplied to him the form.³ Thus Baur as an historical theologian constructed the history of the Church in terms of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.⁴ The "thesis" in the system was the Apostle Paul: the "antithesis", the other apostles, especially Peter, and all of Jewish Christianity; the "synthesis", the Catholic Church. Paul's "universalism" was set

1. Bauer, R., Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (henceforth to be abbreviated "RGG"), 2. Aufl., I, p.817.
2. Schneider, Ernst, F.C. Baur in seiner Bedeutung fuer die Theologie pp.49,56.
3. Bauer, R., op. cit., p.818.
4. Barth, K., Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, p.450

against Peter's "particularism"; Paul's "antinomianism", against Peter's "legalism".¹

Thus the principle of development and growth was applied to the history of the Church. But not only ^{that} -- Christianity was connected with all the previous religious development of the world, and was especially prepared for by Platonism.² Christianity is superior to all other religions because it satisfies human wants more adequately than any other.³ But this is not to say that Christianity is a finished, perfect product, for it is a complex of views and ideas which are in motion, progressing toward a goal.⁴ This process is no mere accidental characteristic, but is itself absolute.⁵

These are the principles behind Baur's theology, and it is now our task to investigate his theological method. True to Hegel, Baur would carefully examine each book of the New Testament to see whether it had Pauline or Petrine overtones, or made an effort to conciliate the two. This test would determine whether a book belonged to the thesis, antithesis, or synthesis. Thus each book must certainly be classified in one of the three categories. Those therefore which seek to bridge the gap between Peter and Paul must

1. Drummond, A.L., German Protestantism Since Luther, p.117.

2. Baur, F.C., The Church History of the First Three Centuries, I, pp.6,8,11.

3. Ibid., p.7,8.

4. Lichtenberger, F., The History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, p.383.

5. Schneider, op. cit., p.321f. "...Der geschichtliche Prozess ist das Absolute selbst, das in ihm sich objektivierende Goettliche, die Idee, welche der substantielle Inhalt der Entwicklung ist."

surely belong to a later period, and are "writings with a purpose" ("Tendenzschriften"), aimed at reconciling the two parties by softening their differences.¹

But we must be careful not to accuse Baur of always using an arbitrary method to confirm results he had already decided upon. This would certainly be the wrong impression, because Baur himself was the leader of a thorough-going, scientific (in the best sense) school of exegesis; and it is to him that we owe a great debt in the field of historical criticism. Baur and his school appeared with a positive approach² to show what the books of the New Testament were, the peculiarities of their forms, the conditions under which they were written; with the object in mind of restoring the continuity of historical affirmation and of linking the facts together.³

Baur understood the philosophy of history to be the objective happening plus the subjective knowledge of it; history itself, as the development of the idea.⁴ He tried to find a line between history and myth, and a criterion by which to distinguish one from the other.⁵ Baur was interested in what the words of a book or passage said, what the author meant, and what the reader or hearer understood by what was written or said.

As opposed to his student Strauss, Baur was against naturalistic or fanciful explanations of the miracles. He even chided conservative Neander for using this method of interpretation.⁶ Baur himself,

1. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p.384. Such ones are, according to Baur, Acts, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, etc.

2. As opposed, e.g., to D.F. Strauss' negative one of demonstrating what the Gospels were not (viz., not historical in the sense of the events reported having happened in fact). Cf. R.W. Mackay, The Tuebingen School and its Antecedents, p.192.

3. Ibid., p.192f.

4. Schneider, op. Cit., pp.71,74.

5. Ibid., p.120.

6. Baur, Paul, I, p.27,31.

however, was at times guilty of the same practice, especially when forced to defend his dialectic. Historical phenomena he often subjected to speculation.¹ "Historical criticism and speculation were the two tracks upon which Baur's works moved."²

There are many inadequacies in Baur's system. He so sharpened the differences between Peter and Paul that they almost appeared to be founders of rival German theological parties ("Richtungen"), "complete with followers and acrimonious manifestoes."³ Because the Hegelian dialectic ruled, Scripture was inevitably distorted. Philosophical systems are not in fact perfectly appropriate as frames into which to pour the Scripture. But when, as for Baur, the dialectic or historical development is "absolute", then the burden imposed upon Scripture is intolerable. The historico-critical method is necessary and good, but it is betrayed when it is yoked with an absolute dialectic; and the use of such a combination indicates a basic unwillingness to listen to the Scriptures.⁴ The Hegelian system is incompatible with the Scriptures for several other reasons. One is that history, which is thought of as development, or progress, or process, is extremely remote from the biblical understanding of history.⁵ Another is that history understood in terms of ideas is

1. Lichenberger, op. cit., p.381. 2. Schneider, op. cit., p.319f.

3. Drummond, op. cit., p.117f.

4. Lichenberger complains that in Baur's system, "Persons are sacrificed to ideas, moral probabilities to logical necessities. Hence we have forced interpretations, rash judgments, hasty conclusions; and hence the taking up of a position which ends by a sort of voluntary blindness as to the value of the solutions proposed, which are most frequently more difficult to admit than the difficulties which they pretend to solve." op. cit., p.388f.

5. We shall have more to say to this point when we come to consider "Heilsgeschichte" in this chapter and elsewhere.

equally strange to the Scriptural way of thinking.¹ Finally, the synthesising of contradictions is harmful.²

Lichtenberger suggests that Jesus Christ was an embarrassment to Baur's system.³ He says that Baur was skeptical of super-naturalism, miracle, resurrection, and that he was vague on Jesus' Messianic consciousness.³ C.A. Briggs, on the other hand, feels that Baur did a great service to Christology by showing what could and could not be claimed for an "Historical Jesus"⁴. Baur expounds various motifs about Christ in his Vorlesungen ueber neutestamentliche Theologie⁵, but it is extremely difficult for him to maintain at the same time a proper Christology and an all-embracing, absolute dialectic of history.⁶ And despite all his protestations of objectivity, Baur throws open the doors to subjectivity by identifying the Holy Spirit with the human spirit.⁷

But there are very many positive things which must be said for Baur. James Moffatt says:

1. We shall have more to say to this point when we come to consider "Heilsgeschichte" in this chapter and elsewhere.
2. Despite the fact that Schneider (p. 325) and Drummond (p. 118) congratulate Baur for disposing of contradictions by the dialectic, it is our opinion that there are some real contradictions or paradoxes in Scripture which we cannot simply synthesise away. We shall discuss this connection with "Tholuck's Hermeneutics".
3. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p. 389ff.
4. Briggs, C.A., The Study of Holy Scripture, p.498.
5. Baur, Vorlesungen . . ., p. 46ff.
6. "...wie konnte darueber, die Besonderheit der Geschichte Christi zur bloss exemplarischen Besonderheit werden, vielleicht auch zu einer, Phase im allgemeinen Ablauf der Geschichte!" Otto Weber, Grundlagen der Dogmatik, p. 158.
7. "In his Christian consciousness as an essentially spiritual one, the Christian knows himself to be identical with the spirit of God." Baur, Paul, op. cit., II, p. 128.

"Baur came immediately after (Priestly), and Baur was a trained scholar; in his stronger hands the historical method first showed how fruitful it could be in handling the New Testament documents. For the first time it was shown that these documents were unintelligible apart from a movement of thought, that this movement was manifold, that antagonistic views prevailed in the primitive Church, and that the genetic conception of the New Testament implied a recognition of the various stages in the controversy. Like all pioneering work, Baur's had to be re-shaped. ... But the principles of literary and historical research were now introduced into New Testament criticism. Since Baur wrote, they have been improved, but never seriously questioned."¹

Moffatt goes on to point out that among the services Baur rendered historical criticism was his ability to ask of Scripture the proper questions. "He asked not only how certain things happened in the New Testament period, but why -- why then and not earlier or later, why thus and not otherwise."²

Lichtenberger suggests that the Tuebingen school,

"...proposed to study the character, dogmatic tendency, historic surroundings, and chronological epoch of every Gospel; to assign to the canonical writings their place in the religious literature of the first two centuries; to make them enter into the general current of history; and subsidiarily, to utilize the criticism of the New Testament in view of the history of Dogmas. This was in particular the merit of ... Baur, the head of the Tuebingen school".³

Lichtenberger adds that due to Baur the historical conception of the canon displaced the dogmatic; that Baur gave a most fruitful impulse to historical criticism, which "is his enduring merit and undisputed glory."⁴

-
1. Moffatt, James, The Approach to the New Testament, p. 118.
 2. Ibid., p. 118.
 3. Lichtenberger, Op. cit., p.378f
 4. Ibid., p. 388.

One of the highest tributes to Baur is a statement by Wilhelm Dilthey in 1865, quoted by Emanuel Hirsch. It says that genuine historical investigation in theology "stands upon the shoulders of two theologians who are the fathers of the modern Church" -- Schleiermacher and Baur.¹ We must thank Baur, he says, for "the understanding of Christianity in the whole of history."²

C. E.W. Hengstenberg

There was at least one faction in the theology of the nineteenth century which did not come under the normative influence of Schleiermacher -- viz., the group led by E.W. Hengstenberg, "the pillar of Biblical orthodoxy".³ Hengstenberg as a young man read Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre, and said, "to that man I shall never betake myself".⁴ There were few in fact on the theological scene with whom Hengstenberg did not violently differ; even Neander, Tholuck, and Stier, with whom he was allied in spirit, were not exempted from his denunciations.⁵

Hengstenberg believed that the Christian faith is grounded upon the Bible as a whole.⁶ He was the foremost exponent of mechanical inspiration.⁷ Not only the Scriptures must be believed in, but also

1. Hirsch, Emanuel, Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie, V, p. 553.

2. Ibid., p. 553. But Hirsch adds that this statement makes a judgment upon the theology of 1865. "In der Tat sah es damals so aus, als ob Baur's Lebensarbeit in der theologischen Fakultäten wirkungslos vorübergehen sollte. Um den grossen Forscher seit der Mitte der sechziger keinen theologischen Lehrer in Deutschland, der sich als Fortführer seiner Lebensarbeit fühlte. Man hatte die Tübingener Kritik 'ueberwunden'".

3. Drummond, op. cit., p. 120.

4. In Pope, W.B., "Essay on the Life and Writings of Hengstenberg", in The History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament, II, p. xi.

5. Ibid., p. xii.

6. "Der christliche Glaube gründet sich auf die Bibel als Ganzes. Wer die geringste alttestamentliche Stelle antastet, tastet Christus an."

by all means the Lutheran confessions. So Scripture and creed go inextricably together.¹ A third factor was inner experience -- Pietism. W.B. Pope tells us that among Hengstenberg's last words were these, "No orthodoxy without pietism, no piety without orthodoxy."² But Hengstenberg felt that Schleiermacher's "theology of feeling" must certainly be avoided, and he made it quite clear that subjective experience must always come under the control of the objective facts of faith, viz., those attested to in the Scriptures and in the confessions. Inner experience must be subjected to outer authority; for the conversion-faith which grasps the grace of God in Christ is the same thing as the will to abide by the Church's doctrine.³ Thus it is at once apparent that the Bible, the Church's confession, and the inner experience of faith -- all of these perfectly agree and they establish and support each other.

Hengstenberg quoted in Hirsch, p.126f.

7. Drummond, op. cit., p.120. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p.213. He went to great lengths, e.g., to establish the credibility of the historical books of the Old Testament. Cf. his History of the Kingdom..., op. cit., I, pp.26-43.

1. "...D. H. die Rueckformung des Denkens zur von Gott geoffenbarten Wahrheit enthaelt die Aufgabe, ganz und gar biblisch denken zu lernen und zu lehren. Diese Aufgabe schliesst aber, gemaess der sachlichen Uebereinstimmung von Schrift und Bekenntnis, es in sich, dass man sich wieder ganz auf den Boden der reformatorischen Bekenntnisse stellt." In Hirsch, p.120.

2. Pope, op. cit., p.xliii.

3. "...die Gleichsetzung des biblischen Lehrbegriffs mit dem der kirchlichen Bekenntnisse und ueberhaupt das Verstaendnis des innern Erlebnisses als Einbindung unter eine aeussere Autoritaet bringen es mit sich, dass der Gottes Gnade in Christus ergreifende Bekehrungsglaube fuer Hengstenberg eins mit dem Willen zur kirchlichen Rechtglaeubigkeit. Pietismus und Orthodoxie schmelzen in dem Sinne zusammen, dass das pietistische Erlebnis als Willensmotor dem Prinzip kirchlicher Orthodoxie ein -- und untergeordnet wird." Hirsch, p.122.

Hengstenberg's chief interest was the Old Testament, upon which he concentrated most of his attention.¹ The thesis for his expansive Christology of the Old Testament is introduced as follows: "In the Messianic prophecies contained in Genesis we cannot fail to perceive a remarkable progress in clearness and definiteness."² From the vague prophecy of Messianic victory in Genesis 3:15b, the signs begin to crystalise more and more in connection with Shem, Abraham, Jacob, Judah, et al, until finally it is narrowed to a specific family, the line of David.³ Hengstenberg wrote on the Gospel of John just because he thought that it was filled with references and allusions to the Old Testament, and on Revelation because of its dependence on the apocalyptic of the Old Testament.

But the Old Testament in the hands of one who pursued his orthodoxy with fanatical zeal was bound to be sometimes wrongly interpreted. It was especially the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Bible that made trouble for Hengstenberg's interpretations. For this doctrine virtually forces one to allegorise certain difficult passages.⁴ But Hengstenberg's choice of passages to interpret figuratively is remarkable. Balaam's talking ass he takes for a vision; the sun's

1. His major works are these: The Christology of the Old Testament, The History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament, and commentaries on Ecclesiastes, John, Psalms, and Ezekiel; also works on Egypt and the Books of Moses, etc.

2. Christology..., op. cit., I, p.1.

3. Ibid., p.1ff., 123.

4. J.K.S. Reid makes an excellent point of this in his The Authority of the Scripture, p.158ff.

standing still he reads poetically; Jephthah's vow results not in the daughter's being sacrificed, but in her being consecrated to God as a virgin.¹ In almost all other places Hengstenberg subscribes to the factual happening of what is reported, but also with abundant use of allegory.² His eight "safe rules by which to determine the limits between the figure and the fact"³ are hardly commendable for interpretation, let alone "safe".

One of Hengstenberg's great problems was that he was no dogmatic theologian, nor was he a biblical theologian -- he could not systematise.

"Hengstenberg was not at any time a systematic theologian, but biblical theology was cultivated by him with great ardour. Biblical theology, however, to be of any service, must be systematized; and here it was that our expositor failed. He was only an expositor, or, if he entered upon the discussion of the doctrines derived from Scripture, it was only in detached essays and monographs. Had he given a few years of his strength to the construction of an Old Testament biblical theology, he might have accomplished one of the most deeply needed tasks of the day."⁴

Hengstenberg fiercely opposed the Rationalists. It was not that he advocated the "sacrificium intellectus", it was rather that he held the position that reason must humble itself and bow beneath the Scriptures, in order that the Word of Revelation and the Holy Spirit

1. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p. 213, Hirsch, op. cit., p. 126.
2. Lichtenberger (p. 213) and Hirsch (p. 122) accuse Hengstenberg of the worst sort of Rabbinic interpretations.
3. Christology...., IV, pp. 433ff.
4. Pope, op. cit., p. xxix. Cf. p. xxxv.



may renew the mind. For every Christian article of faith is irrational, but that is because our rationality is irrational.¹

While we cannot approve of Hengstenberg's occasional allegorical usages of Scripture, his insistence upon mechanical inspiration and subscription to the letter of the confession, and his frequent bitter attacks upon his enemies; we must welcome his appearance upon the theological scene for several reasons. While most theologians were following after Schleiermacher, preaching a gospel of pious feelings and ignoring the Old Testament and the confessions, Hengstenberg did a good thing to oppose Schleiermacher, to stress the objective reality behind the subjective experience (without abandoning the experience) and to concentrate his energies upon expounding the Old Testament.² Hengstenberg's emphasis upon loyalty to the confessions is well taken, even though it was sorely overdone. Union theology, shaped largely by Schleiermacher, was a far from adequate theology. Hengstenberg, for all his extremism, served the Church as a check against the excesses of union theology.

d

D. J.C.K. von Hofmann

Another of the important theologians of the nineteenth century was J.C.K. von Hofmann of Erlangen, and another student of Schleiermacher's.³ Von Hofmann's contribution, and perhaps the most important

1. Hirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 124. Cf. K. Barth's Dogmatics in Outline, Chap. 3, "Faith as Knowledge".

2. A statement of Hengstenberg's which could profitably be heard again is this: "The time is no longer distant when every pastor worthy of his calling will make it a rule of life to read his chapter daily, as in the original text of the New Testament, so also in that of the Old Testament." Quoted by Pope, *op. cit.*, p. xxxviii.

3. Hirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 420. "Er hat von Schleiermacher gruendlich und unmittelbar gelernt." Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

contribution of nineteenth century conservative theology, was the principle of "Heilsgeschichte".¹ G. Weth defines "Heilsgeschichte" thus:

"...a theology through which the continuous summary of historical exegetical, and dogmatic work builds the structure of a single system, and with this system it will give an imaginative concept of the becoming of revelational history from creation to the final breakthrough of the Kingdom of God."²

It is a paradoxical weaving together ("Ineinander") of God's acts and historical events (e.g., "Pontius Pilate" in the creed).³

It is a two-sided coin: God's action on behalf of man in His deeds of salvation and grace, on the one side; and on the other, God's confronting man in the depths of his existence in history.⁴ It is a sequence ("Nacheinander") of divine deeds ("Heilstatsachen") which play out from a fore-ordained plan of God, and which extend from the creation to the Parousia.⁵

Jesus Christ is for Hofmann the end and the middle of history.⁶ The Incarnation marks the beginning of the fulfilment of all prophecy and therefore of all history (history is prophecy); Christ is the new man, the anti-type of the old.⁷ Hofmann speaks of the Scripture

1. Steck, K.G., "Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte", Theologische Studien, Heft 56, p. 7ff.

2. Ibid., p. 10.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ott, Heinrich, "Heilsgeschichte", RGG, III, 3. Aufl., p. 187.

5. Ibid., p. 187.

6. "Jesus ist Schluss, aber auch Mitte der Geschichte: seine Erscheinung im Fleische ist der Anfang des Endes." J.C.K. von Hofmann, Weissagung und Erfuellung im Alten und im Neuen Testamente, I, p. 58.

7. Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, art.: "Hofmann", V, p. 313.

in terms of "miracle". That Christ is the content of the Bible is an absolute miracle.¹ All of the miracles in the Bible must be understood in light of Him.² The history of Israel is a miracle, and it must be so in order to pre-figure Christ. The same is true of the New Testament.³ All of the miraculous aspects in the Biblical history are understood in reference to its central point.⁴ By knowing ^{of} Christ and of the salvation of the world, we also know that a history is going on between God and man from the beginning of time to the end.⁵

The main theme of "Heilsgeschichte" is thus prophecy and fulfilment. The witness of the New Testament understands the happenings connected with Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (history) and as the accomplishment of the plan and program of promise and fulfilment.⁶ The Old Testament is promise and prophecy, but the New Testament is not the whole, but the beginning of fulfilment -- in the appearance of Christ there is something future.⁷

Old Testament history is the provisional stage of salvation which is realised in the New Testament, and it moves toward its consummation.⁸ Therefore, to interpret this history one must know the facts of the Old Testament and where they fit into the process; one must appraise the typical significance each fact has in the light of the New Testament salvation. Typology, for Hofmann, is not confined to the Old Testament citations in the New Testament, for we have to do with the Old Testament as a whole. In it we single out the basic types.

1. Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, Minneapolis, 1960. p. 31.

2. A translation by Christian Preus of Hofmann's Biblische Hermeneutik, Nördlingen, 1880, which were his lectures at Erlangen in 1860.

3. Ibid., p. 31.

4. Ibid., p. 40.

5. Ibid., p. 40.

6. Ibid., p. 48.

7. Ott, op. cit., p. 187f.

8. Wach, op. cit., I, p.377.

8. Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, p.136.

We do not consider minor points of comparison in isolation from the whole, for this will lead into error. It is like the interpretation of a parable. Only the main point or points are intended as the point of comparison. In the typological understanding of the New Testament, on the other hand, one has to notice how the new things in the New Testament are moulded by the typological connection in which they stand with the history and prophecy of the Old Testament, and also how by the fulfilment of the Old Testament history and prophecy the newness of the New Testament history is moulded.¹

Whence came this idea of "Heilsgeschichte"? There are varied opinions. Heinrich Ott says that "Heilsgeschichte" has strong biblical grounds, and indeed rests upon the whole witness of the Bible, which documents the "Heilstatsachen".² This planned process of God's activity stands in many texts.³ K.G. Steck is of the opinion that it came in part from the Reformation's doctrines, and then was handed down.⁴ C.A. Briggs claims that "Heilsgeschichte" "is a further unfolding of the organic principle of Schleiermacher and a revival in another form of the Puritan principle wrapt up in the covenant theology...of Cocceius and the Pietists"⁵. Certainly there were philosophical influences⁶; Bultmann finds Hofmann committed to a largely Hegelian philosophy of history.⁷ Steck observes that

1. Ibid., p. 180.

2. Ott, op. cit., p. 188.

3. Ibid., p. 188. Ott mentions various texts in Deut., Lk., Ro. 9-11, various NT eschatological passages which proclaim Jesus Christ to be pre-existent, promised, incarnate, exalted, made present, and coming again.

4. Steck, op. cit., p. 12ff. He mentions the names of Bengel, Oetinger, Wizenmann, Herder, Hamann, and Menken.

5. Briggs, op. cit., p. 472.

6. Steck, op. cit., p. 16.

7. McIntyre, J., The Christian Doctrine of History, p. 63.

"Heilsgeschichte" hangs together with the other doctrines of Hofmann's time -- experiential theology and apologetics.¹

Whatever the sources, there are some elements in Hofmann's "Heilsgeschichte" which seem to us to be quite unbiblical. One such element is that it aims to give a highly systematized single structure to God's redemptive activity, the quest for which is foreign to the Bible, and somewhat presumptuous.² A process in which every age carries within it the seed of the next³ belongs to a world in which most things are predictable, a world in which nothing new happens. When we try to harness this kind of system to the acts of God in history it is a futile and false endeavour.

When the Old and New Testaments are joined together by this system, both Testaments suffer. The Old Testament becomes only the record of events preparatory for the time of Christ.⁴ Put into this orderly sequence of planned events, reconciliation in Jesus Christ becomes the expected, inevitable thing, and thus its significance is minimized.⁵

In Hofmann's system the bearer of revelation is "Heilsgeschichte" as history, not the Word as the biblical witness.⁶ In the great anxiety to express the events which happened is a resultant depreciation of the record describing and interpreting those events. Steck makes a good case against this depreciation. For him the living word

1. Steck, op. cit., p. 8.

2. Ibid., p. 58ff. Cf. H.J. Kraus, Geschichte der Historisch-Kritischen Erforschungen des Alten Testaments, p. 207.

3. Hirsch, op. cit., p. 425. Cf. Kraus, op. cit., p. 207. "Revelation and history flow together toward an inevitable, objectively obvious, lineal movement of development ("Entwicklungsgang")."

4. Kraus, op. cit., p. 208.

5. Huebner, E., RGG, 3. Aufl., "Hofmann", p. 421. vol. III. "Hofmanns Heilsgeschichte gibt der Rechtfertigung keinen Raum".

6. Steck, op. cit., p. 58.

of God is the unity of letter and Spirit, not history ("Geschichte") and historicity ("Geschichtlichkeit"). Written-ness ("Geschrieben-sein") is the really valuable thing.¹

Just as Hofmann's concept of "Heilsgeschichte" is called in question by Scripture, according to some, so according to others is his attitude toward history itself. Bultmann accuses him of sanctifying world history by positing Jesus Christ as the key to all history.² Bultmann suggests that what actually happens is the contrary, for "eschatology destroys history."³ Barth insists that biblical history

1. Ibid., p. 58. Hofmann writes in the conclusion to his Interpreting the Bible, p. 236: "We first described the specific character of Biblical exegesis by defining it in terms of the relationship in which the theologian stands to Scripture as a whole. A further qualification was derived from two facts: 1) that the historical fact of salvation in Christ had an historical preparation. 2) that the Biblical proclamation of salvation originated step by step in the course of Holy History. As a result of these facts the process of salvation itself and the Biblical witness to it had to be differentiated." Steck's point is well taken; for though Hofmann makes point number 2), he never says that the written record is a part of Holy History, or is itself Holy History. This makes it dangerous for Hofmann to make his differentiation between salvation and proclamation in his concluding words, where he has no opportunity to qualify his remark. It has the effect of a heavy concentration upon the "God who Acts", with less attention being paid to the God who speaks (and thus acts) to men and is spoken of by men in the written records.

2. McIntyre, op. cit., p. 63. Of course, we must remember that Bultmann has an aversion to the facts of faith occurring in concrete history; he would keep the "faith" and drop the "facts", feeling that the two are in conflict with each other. Faith for him is other-worldly, and the less it has to do with this world the stronger and better it is. This is a curious docetism.

3. Quoted in Ott, op. cit., p. 188. We should say, however, that Hofmann's eschatology is far better than Bultmann's - Piper points out (Foreword to Interpreting the Bible, p.vii.) that Hofmann discovered the significance of eschatology fifty years before Schweitzer. In the last section of Interpreting the Bible "The Foreshadowing of Future Events", Hofmann notices that the Biblical descriptions of the events which precede the end of the age necessarily use words from present experience and past history. From these we are unable to form adequate representations. But there is an even greater unclarity in the case of "the images describing how this world will be transformed into a new one!" (Ibid., p. 228).

is not history at all, in any acceptable sense; for seen from above it is the acts of God, and seen from below it is not interesting, a series of impossible undertakings.¹

But there are positive things which must be said for Hofmann's "Heilsgeschichte". As we observed,² Steck considers it to be the most important conservative contribution to the theology of the nineteenth century, and it is a term which in the twentieth century still enjoys currency.³ Heinrich Ott conceives it to be important today to concentrate upon the salvific events, but to avoid any kind of making a holy sequence out of them.⁴ One service rendered by Hofmann is that in his use of "Heilsgeschichte" he brought together the historical moment with the act of revelation,⁵ stressing the valuable point that revelation is action, not theory.

The complaint which we should make against Hofmann's eschatology is that he loses sight of the difference between the Old and New Testament eschatologies. The New Testament, for Hofmann, simply repeats the eschatology of the Old Testament. Hofmann slips from unity into uniformity of the two testaments because of the demands of his idealistic system.

In like manner, history and prophecy are, for Hofmann, the same. We agree that prophecy is history, but when one reverses the formula something dangerous is at work - This is more the case in the Schriftbeweis than in Interpreting the Bible, for in the former there is a thorough-going typology: God so arranged the affairs of the Old Testament that they prefigured what He knew would happen in Christ.

1. Steck, op. cit., p. 35. This is what Barth calls the "Jenseitigkeit, ... Ungeschichtlichkeit, Weltlichkeit der biblischen Linie." It is "ein Neues, Unvergleichliches, Unerreichbares, nicht nur Himmlisches, sondern Ueberhimmlisches."

2. Cf. above, p. 53.

3. James Mays in Interpretation, April, 1960, p. 212, notes that Cullmann and Barth use this concept, and that even Bultmann says that it can be useful. The modern theologians, of course, re-interpret and re-define the word.

4. Ott, op. cit., p. 189. Ott here is interested in an existential interpretation ~~of~~ the biblical witness to these events, in which these events are made understandable in their meaning for the self-understanding of faith.

5. H.J. Kraus, op. cit., p. 207f. suggests that, "Offenbarung ist Geschichte, nicht Lehre; ... historia, nicht doctrina."

Having considered the main pillar of Hofmann's hermeneutics, we now turn to his other hermeneutical principles. But first, a word about his general theological position. For Hofmann, exegesis is the foundation ("Grundlage") of theology.¹ There must be a working together ("Ineinander") of theology and exegesis.² A second presupposition is that Scripture takes precedence over tradition.³ The most fruitful example of Hofmann's practice of this is his doctrine of the atonement. Hofmann objected to the orthodox doctrine with its legalistic words and its preoccupation with the satisfaction of the wrath of God. He substituted moral words, spoke of grace, and saw the atonement in terms of humanity's enmity (not God's wrath) against God being nailed to the cross.⁴ Hirsch⁵ commends this as a real theological insight into the doctrine of Christ's substitutionary sufficiency. Hofmann united the death of Christ with a clear picture of His life and work, stressed Christ's obedience, and His representation of universal humanity.⁶ Hofmann was one of the first to accuse Lutheranism of being untrue to Luther, and this challenge to tradition led to the studies of Luther in more recent years.⁷

A third important point about the Bible is that Christ is the judge of Scripture. Hofmann says:

"To the interpreter who approaches Scriptures as a believing Christian no miracle recorded in Scripture will appear as an

-
- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Wach, <u>op. cit.</u> , p. 361f. | 2. <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 362. |
| 3. Lichtenberger, <u>op. cit.</u> , p. 450. | |
| 4. <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 453. | 5. <u>Op. cit.</u> , p. 425ff. |
| 6. <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 426f. | 7. <u>Ibid.</u> , p. 457. |

isolated fact, but rather he sees it as a component part of that history which revolves around Christ, tends toward Him, starts from Him, and therefore shares the nature of Him who is the absolute miracle. The problem then is no longer whether this or that event which Scripture reports is possible, but rather: in what relation does it stand to Christ? It is judged from that point of view alone, not according to the laws of nature."¹

Hofmann has several other hermeneutical principles which deserve mention. Some of these are corollaries of "Heilsgeschichte". Kraus believes that Hofmann preferred the "spiritual" understanding of the Old Testament to an historical exposition of it.² To Hofmann's mind, one must not begin to interpret the Scriptures from doubt and criticism, but from trust in the truth of them.³ The expositor himself must have faith in order to do his job properly. This personal faith is the basis of understanding what the Scriptures say.⁴ Without this faith the expositor has no relation to the Scriptures at all.⁵ The experience of re-birth is emphasized. Though this is an extremely personal, highly individualised affair, Hofmann centres this experience of faith in the Church. He was perhaps led to do this in light of the nature of "Heilsgeschichte" to operate through a

1. Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, p. 31.

2. Op. cit., p. 208. There is in Hofmann, says Kraus, a theological tendency which militates against an historico-critical understanding. (p. 210). This is confirmed in Hofmann's "Hermeneutik", Encyklopaedia der Theologie, p. 141f.

3. Wach, op. cit., p. 372. Christian Preus in "The Contemporary Relevance of von Hofmann's Hermeneutical Principles", Interpretation, IV, July 1950, p. 312, notes that Hofmann stands in the middle position between the schools of Baur and Hengstenberg, and that, "It was one of Hofmann's marks of greatness that he recognized certain valid features in the methodology of Baur's school of historical criticism and fearlessly employed them in his own studies." But both schools repudiated Hofmann.

4. Weber, op. cit., p. 160.

5. Wach, op. cit., p. 370. It is here that the Holy Spirit comes into the doctrine -- in the Scriptures, in the Church, and in the individual believer. He is the dynamic of the "Heilsgeschichte" and operates in the act of interpretation. Thus Hofmann denies static conceptions of timeless truths which can be extracted from Scripture; Cf. Preus, p. 316f.

covenant people. He saw clearly that the Church is Israel, and that the interpreter must do his work as a member of the Church in order to understand what is said about Israel.¹

Therefore Hofmann is concerned with the mutual support and harmony of the three factors, 1) inner experience, 2) the Church, and 3) the Holy Scriptures. The Holy Spirit witnesses to us in each and all of these ways, and they confirm each other. Contrary to Schleiermacher, inner experience of the believer is not enough. Nor is confessionalism, nor Biblicism alone. All three factors belong together.

Hofmann held to faith without sacrificing scholarship.² He combined the scientific treatment of the Bible with belief in the Bible's revealed content.³ He differentiated between elements subject to critical investigation and revelation.⁴ He stated the problem clearly in relation to life in the Church and religious experience.⁵ This guards against rationalism, confessionalism, and existentialism.⁶

At the forefront of Hofmann's theology is the emphasis upon understanding the Bible as an organic whole. His Schriftbeweis was a testimony against the atomistic use of Scripture.⁷ In his Weissagung und Erfuellung he makes the same point.⁸ The unity of Scripture was, of course, "Heilsgeschichte", centring upon Jesus Christ. Hofmann examined not only the unity, but also the variety of the biblical books.⁹

1. Wach, op. cit., I, p. 375.
Interpreting the Bible, p. ix.

3. Preus, C., Translator's Preface to Ibid., p. xii.

4. Piper, op. cit., p. viii.

6. Ibid., p. xiii.

8. Haussleiter, op. cit., p. 3.
op. cit., p. 139f.

2. Piper, Foreword to Hofmann's

5. Preus, op. cit., p. xiii.

7. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p. 447.

9. Hofmann, Hermeneutik,

Hofmann, following Schleiermacher, understood biblical hermeneutics to be a part of general hermeneutics. The special thing about biblical hermeneutics grows out of the nature of its materials.¹ Because of this connection with general hermeneutics, and also for the reason that it takes its materials from the other theological disciplines and its methods from logic, biblical hermeneutics is not a closed system.²

For Hofmann, the rules of general hermeneutics apply in all cases, but they are qualified by 1) the relationship in which the theologian stands to Scripture as a whole, and 2) the twin facts of the historical preparation for the historical salvation in Christ and the origin of the Biblical proclamation of salvation within the course of Holy History.³ "These are the only two features relevant for the interpretation of Scripture. There are no further modifications of the general rules of hermeneutics."⁴

In a survey of the history of interpretation, Hofmann concludes that "Wherever exegesis departed from the laws of general hermeneutics, it was because they took a false attitude toward Scripture" (not that they were ignorant of those laws).⁵

The difference in the Old and New Testaments is in terms of salvation realized in Christ. In the Old Testament we see a process moving toward this complete salvation which is witnessed in the New Testament. (Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, p. 133). The witness of the New Testament originated in the Church of Jesus.; the witness of the Old Testament originated in Israel as the national community of God. Old and New Testament exegesis differ because of the salvation experienced and of the origin of the testimony borne to it. (Ibid., p. 134f.)

1. Mays, op. cit., p. 212.

2. Wach, op. cit., p. 363.

3. Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, p. 236.

4. Ibid., p. 236.

5. Ibid., p. 15.

Thus for Hofmann, a proper understanding of Scripture (for him in terms of "Heilsgeschichte") has a two-fold effect upon the general laws of hermeneutics. It is first a limitation, because interpretation must be carried on ⁱⁿ light of Christ, the content of Scripture; which fact is not to those outside of faith, an obvious rule. But this view of Scripture is also a liberation, for it sets the interpreter free from false views of the Scriptures, that he may use the rules of general hermeneutics. E.g., as Hofmann saw it, interpretation up until the Reformation was ruled by tradition, and the distinction between the historical and spiritual senses of Scripture worked to the disadvantage of the general rules of interpretation.¹ But the Reformation freed exegesis from tradition, acknowledged the principle of interpreting Scripture by Scripture as a work of the Spirit and restored the historical meaning of Scripture. This led to the re-discovery of the "saving truth" in the Bible.

A final hermeneutical principle to be mentioned is that Hofmann recognized that as interpreters we come to the Scriptures with presuppositions.

Hofmann speaks of the rationalists as "victims of self-deception" who :

"boasted that they were guided by no pre-supposition whatsoever in their work, in contrast with the type of interpretation which was

1. Ibid., p. 9.

"determined by the common faith of the church and the presupposition that Scripture is the word of God in a unique manner. These men did not realize that they too were dogmatically determined by the opposite presupposition. In fact "a complete lack of presuppositions" on the part of the interpreter would be unthinkable. It is impossible for the interpreter to be neither Christian nor non-Christian, neither religious, nor irreligious, but merely interpreter. He approaches Scripture as a person with a definite character and nature and experience, not as a "blank sheet" upon which Scripture inscribes itself."¹

We consider this to be a very sensible view, and one quite essential for sound exegesis.

To give a concluding critique of Hofmann's hermeneutics, we list some negative things first. In the last analysis he did not put his finger upon the true relationship between the Old and New Testaments.² As we noted, his closed system of "Heilsgeschichte" was not able to do justice to the very "Tatsachen" of the Old Testament of which he spoke with such enthusiasm. Their actuality was minimized because they were made to pose as chiefly preparatory events. Neither could his system free the Incarnation from being a product of the sequence, automatically produced. It was a good thing to say that the interpreter of Scripture must have personal faith, but quite another thing to suggest that a "spiritual" interpretation is better than an historico-critical one. Wach says that Hofmann's use of the word "experience" ("Erfahrung") is more in the line of Schiermacher^{le} than in that of the pietists, e.g., Tholuck's;³ though many of the ingredients of the pietistic concept occur in Hofmann's writings.⁴

But we must also say some positive things of Hofmann's

1. Ibid., p. 13f.

2. Briggs, op. cit., p. 472.

3. Wach, op. cit., I, p. 85.

4. He uses such words as: "Selbstbewusstsein", "Selbstgewissheit der christlicher Erfahrungstatsache", etc. Ibid., III, p. 360, 369f.

hermeneutics. It must be said that he was quite correct to see Christ as the end and middle of history, the centre of the Biblical witness, and the fulfilment of the Old Testament. He rightly held the Bible to be a miracle because of its relation to the Incarnation, the greatest miracle of all. He was true to revelation, because he found it in concrete history. And he was true to history, because he found its key to be the Incarnation. Thus he took revelation to be action, not theory; and he understood history to be God's history, not man's.

Hofmann's general theological position made exegesis to be the foundation of theology, and he thought of the two as complementary disciplines, each helping the other. He had a sound order of precedence when he put Scripture over tradition (as, e.g., his doctrine of the atonement) and Christ as Judge of Scripture. Once again his good sense of proportion may be observed by his holding in balance religious experience, the confessions, and the Bible. His views on each are valuable, for he affirmed the necessity of faith for interpretation of the Bible; he saw the Holy History always in the context of the Church; and he understood the Bible as an organic whole united in Christ ("Heilsgeschichte").

He contributed greatly to Biblical hermeneutics. He saw it as a part of general hermeneutics, and thus open to instruction from other disciplines. But he also saw the very special nature of its material. This latter makes it necessary that one comes to the Bible with presuppositions, and it is foolish to think otherwise. The proper presupposition is faith. Another point of Hofmann's is his insistence that the Old Testament types be appraised not in isolation but in light of the whole of Scripture.

E. Friederich Luecke

The closest follower of Schleiermacher in the nineteenth century was perhaps Friederich Luecke. He was a friend and student of Schleiermacher's in Berlin, and like him he was artistic and receptive.¹ Luecke wrote several things on hermeneutics: an academic address of introduction, then in 1816 his Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Hermeneutik und ihrer Geschichte, a series of articles in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken from 1828-32; and his editing of Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik und Kritik.

Luecke's hermeneutics have received in some quarters lavish praise.² They are more closed and systematic than Schleiermacher's, even though the two parallel each other in format and content.³ He was not as bound to philosophy as Schleiermacher was, nor was he as poetical an interpreter.⁴ But Luecke had a greater grasp of the problem of hermeneutics as a part of the whole of theology than did his teacher.⁵ Schleiermacher's hermeneutics were general, with particular application to the New Testament; Luecke's concentrated more on the special problem of biblical hermeneutics.⁶ Schleiermacher's interest in general hermeneutics was not dismissed by Luecke, but Luecke went further to establish norms for biblical hermeneutics which were, he intended, taken from the Bible.⁷

From Schleiermacher Luecke learned that biblical hermeneutics is properly a theological discipline, and Luecke worked out the implications of this. The removal of the separation of exegesis from

1. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p. 339.

2. E.g., Ibid., p. 339: "The Hermeneutics of Luecke have become classical. It may be said that they definitely fix the principles which ought to regulate the subject."

3. Wach, op. cit., II, p. 154. Of course, it was Luecke who organised Schleiermacher's content into a format in Hermeneutik und Kritik.

4. Ibid., p. 155.

5. Ibid., p. 155.

6. Ibid., p. 155.

7. Ibid., p. 171.

dogmatics was one of the great gifts of the new hermeneutics.¹ Exegesis had to surrender to the systematic and scientific ordering of dogmatics. Exegesis and dogmatics must not weaken each other, but they must be regulated by the "Prolegomena", i.e., by hermeneutics.²

Luecke, in the tradition of Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Hegel, is a great harmoniser of opposite tendencies. He seeks a synthesis of historical and philosophical knowledge, of doctrinal and historical elements, and of science ("Wissenschaft [Theorie"] and art ("Kunst [Praxis"]), or of the theoretical and practical.³ These syntheses resulted in a softening of the emphasis made upon history by the Tuebingen school and by Hofmann et al.⁴ Luecke wanted to find the harmony between general and biblical hermeneutics, and sought to do so by uniting the "theological elements" with general hermeneutics in a really organic way.⁵ But again, says Luecke, we must have both statements, that biblical hermeneutics are like and also unlike general hermeneutics -- they are alike in the "fore-court" but unlike in the "interior".⁶

There are some things in Luecke's harmonising and systematising which are so clever that they are incomprehensible. Even as astute an observer in the field of hermeneutics as Joachim Wach confesses at one point that he does not understand a certain distinction of Luecke's.⁷ Sometimes we have the feeling that we are back in the most tedious days of scholasticism when we plow through some of Luecke's fine distinctions

1. Ibid., p. 159.

2. Ibid., p. 160.

3. Ibid., p. 161ff.

4. Ibid., p. 159.

5. "Vorhof" and "Innere". Ibid., p. 420. "Nur wer beide Schluessel hat, und richtig, d.h., ohne Verwechselung und in gehoeriger Verbindung gebraucht, vermag die Schrift ganz zu erschliessen."

6. Wach, op. cit., II, p. 169.

7. E.g., cf. Ibid., p. 164ff. Hermeneutics, says Luecke, is first the theory of investigation and second the theory of presentation. The first concerns the content of the New Testament in terms of the

Luecke also furthered Schleiermacher's "theology of feeling" in his works on hermeneutics. To Luecke, as to his teacher, the "religious sense" of a passage is no less necessary than the philological and the historical.¹ "He alone", says Luecke, "really seeks, who aspires to find; he alone fathoms, who is filled with love; he alone finds, who increasingly in love receives light from on high."² Thus ardent piety must accompany scientific exegesis if proper interpretation is to take place. In fact these things are so united that we find Luecke speaking of a "principle of Christian philology."⁴

Thus a love for the Word of God is an indispensable requisite for the right interpretation of the Bible.⁵ Thus Luecke's introductory address on hermeneutics "breathes Schleiermacher's 'Enthusiasm'".⁵ Thus Keil, thinking as a theologian, offends Luecke with the "coolness and temperateness" of his exegesis.⁶ And so the determinations and presuppositions which "unlock...the Holy Scriptures", and which are necessary for true exegesis, are "the power of the understanding and

historical, dogmatical, and ethical; and the form in terms of the grammatical, rhetorical, aesthetical, and symbolical; the second contains a) the theory in itself and in its elements, the form and content generally, which are determined by the object, b) a consideration of the special ways and forms of exegetical results (special rules), c) the methodology of applying these laws and rules to particular cases.

1. Lichtenberger, op. cit., p. 399.
2. Ibid., p. 399f.
3. Wach, op. cit., p. 166.
4. Briggs, op. cit., p. 472.
5. Wach, op. cit., II, p. 155.
6. Ibid., p. 156.

the heart, depth and thoroughness of godly learning, holy seriousness, theological faith, and Christian love."¹

In addition to its emphasis on system and feeling, Luecke's hermeneutics has an important point in regard to the interpreter's relation to the biblical writers. Here again Luecke follows the lead of Schleiermacher. Understanding of the canon, says Luecke, demands three things: 1) exact knowledge of the speech and time, of the outer and inner form of a writing, 2) perfection and sanctification of the religious element, and 3) "spiritual relationship" with the biblical writer.² In his Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Hermeneutik Luecke's main point is "the necessity of spiritual sympathy on the part of an interpreter with the sacred writers".³

What is this "spiritual relationship" or "spiritual sympathy"? In an interesting section of Luecke's "Reminiscences of Schleiermacher" he suggests that hermeneutics in practice has two movements, the "immergent" and the "emergent".⁴ The "immergent" movement is the interpreter's "entering into the writer's thought" through self-surrender of one's individuality.⁵ →

1. Ibid., p. 156.

2. Ibid., p. 167f.

3. Davidson, Samuel, Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 713.

4. Luecke, "Reminiscences of Schleiermacher", A Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, by Schleiermacher, p. 32.

5. Ibid., p. 32. But this "giving up" is really no loss, it represents rather an expansion of life.

This self-surrender enables one to see a text "objectively", but some of the self always remains behind, and it is that which interferes with true objectivity.¹ The "emergent" movement, on the other hand, is the voluntary apprehension and appropriation of what the writer says. This has the opposite characteristic of the "immergent", for one requires individuality and genius to apprehend and appropriate. This is just as important as the "immergent", because if one has the latter and not the former, he is really unable to properly expound.² Thus the interpreter first "sinks himself" into the spirit and peculiar manner of the author in order that he may arise from that lowly state of self-surrender to proclaim to his age the meaning he has appropriated down there. It is a listening in order to speak; the listening requires self-renunciation, but the speaking requires self-expression and wit. Schleiermacher, says Luecke, has more of the second than the first; he has so much individuality that he just could not subordinate it to a self-surrender.³ Luecke as a theologian is obliged to say this even about his beloved teacher; but this apparently hurts Luecke very much, and his loyalty forces him to preface this remark with the observation that Schleiermacher's magnitude of originality "rendered important service to the cause of exegesis also".⁴

-
1. Ibid., p. 33.
 2. Ibid., p. 33.
 3. Ibid., p. 33f.
 4. Ibid., p. 33.

Schleiermacher's great individuality prevented his full self-renunciation, and this may be noted in his treatment of the Apostle Paul, where, Luecke suggests, Schleiermacher

"...imperceptibly changes the Apostle into himself; makes him just as severely dialectic in his mode of thinking, just as artistic in his manner of writing; and seeing himself in Paul rather than Paul in himself, falls into the consequence...of expounding himself, rather than the Apostle."¹

In this we find a repetition of the basic weaknesses of Schleiermacher's theology, recognised in part by Luecke, but not corrected; viz., the confidence in religious feeling as a proper tool of true exposition, and a belief that the appropriation and proclamation of the meaning of Scripture consists of "self-impartation" ("Selbstmitteilung") of what one already has. But in this case what is imparted is some novel, ingenious apprehension of what a text says, and this comes from a person whose very cleverness prevents him from having humbled himself really to listen to the text. Luecke himself says that this is to fail to see the text objectively; yet he excuses him (Schleiermacher) because of his great originality.² Luecke did this first, we believe, out of loyalty to and appreciation of Schleiermacher; and second, out of an acceptance of Schleiermacher's "theology of feeling" and his theory of "self-impartation". Despite these, however, and despite some of what seems to us to be scholastic superfluities, Luecke rendered a great service to the study of hermeneutics when he fastened exegesis securely to dogmatics, explored the relationship between the two, and sought to work out the connection between general and biblical hermeneutics.

1. Ibid., p. 34.
2. Ibid., p. 34.

F. Wilhelm Dilthey

Another important follower of Schleiermacher's hermeneutics was Wilhelm Dilthey. His hermeneutics were in fact an "elaboration" of Schleiermacher's.¹ For Dilthey the term hermeneutics denotes the art and science of interpreting a) written records, and b) all fixed and enduring expressions of mind.² Hermeneutics is the technique of exegesis, the rules of grammar, etc. But it is more than that. Psychological interpretation, intuition, divination are required if understanding is to take place. "For understanding depends on the measure of sympathy."³ There is an inner reality, and the spiritual world is perceivable from within. In his "Entstehung der Hermeneutik" Dilthey speaks of this inner reality:

"True, the human studies have an advantage over all knowledge of nature in that their object is not a phenomenon given in sensation, a mere reflection in consciousness of something real, but immediate inner reality itself, and this moreover in the form of a connected system enjoyed from within."⁴

He goes on to say that this leads to great problems in apprehending inner experience, and that inner experience does not tell one of his individuality, only comparison with others does.⁵ But objective knowledge of this comes through a process which we call "understanding"; understanding is "the process in which from signs given to the senses we come to know a psychic reality whose manifestations they are."⁶ "Interpretation rests upon understanding, which rests on a projection of self into the other, and this is not an intellectual but an

1. Hodges, H.A., Wilhelm Dilthey, an Introduction, p. 26.

2. Ibid., p. 160.

3. Wach, op. cit., I, p. 78. "Das Verstehen ist von dem Mass der Sympathie abhaengig."

4. Translated by Hodges, op. cit., p. 125.

5. Ibid., p. 125.

6. Ibid., p. 126.

"imaginative act".¹ This is an element in interpretation which cannot be reduced to a hermeneutical rule; Dilthey, following Schleiermacher, calls it "divination".² It cannot be taught, it can only be somehow "caught"; it is a mystery and an offence to the purely logical mind. Dilthey echoes his teacher in claiming that by virtue of psychological interpretation, the interpreter understands the author better than the author understands himself.³ The interpreter's comprehension of what the author says is possible because, as Schleiermacher said, "'the individuality of the exegete and that of the author do not stand opposed to each other as two facts which cannot be compared.'"⁴ Dilthey suggests that by virtue of both having been "formed on the basis of human nature in general", "the social life of man is made possible for purposes of speech and understanding".⁵ He pursues this further:

"All individual distinctions are ultimately conditioned not by qualitative differences of persons from each other, but only by differences of degree in what goes on in their souls. But while in this the exegete, as it were, experimentally transposes his own quality of living into an historical milieu, on the basis of this he is able momentarily to emphasize and intensify some of the processes of his own soul, and to let the others recede into the background and so to induce in himself an imitation of a life which is not native to him."⁶

This is why people can understand each other, and this is why exegesis of written documents is possible.

"Exegesis is a work of personal art...it rests on affinity, intensified by a thoroughgoing communion with the author --by constant study."⁷

1. Ibid., p. 28.

2. Ibid., p. 28.

3. Ibid., p. 28.

4. Quoted by Bultmann, R.,

"The Problem of Hermeneutics", Essays, p. 238.

5. Ibid., p. 238.

6. Ibid., p. 238.

7. Ibid., p. 238.

In this way past history becomes present to the interpreter of ancient documents; indeed, the modern man can

"...have present in himself the entire past of humanity: beyond all the limits of his own time he looks out upon vanished cultures: he takes up their power into himself and enjoys their charm: a great increase of happiness comes to him from this."¹

Through inner affinity and sympathy, the gift for which Dilthey calls genius, interpretation reaches a high state of perfection; thus a similarity of conditions produced an affinity between the ancients and the ^{men of the} Renaissance, so that the latter were really able to understand the former.² "This inner relationship which makes transposition possible, is therefore the presupposition of all hermeneutic rules..."³

Understanding has its own history and evolution. Scientific studies, says Dilthey, give us knowledge, but art gives us understanding; and "we understand more than we know".⁴ The poets are the genuine makers of history; and among them Homer, Shakespeare, and Schiller stand out. They discovered and pointed to the "three stages of that understanding of man which lies at the foundation of history and the human studies."⁵ Poets were quoted as authorities in philosophical debates, and differences of interpretation inevitably occurred. This created a need for hermeneutics. The Stoics introduced allegory because the sacred writings of their day offended people's intelligence and morality.⁶ This method of interpretation was accepted by the Alexandrians, the Alexandrian Christians, and it spread throughout the world. The Renaissance re-discovered the ancient rhetoric and the rules in order to reconstruct the classics. The Reformers studied hermeneutics so that they could vindicate the

1. Dilthey, "Hermeneutics", in Hodge, op. cit., p. 125.

2. Dilthey, "The Intuitive Element in Understanding", in Hodges, op. cit., p. 128.

3. Ibid., p. 128f.

4. Quoted in Hodges, op. cit., p. 2

5. Ibid., p. 25. 6. Ibid., p. 26.

intelligibility of Scriptures over against the Roman Catholics and the Anabaptists. Other developments followed in order from Melanchthon, Spinoza, the English Deists, etc. The classical line re-appeared with the Homeric question. Schleiermacher combined classical and biblical streams, and lifted hermeneutics from the status of a literary technique to a philosophical discipline.¹ Thus the history of understanding developed regularly and necessarily from step to step;

"....the need for deep and universally valid understanding gave rise to philological mastery, and this in turn to the laying down of rules and the codification of them".²

Finally the proper time came for rules which rose from an "analysis of understanding".²

Dilthey equates objectivity with what can be **shown** to be universally valid. Of hermeneutics he says:

"Its business is to furnish, in opposition to the continual inroads of romantic arbitrariness and skeptical subjectivity into the field of history, a theoretical vindication of the universal validity of interpretation, upon which all security in history depends."³

Dilthey uses Hegel's concept of objective and subjective.⁴

The objective "covers all the principles and relationships composing the moral and social life of man: economic, legal, ethical, domestic, civil, political activities"; and the subjective includes "all processes and activities within the individual consciousness"; also in contrast to the "objective mind" is the "absolute mind", which includes "those activities through which man becomes conscious of his kinship with the universe, viz., art, religion, and philosophy."⁵

1. Ibid., p. 25ff.

2. Dilthey, "The Rise of Hermeneutics", op. cit., p. 128.

3. Quoted by Hodges, op. cit., p. 25.

4. Wach, op. cit., I, p. 102.

5. Hodges, op. cit., p. 30f.

Like Schli^eermacher, Dilthey feels that the interpreter should be extremely skilled in the grammatico-historical methods and also in the powers of intuition.¹ The interpreter seeks to interpret a hero or genius, or a great event in history.

"The most proper approach to (the hero or genius) is the most subjective. For the highest possibility of grasping what is powerful in him lies in the lived experience of his effects upon ourselves, in the enduring conditions to which our own life is subjected because of him."²

Dilthey virtually confines the hermeneutics of written records to that of the great events in history.³ And, of course, the interpreter himself is a virtuoso, a man of sensitive genius, who skillfully interprets the heroes and geniuses and most important events of every age.

Once again like Schleiermacher, Dilthey holds important the presuppositions that biblical hermeneutics has the same rules as general hermeneutics, and that this observation was a special contribution of Schleiermacher's to the study of hermeneutics.⁴ Another significant insight carried over from Schleiermacher was that we can interpret the whole only by seeing the parts, and the parts only in light of the whole.⁵ Each part, each word is ambiguous or meaningless by itself; it is "indeterminately determinate" (moves freely within range of possibilities which it has, e.g., in the dictionary).⁶ To know the thought of the author we must know the situation in which he wrote; yet we must already know the situation if we are to know his thought.⁷

1. "Entstehung der Hermeneutik", Gesammelte Schriften, V, p. 332f.

2. "The Intuitive Element...", op. cit., p. 129.

3. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 235. "In actual fact Dilthey confines hermeneutics to the interpretation of 'constantly fixed expressions of life', that is, of the monuments of civilization, and so primarily of literary documents, alongside which, however, the works of art are also of material importance."

Thus we go from whole to part and from part to whole.

Bultmann draws heavily upon Dilthey for his own hermeneutics. He notes that Dilthey's "harking back" to Schleiermacher served the purpose of rediscovering the real aim of interpretation, which had been suppressed by the "historical school".¹ The "historical school", says Bultmann, was one-sided, it underated the "texts and monuments" as "sources" by which the picture of a past age might be reconstructed, and only as "sources".² But Bultmann suggests that Schleiermacher and Dilthey were one-sided also:

"Schleiermacher's conception of understanding...is orientated to the interpretation of philosophical and literary texts. But does it also hold good for other texts?...No, it would appear! And 'no' in actual fact..."³

But for Bultmann this is not only not too bad, but it is in fact necessary, for

"...a comprehension -- an interpretation -- is, it follows, constantly orientated to a particular formulation of a question, a particular 'objective'. But included in this, therefore, is the fact that it is never without its own presuppositions.⁴ it is governed always by a prior understanding of the subject."

4. Wach, op. cit., I, p. 102. Bultmann observes that "...J. Chr. K. von Hofmann has seen what is the decisive character in his own way, when he says the biblical hermeneutics does not seek to represent itself as an independent and self-contained science, but has as its presupposition hermeneutics in general; that it does not, however, consist simply in the application of this to the Bible, but assumes the existence of a relation to the contents of the Bible (Biblische Hermeneutik, 1880, p, lff.)." In "The Problems of Hermeneutics", Essays, op. cit., p. 241.

5. "Entstehung der Hermeneutik", op. cit., p. 334.

6. Hodges, op. cit., p. 27.

7. Ibid., p. 27.

1. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 247.

2. Ibid., p. 247.

3. Ibid., p. 238f.

4. Ibid., p. 239.

Thus the one-sidedness of the "historical school" is heinous to Bultmann, while the one-sidedness of Schleiermacher and Dilthey is not a grievous fault, but is indeed necessary, in Bultmann's way of thinking, because of their presuppositions and prior understandings. Apparently a person's one-sidedness is all right if it happens to be the kind of one-sidedness which we ourselves also have.

A more useful point is made by Bultmann when he says that the link between interpreter and author is not a common humanity, nor is it an interest which the interpreter has in the psychological states or the author, but it is rather the interpreter's interest in the subject matter of the author.

"Instead of reflection on the individuality of author and expositor, on their psychological processes and on the spiritual make-up or intellectual consanguinity of the expositor, it requires consideration of the simple fact, that the presupposition for understanding is the interpreter's relationship in his life to the subject which is directly or indirectly expressed in the text."¹

This is especially true in the area of biblical interpretation where the subject matter is far more important than the psychological states of the biblical writers, and where the author's individuality is by no means emphasized. In case of the prophet, e.g., he is correct who observed that "the prophet's function is to disappear!" How alien then to biblical hermeneutics it is when Dilthey proposes that hermeneutics is concerned with interpreting the individuality of heroes and geniuses and the great events in history; or when he demands that the expositor himself be a virtuoso of divination.

Another criticism of Bultmann's which is well taken is that Dilthey tried to deliver hermeneutics from the grasp of romantic

1. Ibid., p. 241.

^saestheticism, but could not.

"Dilthey's endeavour is manifestly to find his way out of the ultimately aesthetic approach of romanticism. He is, of course, still caught up in it when he sees the interest in the 'feeling after strange states of the soul' (Nachfühlen fremder Seelenzustaende) as lying in the happiness arising out of this, and when he speaks of the 'enchantment' which that man enjoys who gazes beyond all the limitations of his own age into the civilization of the past. But such a man does not only enjoy the enchantment; he also 'appropriates for himself the power of the past.'"¹

Thus while Dilthey shaped general hermeneutics and gave significant insights into biblical hermeneutics, we have to take exception to some of his principles when applied to biblical interpretation, which the Scriptures themselves do not allow. Some of these are his strongly subjective², romantic aestheticism; his category of the objective as the universally valid; his preoccupation with geniuses, heroes, and the monuments of history. Dilthey's contributions to hermeneutics are not, however, to be slighted. He saw that it was indeed possible for the interpreter so to identify himself with the ancients through their literature that those ancient happenings, etc., became quite present ("gegenwaertig") to him. This was done by means of the imaginative act of divination, but not without careful application of all the grammatico-historical rules. He noted that biblical hermeneutics is a part of general hermeneutics, and must not exempt itself from the rules of grammar and language. He rightly understood that understanding comes from reading the whole in light of the parts and the parts in light of the whole. He recognised the reality of the subjective side of man, though he was inclined to locate the reality of religion in inner experience ("Erlebnis") and individuality.³ Finally, his

1. Ibid., p. 250. Cf. G.A. Morgan, "Wilhelm Dilthey", in The Philosophical Review, XLII, 4, July, 1933, p. 377.

2. Morgan, op. cit., p. 365.

3. Ibid., p. 358.

profound explorations¹ into the nature and history of understanding constitute an important landmark on the subject, considered from the stand-point of philosophy and psychology as well as that of theology.

But significant in the highest degree for hermeneutics is Dilthey's discovery that we all do our work as interpreters, approaching Scriptures with our own systems of thought~~s~~, philosophies of life, world views, presuppositions, and prior understandings. Thus we are all subjectively determined as expositors, a recognition which must be made if we are to do our job of interpretation. Thus Dilthey's contribution to the current discussion of the subjective and the objective is a most valuable one.

We have made a brief sketch of the background in which Tholuck wrote, showing the various influences upon and contributors to the study of hermeneutics in his period. If we combine the results of this chapter and ^{the} last chapter, we may be able to predict where Tholuck will fit into the scene. His deep piety and faith, e.g., will doubtless give him an affinity to Schleiermacher's "feeling of absolute dependence", and may result in his considering feeling a useful hermeneutical tool. Tholuck's piety will also give him a kinship to Hengstenberg, Hofmann, and Luecke, all of whom insisted upon the necessity of religious experience for proper interpretation. Tholuck's love for the Church should make him sympathetic to Schleiermacher, who sought to make peace in the Church, to Hengstenberg, whose "Heilsgeschichte" took place within the covenant community.

1. Morgan remarks that Dilthey never sufficiently drew out all the ramifications and applications of his theory of understanding. Ibid., p. 365.

We see too that Tholuck was not alone in being affected by Hegel and Schleiermacher. Baur drew the foundation and form of his theology from them. His system was Hegel's dialectic, history in terms of ideas. Hofmann's "Heilsgeschichte" also owed something to the dialectic. Lücke and Dilthey made no effort to hide the fact that their hermeneutics were elaborations of Schleiermacher's. Hengstenberg alone remained aloof, and it may even be that the popularity of Hegel and Schleiermacher drove him even farther into orthodoxy. It may be too that he absorbed a bit of Hegel when he proposed that there was in the Old Testament a progress of clarity. Nor was Tholuck alone in positing a "continuity" between God and man after the example of Schleiermacher and Hegel. Baur also synthesized contradictions and identified the Holy Spirit with the human spirit. Luecke too was a harmoniser of opposites, and held Schleiermacher's theory of "self-impartment". Dilthey as well reproduces the romantic aestheticism which so easily bridges the gap between God and man. Highly subjective interpretations were indulged in by Schleiermacher, Luecke, and Dilthey; and we expect to find the same to be true of Tholuck because his regard for feeling and subjective states was so similar to theirs. Baur, Hengstenberg, and von Hofmann, on the other hand, repudiated such subjectivity, and held it in check by giving due regard to the objective facts of faith in the context of the Church. Unlike Tholuck, Schleiermacher had no radical doctrine of sin, nor did Luecke or Dilthey, so it seems. This made them even more susceptible to the notion of "continuity" between God and man. Somewhat similar to this is Tholuck's apologetical interest to appeal to the cultured on basis of reason, or in some

other way to touch a "divine spark" in man, which he learned from Schleiermacher and shared with Luecke and later with Dilthey. But also we find in Tholuck a pronounced Christocentricity, which we see is shared by Hofmann.

As far as we have gone, we find that Tholuck is by no means radical or iconoclastic in his general theology. For he will find many supporters, either on one hand or the other, for any of his main points in philosophy or theology. But we must now become more specific and investigate Tholuck more particularly in the field of Biblical hermeneutics.

1. Tholuck, Hans, *Handbuch der Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1836.
2. Tholuck, Hans, *Handbuch der Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1836.
3. Tholuck, Hans, *Handbuch der Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1836.
4. Tholuck, Hans, *Handbuch der Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1836.

PART III Tholuck's Hermeneutics

Chapter III Presuppositions

We begin our study of Tholuck's hermeneutics by noting his doctrine of Scripture. This is set forth in a concise way in his article "Bibel", 1851. For Tholuck, the Bible is the normative authority for faith and life.¹ It is the means to truth; all parts of the Church's worship, and the language of the Church have been and are to be based upon it.² It is to be diligently read and studied by laity as well as clergy.³ It is the word of God and will not pass away -- it remains constant as the foundation of faith and a tool of instruction.⁴ It is a masterpiece of literature, containing treasures of philosophy and gems from almost every field of learning.⁵

What is important to note is that, in the above statements, Tholuck has committed his theology to be closely bound to Scripture. That Scripture is the Word of God, the norm for the faith and language of the Church, and the means to truth, for Tholuck, indicates that his exegesis will be a serious activity for him. This we lay down as the initial presupposition of his hermeneutics. Scripture has this authority, but not because it was mechanically dictated by the Holy Spirit to passive men used as lifeless tools. Tholuck suggests that, in so far as the New Testament writers often changed the wording of an Old Testament passage they cited, or even

1. Tholuck, "Bibel", Unterhaltende Belehrungen zur Foerderungen Allgemeiner Bildung, pp. 1, 6.

2. Ibid., pp. 65, 66.

3. Ibid., p. 67.

4. Ibid., p. 79.

5. Ibid., p. 79.

mistranslated (from the Septuagint), they thus distinguished between "letter" and "spirit" in a text.¹ Tholuck does maintain, however, that the sense of an Old Testament passage is never misrepresented in the New Testament.² There is for Tholuck a further distinction between "symbolic" and "actual" in Scripture, e.g., Hosea's marriage is taken to be symbolic.³ Having thus rejected the mechanical dictation theory of the inspiration of Scripture, Tholuck may speak of "errors" in the Bible,⁴ contradictory prophecies,⁵ and questionable Psalm titles.⁶

Having said this, Tholuck is free to employ the methods of biblical criticism of his day; though these he will use with discretion. For unlike his Rationalist opponents, Tholuck presses strongly for the historicity of the Biblical accounts,⁷ as we shall elsewhere note.

In his article, "Inspiration", in Herzog's Real-Encyklopaedie, Tholuck sketches the history of theories of inspiration. He attributes to Plato the hard and fast distinction between men speaking humanly and divinely, each exclusive of the other.⁸

-
1. Tholuck, "Citations from the Old Testament in the New," Appendix to Commentary on the Hebrews, p.221.
 2. Ibid., p.221.
 3. Tholuck, Die Propheten und Ihre Weissagungen, pp.49-73.
 4. Tholuck, "Bibel", op.cit., Chapter 4.
 5. Tholuck, Propheten, op.cit., pp.134-146.
 6. Tholuck, Commentary on the Psalms, p.xiv.
 7. Tholuck, "Bibel", op. cit., Chapter 6.
 8. Tholuck, "Inspiration", from Herzog's Real-Encyklopaedie fuer Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, tr. in The Journal of Sacred Literature, iii, July, 1863, p.353.

This came by way of Philo into the Church as the origin of the mechanical theory.¹ It next became popular to speak of various degrees of inspiration; and finally in Origen, Augustine, and Luther there appear contradictory statements, some affirming, some denying, verbal inspiration.² Calvin, though holding that all Scriptures are "heaven sent," "the very words of God,"³ freely speaks of historical and other inaccuracies in Scripture.

The mechanical theory was widely held in the Post-Reformation hardening of doctrine, but with the rise of criticism and exegesis, no one in Germany in Tholuck's day, to his knowledge, had risen to defend the old mechanical theory with such resoluteness as in former times.⁴ In Tholuck's opinion, where exegesis is carried out in a critical way, grammatically and historically, there is no place for a mechanical theory. Where a mechanical theory is held, the Biblical authority for it, and the hermeneutics supporting it,⁵ need to be re-examined.

The Deutsche Zeitschrift of 1850, however, carries a more popular article by Tholuck on the same subject, in which the important distinction is made, that even though a dictation theory obtained in the early history of the Church, not until the seventeenth century was Scripture regarded as the "infallible

-
1. Ibid., p.354.
 2. Ibid., p.358.
 3. Ibid., p.360.
 4. Ibid., p.362f.
 5. Ibid., p.363.

production of the Divine Spirit, not merely in its religious, but in its entire contents; and not merely in its contents, but also in its very form." ¹ "...not only the sense, but also the words, ...letters, ...vowel-points, ...according to some, the very punctation, proceeded from the Spirit of God." ² That it came in that century, not earlier, was due to the desire of the Protestants of the time to have as infallible and tangible an authority in the Bible, as the Roman Catholics had in a pope. Previous to that time, theologians generally held to a view of inspiration never precisely formulated, but one allowing them freedom to speak of errors in history, grammar, and translation in Scripture; while at the same time, they, in the main, insisted that the sense and content of a passage was never impaired by errors it may have contained. Tholuck concludes:

"It has been proved that the assumption of an inspiration extending to the entire contents, to the subject-matter and form of the sacred writings, has so little claim to the honour of being the only orthodox doctrine, that it has been the opinion of, comparatively speaking, an exceedingly small fraction.³ at no period whatever was such an opinion generally entertained."⁴

Tholuck submits that the dictation theory arose from a "presumed necessity for certainty of faith," but that errors in translation (e.g., Hebrews' use of the Septuagint) and errors in

-
1. Tholuck, "Die Inspirations-Lehre," Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1850, tr. in the Journal of Sacred Literature, vi., July, 1854, p.331.
 2. Ibid., p.332.
 3. Ibid., p.352.
 4. Ibid., p.352.

fact (contradictions in narration, e.g., in the Synoptic Gospels) indicate the falsity of this opinion.¹ Whereupon, Tholuck's view is :

"The Bible, as it appears to us, can in no case pass as verbally inspired; therefore also its contents cannot in all their details be considered as externally guaranteed ... This belief entirely coincides with, and stands entirely in relation to, belief in the Divine contents. Faith in a Divine inspiration of Scripture relates, first of all, to that truth witnessed by the 'demonstration of the Spirit and power', by which (according to 1 Cor. ii.4.) the Apostle established belief in his preaching in the hearts of the Corinthians; that is, the Christian doctrine of salvation. This doctrine approves itself to us as truth, when the man becomes conscious that his intercourse with God is re-established; that for time and for eternity he enters into proper relationship to his God; and thus, and thus alone, he can become a true man of God (2 Tim. iii.17)." 2.

Tholuck then speaks of a "fidelity of record with respect to words and facts essentially," and adduces a distinction between essential (to which the witness of the Spirit is direct and absolute) and non-essential (to which it is only indirect and relative).³ In faith we believe that the promise of the Holy Spirit to the writers of Scripture was fulfilled, so that their natural subjectivity exercised no obscuring influence "upon the communication of historical knowledge, gained by their own experience, nor upon the revelation which they had received from God."⁴ Then Tholuck appeals to the fact that Providence has

1. Ibid., p.361f.
2. Ibid., p.364f.
3. Ibid., p.366.
4. Ibid., p.366.

preserved the record, and to the Bible's comprehensiveness in terms of world history (Genesis to Apocalypse) as further proofs of the inspiration of Scripture.¹

Though there are extraneous supports for Tholuck's doctrine of inspiration here given, yet we feel that his point is well taken that the doctrine rests upon the activity of the Holy Spirit, and its authenticity is inextricably joined to faith in the revelation itself ("the Christian doctrine of salvation," as he puts it). His use of the passages from 1 Cor. 2 and 2 Tim. 3 in connection with this doctrine is apposite in our opinion.

Scripture has authority for us, in a subjective sense, because all believers can understand it. Here is asserted the doctrine of the perspicuity of the Scriptures. Tholuck, commenting on John 7:20, cites Calvin's strong statement:

"Woe to the Papiets, who are not ashamed to vomit forth the execrable blasphemy, that Scriptures contain nothing that is not ambiguous and capable of distortion, and that, consequently, the tradition of the Church is sole mistress of what they are to believe. But we should remember, that the Son of God, our only judge, approves of that faith alone which is received from the teaching of the Apostles". 2.

This is an important doctrine -- Scripture's meaning is clear to men of faith. Thus Tholuck, having enunciated the normative nature of the Bible for the whole life and worship

1. Ibid., p.367f.

2. Tholuck, Commentary on John, p.371.

of the Church, enjoins the laity, as well as the clergy, to read and study the Bible.¹ He prescribes common Bible study for Church members.^{2.}

Tholuck observes in the Preface to his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount:

"The great task of the present age ... is to understand the relation in which Christ stands to the form of religion embodied in the Old Testament ... The religion of the Old Testament and Gospel constitute one revelation."³

This is stated in a stronger way in his Einige apologetischen Winke fuer das Studium des Alten Testaments: "Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament."^{4.}

Another point in Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture is the principle, "Scriptura scripturae interpres." This we find illustrated on almost every page of Tholuck's commentaries, where he brings into consideration many passages of Scripture which have light to shed upon the text he is treating. Commenting on Hebrews 2:5, e.g., Tholuck seeks to understand "the world to come" by a variety of parallel passages:

"We must form our decision, therefore, by what is said on this subject in other passages of the New Testament, and, particularly, by what our Author teaches. The most distinct intimation that the consummation of the kingdom of Christ shall be upon the new earth is found in 2 Peter iii. 13; Rom. i. 19-21. It has lately been asserted (Usteri ...), that 'the Ep. to the Hebrews contains generally the germs of that opinion which we call the modern one, namely, that our life upon earth is only a state

1. Tholuck, "Bibel", op. cit., p. 67.

2. Ibid., p.57.

3. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p.v.

4. Tholuck, "Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament," Philological Tracts, I, p.224.

of trial and preparation for Heaven. Paul, on the contrary, places the future, for the greater part, upon earth, and sees it in events which shall come to pass on it.' This is one of the many assertions which have been inconsiderately made concerning the Apostolic doctrines, among others by Rueckert, without the smallest attempt at an illustration of Scripture by Scripture." 1

Tholuck refutes this distinction, making reference to 1 Thess. 4:17, Heb. 9:11, 13:14, 6:20, 10:34, 12:22,23, Matt. 5:12, 6:20, 19:21, Luke 16:19, John 17:24.

He reconciles the two views by observing that,

"... on the one hand, it is very natural that the abode of Christ and the blessed should be placed in Heaven, for they are in the immediate presence of God (Heb.ix.24.), but, on the other, that this designation is to be understood not so much of place as of state, as it is expressed in the Lutheran dogmatics, not τοπικῶς, but τροπικῶς ... If the case be thus, there is no reason why the Apostles should not speak of a bliss in Heaven, and yet understand by the expression a bliss which should be manifested upon earth. They might be the more ready to do this, as bliss commences at death, and, until the glorification of the earth, must be fixed, as to locality, somewhere else." 2

To substantiate this, Tholuck then discusses Acts 3:21, Rev. 21:2, 1 Pet. 1:4, Col. 3:1,3, Phil. 3:20, 1 Cor. 15, 2 Cor. 5:2, etc.

Tholuck seeks to understand the Psalmist's claim to righteousness before God, Psalm 18:20-26, in terms of Paul's "rejoicing in a good conscience" (2 Cor. 1:12) on the one hand, and justification by grace, on the other (1 Cor. 4:4, 1 John 1:7). His conclusion is:

1. Tholuck, Commentary on Hebrews, I, p.148.
2. Ibid., p.149.

"It is very evident from all this that it is one thing sincerely to strive to walk according to the commandments of God, and another to be free from all sin. David might have praised the cleanness of his hands, the caution of his ways, and the constancy of his having had before his eyes the statutes of God, but it was no doubt accompanied by the acknowledgment of the necessity of the daily forgiveness of his sins." 1

Then Tholuck cites Psalm 19:12 (both Psalms 18 and 19 attributed to David), the Psalmist's confession of sin.

"Comparing himself with others, he spoke highly of himself -- but before God he did on that account no less join the rank and file of the millions of the children of men, whose hope is salvation by grace." 2

These are but a few of many examples from Tholuck's commentaries, illustrating his understanding and application of the principle of "Scriptura scripturae interpres". It was not his custom to abuse that principle by introducing passages which had no parallel whatever to a text he was expounding. 3

Tholuck's term for this practice is "spiritual" interpretation. He states this precisely as follows:

"In this section (Matt. 5:21-48), as indeed everywhere, not the literal, but the spiritual, interpretation is the true one. Inasmuch as the spirit of an author is expressed by means of the word and the letter, we must, of course, set out from an exposition of the letter and the word. As, however, on the other hand, the letter is of importance only as regarded as an element in the word, the word only when viewed as a

1. Tholuck, Psalms, op. cit., p.95.

2. Ibid., p.95.

3. For an example of his rejecting this method, cf. Tholuck's John, op. cit., pp. 255-258.

member of the sentence, the sentence only considered as a part of the organic whole, criticism, in order to obtain an understanding of the whole work; and the correctness of the interpretation of a sentence and an isolated clause must be determined by the consistency of that interpretation with the idea of the whole work. It is from the neglect of this hermeneutical principle that those false, merely literal, and hence unspiritual, views of such commands as those in vers. 29, 34, 39-42, which are to be found principally in the sect of the Quakers, have arisen." 1

Tholuck then shows how that sect, in obedience to a literal interpretation and application of these verses, rejected oaths, resisted all opposition to evil, abandoned salutations in the streets, adjured titles. He adds that such a strict interpretation universally applied would encourage violence, beggary, indolence, vice, etc. He makes this conclusion:

"So, then, with regard to the sayings of Christ which we are about to consider, we must never forget that they are to be interpreted according to the analogia fidei, according to the whole scope of Christian doctrine, according to the spirit of Christ." 2

In this connection it is worthwhile to note what Tholuck does with Hebrews 6:4-6. It is interesting also, that he here states explicitly the hermeneutical principle with which we are now concerned.

"As it is an indispensable duty in the theological interpreter to explain Scripture by Scripture, and, besides, as the believing interpreter proceeds upon the conviction that, amidst all the diversity of typus doctrinae of the New Testament writers the basis of their Christian consciousness is the same, our first duty here is to collect together those declarations of which the substance appears to be the same

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, op. cit., p.163f.
2. Ibid., p.165.

with that of the passage before us, and to examine whether they lead to the same result, which, if they do, will confirm our exposition; but, on the other hand, to institute a strict search after those declarations which appear to contradict our text." 1

Tholuck examines texts which to him are somewhat parallel; 1 John 2:19, Matt. 12:13,32, 1 John 5:16, 2 Pet. 2:20. Then he opposes to them John 10:28, explaining that to be a disciple in the "full sense" means "not merely to be a participant in those objective privileges of grace, which are enumerated, Heb. vi.4.5., but subjectively, to fulfill all the conditions which the Saviour has laid down....2 Then follow in rapid order twelve Scriptural references to prove that no real disciple can fall away. "Accordingly, it is quite correct to say, that no one plucks His out of His hand, in case (i.e.if) they fulfill the conditions established by Him, in case (i.e. if) they abide in Him."³

Hebrews 6:4-6 is clearly describing a divine-human relationship of the most intimate sort - - a relationship which is ipso facto two-sided, therefore both subjective and objective at the same time. Tholuck's distinction between subjective and objective discipleship is not only useless, but quite harmful. Not only does it not apply, but it distorts the meaning. The reason is this: tasting the heavenly gift, becoming partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasting "the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come" are by all means subjective, as well as objective; and these certainly "fulfill Christ's conditions of

1. Tholuck, Commentary on Hebrews, I, p.249f.
2. Ibid., p. 253.
3. Ibid., p. 254.

discipleship." But Tholuck defines "abide in Him" in this way: ".he who, in the full sense, belongs to his disciples can be known only EX EVENTU..." 1 But about those referred to in this passage there simply is no implication that they do not now belong, and had not earlier belonged, "in the full sense" to His disciples -- and yet they were still in danger of apostasy. It destroys the sense of this text to consider the passages favouring "perse~~v~~erance" under the heading Hebrews 6:4-6.

This practice of Tholuck's and of many others', of softening a text which offends us, or contradicts some text we like, is a clear denial of the principle of finding the most probable meaning of a text by a through investigation of the grammar and historical context, i.e., what the words say. Thus, according to Tholuck, again in Hebrews 6:4-6, those who apostasise cannot really be Christ's disciples "in a full sense" -- so what the verse really means is quite different from what the words seem to say. Dangers lurk behind the words, "What the text really means is..." One of these dangers is allegory. Even though Tholuck repudiates that form of interpretation, we find him, (naïvely) commending as an "ingenious application" Augustine's remark that in Luke 11:12,

"The fish means faith in the ocean-billows of the present life; the bread, the nutritive power of love; the egg is believing hope, which anticipates the future!"²

This only indicates how far along the road one can go when he begins to be careless with what the words of Scripture

1. Ibid., p.254.

2. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, II, op. cit., p.284.

say. It further demonstrates how precise we must be in hermeneutics, in particular, here at this point, in defining "Scriptura scripturae interpres." It also shows how necessary is a strict adherence to the words of the text.

But we should say, in defence of Tholuck, that by and large his use of Scripture to interpret Scripture is quite proper and circumspect. We take it to be a good thing that this is the case, and that he freshly enunciated this principle.

F. W. Farrar remarks that "bias and party spirit are frequent and fatal sources of exegetic error."¹ Tholuck recognised this, praised the Reformed commentators for being ^{more} independent-ly exegetical than the Lutheran,² and commended Calvin for his "freedom from anxious adherence to the established system of faith."³

We believe that Tholuck really intended to interpret Scripture without being too fettered by an iron-clad confessional dogmatic. Where we would expect him, as a Lutheran or even as a Unionist, to be very severe with the Calvinist predestinarians in his commentary on Romans 9-11, e.g., we find his criticisms very mild. In one place he defends the Calvinists against the Lutheran exegetes.⁴

E. A. Park observes that Tholuck "...makes no effort to regulate his creed by any of our formularies, but examines every doctrine for himself, as if he were the first man who investi-

1. Farrar, F.W., The History of Interpretation, p.475.

2. Ibid., p.330.

3. Tholuck, "Calvin as Interpreter of Holy Scriptures", tr. in Calvin's Commentary on Joshua, p.349.

4. Tholuck, Commentary on Romans, II, p.143.

gated it." ¹ We may have expected this from our notice of Tholuck's position as a unionist, in favour of holding to a consensus of Lutheran and Reformed symbols. ² But another example, independent of Reformed and Lutheran confessional lines, is Tholuck's dogmatic or emotional bias for universal salvation, which he was forced completely to abandon because of the overwhelming testimony against it in Scripture.

Park makes the following points on this theme: 1. Tholuck's theology differs from that of the American universalists "as music from discord." 2. Universalist speculations characterised his earlier, not his present, theology. 3. He never made these prominent in his system. 4. They were only a hope, not a positive belief. 5. They came from dogmatic, not exegetical, grounds.³ On December 22, 1837, Park notes, Tholuck refers to a previous statement he made:

"If I remember right, my expressions at the time (1834) were these: dogmatically, i.e., as a theologian, I feel myself drawn toward these opinions (i.e. the doctrine of ultimate universal salvation); but exegetically, i.e., as an interpreter, I do not know how to justify it." ⁴

He was attracted by the passages which seemed to indicate universal salvation, but observed that:

"...other important passages stand in direct opposition; those which speak of eternal punishment, Matt. xxv. 41.46.; 1 Thess. v. 3; Jude 7; -- those which speak of the sin against the Holy Ghost, Matt. xii. 22; -- those which speak of Judas, Matt. xxvi. 24; -- those which say that Christ did not die

1. Park, op. cit., p.18.
2. Schaff, Germany, op. cit., p.293.
3. Park, op. cit., pp. 18, 23.
4. Ibid., p.19.

for all, but for many, Matt.xxvi. 28, and xx.28 ... I confessed at the time that I did not know how to reconcile (this hope) with the clear passages in Scripture, which made me reluctant even at that time to embrace that opinion as an unquestionable truth. Mature reflection, however, on the sin against the Holy Ghost, has made me since abandon the idea of the final restoration of all men; for what Christ says concerning it seems too clearly to imply a degree of opposition against holy truth, which leads to eternal unhappiness." 1

We believe that this demonstrates Tholuck's fairness and freedom from dogmatic bias as an interpreter of the Bible. But we should like to make two further observations. First of all, we see at work in Tholuck's thoughts the opinion that Scripture cannot be contradictory. He takes note of the passages which suggest universal salvation, e.g., Acts 2:21, Rom. 5:18, 11:36, 1 Cor. 15:22-28, Col. 1:16, Phil. 2:20, Heb. 2:10, 10:13,14. Not being able to reconcile these to the passages contradicting them, Tholuck labels the results of his first set of texts "dogmatic", "a hope", and dismisses them in light of the second set of texts. This practice of dismissing one set of Scriptures because of another set is hardly a way to freedom from dogmatic bias. But as far as we have come on our present consideration, we may say that Tholuck will abandon a dogmatic position if he feels that Scripture clearly contradicts it, which is, we feel, a very good rule.

W. Pringle's preface to Tholuck's article on Calvin as an interpreter tells us that Luecke was the first exegete

1. Ibid., p.20f.

in his time to make use of the Reformers in his interpretation; Tholuck was the second.¹ Tholuck was pointed by Neander to the fathers, and now to the fathers of the Reformation; he was compelled to notice the exegetical talent of John Calvin as a model.² He admired Calvin for his "doctrinal impartiality," "exegetical tact," "learning," and his "psychology" based on "Christian experience."³ Tholuck's object in his commentary on the Psalms was "to interpret the book of Psalms in the spirit of John Calvin."⁴

Tholuck was not one to allow his exegesis to be determined by strictly partisan dogmatics. But he did not press that into anything like an extreme anti-confessionalism, on the contrary, he stood right behind the Reformers in the tradition of the Reformation. On the other hand, to draw the lines more closely, in his constant reference to the Reformers, he was at no time too shy to disagree with them on points of exegesis. Tholuck, e.g., quarrels with Luther's translation of εἰκόνα in Hebrews 10:1;⁵ in his Commentary on the Psalms he uses Luther's translation, but discards it where it is incorrect or obscure.⁶

But to stand behind the Reformers in the tradition of the Reformation is not to agree with them on every doctrine

1. Pringle, W., preface to Tholuck's "Calvin..", op.cit., p.345.
 2. Ibid., p.345.
 3. Tholuck, "Calvin...", op. cit., pp.356, 363f.
 4. Tholuck, Psalms, op. cit., p.x.
 5. Tholuck, Hebrews, op. cit., II, p.51.
 6. Tholuck, Psalms, op. cit., p.xv.

and interpretation of Scripture; but rather, it is to be led by them to belief in Scripture as an authority for the Church (because it is) a witness to revelation, and it is (thus) the Word of God. We follow the Reformers by rigorous adherence to and practice of ~~this practice~~ of this principle of Scripture, and its corollary, honest exegesis, as the norm of theology.

For this reason we believe it good that Tholuck, standing in the very shadow of Schleiermacher, prized the Reformers, their spirit, their hermeneutics, and, essentially, their doctrine of Scripture.

In summary, we have briefly sketched some of the basic presuppositions about the Holy Scriptures underlying Tholuck's hermeneutics. This will serve as a background for our discussion of the characteristics and methods of his interpretation. We have found many significant things. Tholuck sees Scripture as the Word of God, and, therefore, the authority for the faith, language, and life of the Church; and this Word will not pass away. He rejects the dictation theory of the inspiration of the Bible, and feels that inspiration is best understood in terms of the content of the Bible (for him, the doctrine of salvation). For Tholuck, Scripture is perspicuous to men of faith, and therefore all are enjoined to study it diligently. The Old and New Testaments must be seen in the light of the one revelation in Jesus Christ, which factor constitutes their unity. Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture, and, Tholuck, in the main, practices that principle in a skillful way. Tholuck preserves his own integrity and independence, as over against a

bondage to orthodox confessionalism, when he approaches Scripture as an exegete; and he forbids his own hopes to determine the outcome of his exegesis. He is loyal, however, to the Reformers, consults them extensively in his commentaries, and endeavours to breathe their spirit, in standing, as he does, in the tradition of the Reformation in the good sense of that term.

From this view of Scripture as a point of departure, we now look into the characteristics and methods for Biblical hermeneutics and exegesis which Tholuck employed.

Part III, Chapter IV - Characteristics and Methods

A. The Grammatico-Historical Sense.

We are not disappointed in our expectation, based upon an inspection of Tholuck's theology of Scripture, that his exegetical work will be characterised by a strong emphasis on the grammatical structure of the text, and on the historical context surrounding the text. We have already observed that Tholuck praised the Reformed theologians for their "impartial, historical, grammatical interpretation" of the Bible.¹ He considered Calvin a good hebraist, commended his "exegetical tact", and his disavowal of forced interpretations.² According to Tholuck, Calvin's method of interpretation is as follows:

"The exegetical tact of Calvin appears eminently in the method of his interpretation. Cautious and always clear, he first unfolds the difficulties in the construction, and everywhere develops with acuteness the ὑπέρβατα, ἀνανταπόδοτα, ἐπανορθώσεις; he then explains the words, and, at the same time, the rhetorical figures -- climax, paranomasia, antanaclasis; he also notices the peculiarities in phraseology of the different writers, Paul, John, etc; and, finally, he deduces the sense in the most natural way, so that it seems to arise, as it were, of itself, to the reader; as is always the case with every good interpretation." 3

By virtue of commending this practice of Calvin's, Tholuck has pledged himself, as it were, to a grammatico-historical treatment of texts. We shall later discuss whether his performance was consistent with his aim in this regard.

*

1. Tholuck, "Calvin...", op.cit., p.346.
2. Ibid., p. 348, 362.
3. Ibid., p.363.

Tholuck, laying down the requisites for Biblical interpretation, suggests that:

"An interpreter must explain the text with philological exactness ... A commentator must explain the meaning of a biblical writer in the true spirit of the ancient history; that is, he must bring before the eyes of the modern a picture of the whole mode of life, which was adopted in the days of inspiration, the whole character and accidental peculiarities of the Jews and early Christians." 1

Closely connected and integral to this principle is the need for the interpreter of Scripture to have a "sympathy" with the Biblical writers. That this was an important consideration to Tholuck is indicated by his praise of that practice in Calvin:

"In the Pauline Epistles, (Calvin) merges himself in the spirit of the Apostle, and becoming one with him, as every one already feels, he deduces everywhere the explanation of that which is particular from that which is general... The whole history of the New Testament becomes in his hand alive and vivid. He lives in every person who comes forward, either speaking or acting, in the wicked as well as in the good, and explains every discourse from the circumstances, and from the soul of him who speaks. In the Acts of the Apostles, this his art shews itself in a way worthy of admiration. He apprehends admirably the exact state of mind of the person acting, and lays it before the reader; and especially he interprets so well the speeches of Paul, that in a perfectly natural way they become at the same time a sermon for the reader." 2

So important to Tholuck is this principle of identity^{it} with the Biblical writer, that it constitutes for him the first

1. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology," Bibliotheca Sacra, I, May, 1844, p.859.
2. Tholuck, "Calvin..." op. cit., p.368.

requisite for an interpreter of the Scriptures.

"First, all good interpretation of the Scriptures depends upon this, that the commentator himself possess the spirit of his author, or that he be able to transfer himself into that spirit." 1

Then Tholuck cites many negative examples of this in the last half of the eighteenth century. He resumes:

"It may be offered as a general remark, that this deep sympathy, this identity of spirit, between interpreters of the Bible and the writers of it, is wanting in those commentators who adopt the principles of the falsely-called historical interpretation." 2

By the latter Tholuck means those exegetes who relativise the historicity of a text by showing how all the Hebrew and Christian institutions, etc., have their counterpart in heathen traditions; and by suggesting that Christ and the apostles taught nothing new. 3 Tholuck continues:

"Secondly, the biblical writer must be explained psychologically; that is, a man must transfer himself into the identical situation of the individual whose writings he interprets." 4

Another emphasis of Tholuck's which we may group under this heading, is that the interpreter of Holy Scripture must interpret with a humble spirit. This we may first infer from our above discussion of Tholuck's insistence that the interpreter of Scripture must have, or put himself into, the spirit of the Biblical writer whose words he is expounding.

-
1. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia..", op. cit., p.358.
 2. Ibid., p.359.
 3. Ibid., p.340.
 4. Ibid., p.359.

Further, Tholuck demands of a theologian,

"...that he enter on the study of the inspired volume with a degree of modesty equal, at least, to that which he feels when he examines any great author. If he find offensive expressions, he must search for the ground of offence not in the author but in himself." 1

Thus we have pointed out Tholuck's first principle of exegesis: finding the grammatical, historical sense of a passage. Tholuck insists that an interpreter delve deeply into the concrete situation surrounding the words of the Biblical writers, and that he examine **thoroughly** the grammatical structure of those words, in order that he may adduce the meaning of them in the clearest possible manner. Tholuck lays stress upon an interpreter's having sympathy with the writers of Scripture, making identification with them in spirit. Finally, Tholuck suggests that we carry on our exegetical task in a humble spirit, that we come to Scripture modestly, not as masters, but as servants of the Word of God.

B. Christian Experience.

One must have "Christian experience", according to Tholuck, if he is to understand and interpret Scriptures. He praises Calvin's "lively religious feeling" in his treatment of the Old Testament. Tholuck suggests that Calvin's trials by "internal and external conflicts for the kingdom of God" enable him to be a superb interpreter of

1. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia..." op.cit., p.338.

the elegaic and penitential Psalms of David ¹ He adds that only such a one can be a successful interpreter. That Calvin was conscious of this, Tholuck demonstrates by pointing to Calvin's acknowledgement "that his own experience in the Christian warfare had rendered him in some respects peculiarly qualified for the interpretation of David's Psalms." ¹

Then Tholuck quotes Calvin as follows:

"'But if the labour undertaken by me in these Commentaries is profitable to my readers, let them know that, by my own small experience in the conflicts with which the Lord has exercised me, I have not been a little aided, both to applying to present use whatever of instruction could be gathered, and in penetrating more easily into the sense of the writer and of his Psalms.'" ²

Tholuck continues:

"Here Calvin subjoins a comparison of the course in which he had been led, and of his own conflicts, with those of David, in which he takes with heartfelt gratitude a survey of his whole past life." ³

We can see that Calvin is referring to the experiences of outward events, primarily, in his own life which have served as helps to understanding analogous circumstances in the life of the Psalmist. But now Tholuck will seek to observe Calvin's inner Christian experience, as that which peculiarly qualifies him as an interpreter of Scripture.

-
1. Tholuck, "Calvin...", op. cit., p.351f.
 2. Ibid., p.352.
 3. Ibid., p.352.

In the same article in another place, Tholuck considers the excellencies of Calvin's exegetical writings "in a religious sense". This he finds in the degree to which faith in the Redeemer "was an affair of the heart" with Calvin, how much he sought for the salvation and identification of his own soul in the way of self-denial. This may be seen in all Calvin's works, especially the prefaces to his commentaries. Tholuck felt that such a Christian whose "internal life" is so active, who seeks daily to progress in the imitation of Jesus, must in consequence read the Scriptures with an enlightened eye, and be able to see and develop their "deeper religious contents." Tholuck thought that Calvin and the other Reformers stood on the same level, except perhaps Beza and Camerarius, in whose commentaries the "religious element" was kept in the background. But Tholuck made a distinction between those who with deep Christian feeling apprehended the fundamental New Testament ideas and particular terms according to their internal import; and those who interpreted "with a psychology resting upon Christian experience" the Holy Scriptures "in their full connection." It was the latter that, for Tholuck, distinguished Calvin from his venerable contemporaries. The unity of the Spirit which bound together all the Reformers in one spiritual body, Tholuck thought to be delightfully prominent in Calvin in his explanation of those peculiar ideas which are fundamental to the Christian system.

1. Ibid., p.367f.

Tholuck explicitly identifies "Christian experience" with "feeling" in his comment on Matthew 5:14 (the 1856 edition of his Sermon on the Mount, but not in earlier editions of the same). Speaking of salt as life, and light as knowledge, he observes:

"The medium through which that new life, which, as ver. 13 has shown, it was to be the mission of the Apostles to diffuse, was to be conveyed to men, is a new knowledge. It is a knowledge that is based upon feeling, that is, on experience; and which must therefore also prove efficacious in the life, as ver. 16 shows, in which $\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ are mentioned as fruits of the $\phi\omega\varsigma$." 1

Tholuck further elaborates this view of the necessity of religious experience for interpreting Scripture -- but now it takes on the form of "connecting point" ("Anknüpfungspunkt") for faith -- in his article in Bibliotheca Sacra. He argues that if a person says "I love", then his words can be understood logically and philologically. But in order to have full comprehension of the meaning, one must have experienced the emotion of love, one must know the circumstances of him who utters those words (whether he be old or young, religious or sensual, etc.). When a pious man speaks, Tholuck feels that he can give the proper historical interpretation to his words, only if Tholuck knows from his own experience of what the man speaks, and only if Tholuck interprets his expressions accordingly. Then he quotes Origen concerning John the Evangelist that "the beloved disciple could best interpret the words of the Saviour, because lying on the breast of his Lord he became another Jesus." Tholuck concludes that the greater the resemblance between interpreter and author, so much the better will be the interpretation.

2

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, op. cit., p.113.
2. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia," op. cit., p.339.

In an article on "The Importance of the Study of the Old Testament", Tholuck again asserts the necessity of an inner experience for proper Biblical interpretation. He suggests that we approach the Bible as a volume of exalted sacredness and of immense importance to all, with a "holy seriousness", that we may prove "whether it contains the truth in relation to our own hearts." Tholuck says that, disregarding for the present everything at which the understanding stumbles, "we ought to make proof of those portions alone which concern our own hearts and our corruptions." When we have done this, "then will be excited that hungering after a Saviour, and after strength from above, without which we never can be sanctified and purified." When we attain to this firm and deeply-rooted faith, then the words of the Saviour are "felt to be" of divine authority, everything in the Bible receives a higher meaning, and, a spirit of exposition will be generated which the critically philological commentaries of our day do not possess. ¹

Tholuck observes that it is only after long wrestling and agonising that we come to take part in any illumination. In divine matters, he continues, everyone knows only so far as his own experience extends. So we become acquainted with what is divine in the Bible in just the proportion in which it begins to increase in us. ²

-
1. Tholuck, "Old Testament Study", op. cit., p. 262f.
 2. Ibid., p.219.

The divine element which grows within us, says Tholuck, also enables us to wage effective war against "self". General instructions and prescriptions are of little avail to induce men to fight against "self". A new and divine seed must come from without and be implanted in the soul if "self" is to gain the victory over "self".¹

Tholuck is opposing this religion of the heart, as a principle of exposition, to the Rationalists' critical philology which seems to him to be destitute of faith and feeling, and thus in no position ~~to~~ ^{to} meaningfully interpret Scripture. On parallel lines with that argument, but dealing with another aspect of Rationalist theology, Tholuck opposes "practical philosophy" (here another name for religion of the heart) to the "speculative philosophy" of Rationalism.

"It is well said by Bacon, Lord Verulam -- also one of those genial spirits that bowed themselves beneath the Gospel: 'Speculative philosophy resembles the lark, which mounts into the air with sprightly song and circling flight, but descends with nothing. Practical philosophy, on the other hand, resembles the hawk which soars into the clouds only to return with spoil'. And where can a 'man of longing' find satisfaction, in the midst of the straining and driving after fruitless speculation, which our age exhibits, if the heart be not full and the soul warmed? Every one who has discovered what it is which alone can satisfy the cravings of the human heart, will exclaim with Epicurus... 'Thanks to nature for having rendered necessary things of easy attainment, while those of difficult attainment are not necessary.'"²

Tholuck ends the article by quoting Deuteronomy 30:11ff.:
 "...But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."

1: Ibid., p.263.
 2: Ibid., p.264.

We believe that it was useful that Tholuck in his time resolutely took his stand against rationalistic speculation and faithless exegesis. We concur with him that Scripture is understood only in the context of faith, because the "testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum" is that which makes clear the Biblical words. On the other hand, we contend that that^{to} which he opposed the hermeneutics of Rationalism is hardly less theologically suspect than the principles of the Rationalists against which he fought. It may be that experiences of hardship and the like, endured for the sake of Jesus Christ, may enable a man (such as Calvin) to better understand the analogous situations experienced by the men of the Bible (such as the Psalmists). This has to do with the principle of the concrete historical situation which we affirmed above as integral to proper hermeneutics. But it is another thing to say with Tholuck about the man who says "I love," that "I cannot give the proper historical interpretation of his words, unless I know from my own experience what that is of which he speaks, and unless I interpret his expressions accordingly." Admittedly, human relationships of love (in this case) do help us to understand God's relationship to us in love -- and precisely because these human relationships stand as the "Image of God" in us -- but the image of God, indicating that God's relating Himself to us (in Jesus Christ)

is, by all means, prior to human relationships, is the source from which they derive, not vice versa. Our knowledge of our relatedness to God, therefore, does not at all depend upon or come primarily through human relationships. On the contrary, the formula of analogy in Ephesians 5:21-32 cannot possibly be reversed. From Tholuck's statements above, we infer that he believes that any word of Scripture must find verification in his religious experience if it is to be properly understood. We submit that this is a "connecting-point" upon which the Scriptures must depend if they are to have any success in terms of being heard, understood, and obeyed. We must approach the Bible "with a holy seriousness, therefore, that we may prove whether it contains the truth in relation to our own hearts," we are told. "We ought to make proof of those portions alone which concern our own hearts and our corruptions." And whence comes this religious experience, this foremost requisite for Biblical interpretation? And where does it make its dwelling? "A new and divine seed must come from without, and be implanted in the soul." And that Christian experience, that religion of the heart, is a "foundation for the holy Science of Exegesis" -- it fills the heart and warms the soul.

Carl F. A. Fritzsche, Professor of Theology in Rostock, and an old Rationalist enemy of Tholuck's, criticises Tholuck's treatment of Romans 8:28. He says that Tholuck gives some

entirely unexpected information on συνεργεῖν, and quotes him as follows: "The σου (in συνεργεῖν) is not meaningless, but signifies that the living heart (Gemüth) is the actual cause of the operation of good, and the events of life are only the occasion of opportunity." Fritzsche replies that in no case is σου meaningless, but the significance which Tholuck ascribes to it rests upon several misunderstandings:¹) that in οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν θεόν Tholuck concentrates exclusively upon the concept of love; while, on the contrary, the proper emphasis is upon οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν θεόν or τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν (Eph.6:24), i.e. the pious; as, on the other hand, the enemies of God, οἱ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, are the godless (Col.1:21); 2) that he makes τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν dependent on the preposition in the verb (συνεργεῖν) and formulates the construction thus: but we know that all events of life work together at the same time for good to those who love God; while, on the contrary, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν is obviously the "Dativus commodi": but we know that to those who love God (i.e., to the pious worshippers of God) everything in the world amounts to good; 3) that Tholuck in his unclarity did not observe correctly that in the place where he finds: "the living heart is the actual cause of the effect of good, the

1. Fritzsche, C.F.A., Ueber die Verdienste des... D. August Tholuck(s) um die Schriffterklaerung, p.18.

experiences of life only the occasions of opportunity", that the love to God must at least be mentioned, perhaps in this manner: but we know that with the love to God which animates the Christians, all experiences of life work for good.

Even excluding all the manuscripts and sources which make God the subject of this verse (συνεργεῖ ὁ Θεὸς p46 B A sah Origen), it can never be proper to infer from this verse, much less to claim that this verse says, that man's "feeling of love to God" is the primaria causa salutatis, as Fritzsche points out against Tholuck above. This way of handling Scripture certainly spells death to the grammatico-historical method of hermeneutics. Tholuck will not abandon his subjectivist presuppositions, at least in this place, to let the obvious meaning of the passage be heard.

Fritzsche shows us still another place where Tholuck's subjectivism distorts the meaning of a text. He replies to him on Romans 5:5 as follows. Tholuck's explanation: "we perceive the love of God to us through the Holy Spirit, who excites all the inner experiences of the Christian." This may in any case sound very pious, but in the context of the passage it does not fit. For the words: "the love of God to us poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit", certainly show that the Holy Spirit is here considered as the pledge and proof of the love of God to us (cf. - Rom. 8: 15,16; Gal. 4:6), but not

as the exciter of the so-called inner experiences of the Christian and as the mediator of all communications of God.¹

Here it is quite evident that Tholuck subjectivises the Spirit in a way foreign to the passage. But to Tholuck the important thing is the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts, creating lovely experiences which warm our hearts and thrill our souls. And what seems to be less important to him, but nevertheless what the text here says, is that the Holy Spirit is He through whom the love of God is poured into our hearts, and He is the warrant and proof of the love of God to us.

This is not the only place where Tholuck twists a text to make it speak of the Holy Spirit subjectively. Fritzsche points to Tholuck's treatment of Romans 8:26. To those words Tholuck says: "The Apostle thinks here about the condition of the inner life, in which the feeling of rejoicing and fellowship with the Redeemer has lost its vitality, and the man is thrown only upon faith in the objective proclamation. Then there takes place a battle within him, in which the Spirit has no part, as sighs secretly swell up in his breast and sink secretly again." Fritzsche rejoins that he himself does not have the spiritual experiences of the new evangelical but this much he knows without them, that στεναγμοὶ ἀνεκλάλητοι, unspeakable sighs, can only be sighs whose intention may not be exhibited; therefore deep sighs, and that which is here spoken

1. Ibid., p.29f.

of is not an inner condition of the soul of the believer, but of the Holy Spirit: -- but the Spirit of God Himself intercedes for us (for us who do not know what we ourselves in a proper way should pray for) with unspeakable (i.e. deep) sighs, i.e. thereby, that He sighs deeply.¹

This verse says nothing about the condition of the inner life (except the universal condition that we do not know how to pray as we ought). But that idea is so relevant to Tholuck, that he simply reads it into the text. This text concerns the objective action of the Holy Spirit in our behalf (in absence of our subjective ability to pray properly) -- but Tholuck seems to have no ears for that.

Tholuck writes a reply to Fritzsche's "Sendschreiben" in which he tries to defend himself against Fritzsche, citing various interpretations of his own which Fritzsche attacked; and he seeks to substantiate them. Conspicuously absent, among other references, are rebuttals of Fritzsche's refutations of Tholuck's comments on Romans 8:28 and 5:5. There is, however, a word on Romans 8:26. First, says Tholuck, one notes with pain the contemptuous disgust with which Fritzsche speaks of the inner experiences of the Christian and of Paul. Second, there appears the lack of dogmatical knowledge of the doctrine of the effect of the Holy Spirit - "Not the believer sighs," so says Fritzsche, "but the Holy Spirit sighs deeply." Then Tholuck suggests that his reviewer should

1. Ibid., p. 29f.

take to heart what Schleiermacher says in the doctrinal section on the Holy Spirit, Sec. 140-144, about "the union of the divine nature with the human nature in the believers."¹

There is no deep (or otherwise) groaning of the believer in Romans 8:28. Only to the Spirit is this attributed in this passage. (We must say what the passage says.) Furthermore, whatever Schleiermacher may say about the union of the human and divine natures in believers, and this we consider a "pantheistic" doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it can never properly change this text to make it tell us primarily about the inner experience of the believer.

We must assert that the word of Scripture which depends for its interpretation upon our own subjective experience is no Word of God. The content of Scripture, Jesus Christ, speaks for itself and claims our attention. God's revelation in Scripture can and does make itself said and heard. Scripture is revelation itself, because it witnesses this revelation in Jesus Christ. This excludes Tholuck's premise that interpretation depends upon our religious experience -- upon that which we bring with us to the Scriptures, approaching it as we do (for Tholuck) "with a holy seriousness ... that we may prove whether it contains the truth in relation to our own hearts." We bring to a passage all our knowledge, thoughts, and experiences, surely enough. But we should stand ready to see these thoughts shattered

1. Tholuck, Beitraege zur Spracherklaerung des Neuen Testaments, p.102.

and smashed. We take with us all the possibilities we know about, and we should allow for our circle of known possibilities to be widened, broken, or re-moulded. This is consistent hermeneutics. It follows observation all the way, for it is faithful (or tries to be so) in all circumstances to the Object, Jesus Christ, who requires such fidelity from those who seek to interpret the words which witness to Him. The Word grasps us, overmasters us; and we must therefore be prepared to abandon or modify presuppositions we bring along with us, however acquired.

Our system of thought can only be a hypothesis - - exploratory, experimental, provisional. It is no end in itself. We cannot be ultimately loyal to it. We must be controlled by the text, i.e., by the Object of the text. We accuse Tholuck of regarding too highly his Christian Experience. He uses it to test Scripture, to "prove" it. He decries the Rationalists' setting up their own reason as judge of Scripture. But Tholuck does the same thing with his Christian experience. And both courts of appeal are equally subjective, equally false. His may be the more invidious danger of doing lip-service to the Word of God - - but subjecting it in every case to his own circle of possibilities. His is a philosophy actually, a system of thought "implanted in (his) soul" by God, and he does not see it as that which stands in contrast to Scripture, unfitted to Scripture -- but rather posits it as judge of the Scriptures.

This we must emphatically reject. For this denies the freedom of the Word of God. Passed through and subsumed under his religious experience, the Word would have little authority. This means no confrontation of Word against man, no "over-againstness" of the Word, no judgment of the Word against us. ¹

Our attention must be focussed not upon ourselves but upon the Biblical word itself. This is what is so lacking in Tholuck and in all of his subjectivist companions throughout the history of the Church. Failure to do this is to step out of the Biblical framework, and to join the ranks of all of those of whatever opinion who look anywhere else for an object of focus.

-
1. Our accusation seems to clash here with Tholuck's insistence that we approach Scripture humbly, modestly; and that we turn all objects of offence in the Bible upon ourselves, looking for the offence in ourselves, not in Scripture. But Tholuck in this context is speaking against Rationalist aberrations, stemming from speculative philisophy and historical doubt. We have reason to believe that for his own court of verification, viz., religious experience, he posits a higher source and a correspondingly higher authority, which he is loathe to abandon.

Part III, Chapter V. Tholuck's Work in Old Testament.

In the area of the Old Testament, Tholuck made some important contributions. At the time the Rationalists were discrediting so much of Scripture by their speculative critical approach, the Old Testament especially suffered thereby. But Tholuck's emphasis, and that of those of like mind, did much to stem the tide, and to bring a new appreciation to the Old Testament. Tholuck explains in the preface to the English edition of his commentary on the Psalms his own prior doubting of the validity of the Old Testament (he even loathed it).¹ His appointment to succeed De Wette as Old Testament lecturer in Berlin came in that period of his doubting, and threw him into great consternation. Neander was a needed help to him at this time. Tholuck further describes his progress as follows:

"I gradually arrived at the conviction that the criticism and exegesis on the Old Testament, as set forth by the old theologians, did not in any way hold good in every instance. I endeavoured for some time, while the struggle between my religious and my scientific conscience was going on, to justify those views only; but at last I could no longer continue blind to such a contradiction, and the thing to be done was to reconstruct in a new spirit that old theology, as in fact it had already been done with reference to the New Testament. I derived considerable aid in that task from Calvin's Commentary on the Psalms: it disclosed to me a religious depth in this one book of the Old Testament, which opened my eyes for many other glories of the Old Testament Scriptures.

1. Tholuck, Psalms, op. cit., p.ix.

"Progressing in this knowledge, I learned to understand that the Christian revelation is indeed a tree without a root, as long as it is not understood in its intimate connexion with God's revelation of salvation in the Old Testament." 1

a. The Relation of the Two Testaments.

Tholuck submits, on the other hand, in an apologetic vein, that the study of the Old Testament is important, even on the supposition that it is in no way connected with the New, because of the steadfastness and independence, antiquity and humility of the Hebrew people, a numerous, cultivated, and learned folk.² This we believe is the wrong direction, prepared for, but warned against, by Calvin in his enumerating several peripheral attributes of Scripture which have nothing to do with its major purpose. We have earlier noted the same in Tholuck. But such was the practice of the times.

What is noteworthy in Tholuck is his statement that "Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament"; and that the New Testament depends entirely upon the Old.³ The New Testament ethics and doctrines are found in the Old; the prophecies of the Old Testament are fulfilled in the New; and Christ is the centre of all prophecy.⁴ The Old Testament prophecies fulfilled in the New are, for Tholuck, the ideas

1. Ibid., p.x.
2. Tholuck, "OT Study", op. cit., pp.192-207.
3. Tholuck, "OT Study", op. cit., p.207ff.
4. Ibid., p. 225.

of the kingdom of God, the Day of Judgment, and the spiritual kingdom of Israel, all unfolded gradually among the people of God.¹ Implanted in the soul are certain "seeds of eternity", e.g., God, liberty, immortality; in which the Hebrews and also the heathen believed. But the Jews had a sure hope for a Messiah -- a king, royal priest, everlasting Father, messenger of the covenant, teacher from God. Later there evolved other concepts: the Logos, Wisdom and Word of God, the anticipation of the Messiah's kingdom with its peace, prosperity, holiness, and righteousness; and salvation for the heathen too. The history and ritual of Israel are typical and symbolical. But everything in the East is symbolical, says Tholuck -- but only in the Jewish system are things typical. "In their ... symbols are unconscious but definite allusions to the future", and they "prefigure the future."² To guard against errors of the past, Tholuck stresses the "unconscious" nature of the allusions to the future, "for we nowhere find reason to believe, that Moses or his people had very definite and circumstantial conceptions of the coming Messiah."³ Tholuck applies to the types what Lehmus says of the prophecies: "The entire religious system of the Jews is, in the most appropriate sense, a prophecy."⁴ But Tholuck notes that that system is a "σκιά, or shadow," the "obscure and imperfect

1. Ibid., p.240.

2. Ibid., p.257.

3. Ibid., p.258.

4. Ibid., p.259.

resemblance which falls so far short of the glorious splendour of the reality, that it can excite but very faint ideas of it."¹ Tholuck quotes Luecke on the symbol of the serpent in the wilderness, to the effect that Jesus regards the Old Testament account as "an indefinite symbol of the atonement -- as a *σύμβολον σωτηρίας* ." It embraces the two most important points of the atonement: "a life-giving faith" and "the expiatory virtue of death" -- but relying upon a sensible object, an earthly life, and figuratively; as opposed to the New Testament's "pure spiritual" atonement, heavenly life, and "in deed and in truth."² Then Tholuck comes to the summary:

"Thus we see that the writings of the Old Testament are rendered venerable by their antiquity, their perfect keeping, their doctrines, and their historical documents; that the Jewish nation stands pre-eminent, on the score of antiquity, steadfastness, and wise legislation; and also that, in respect of morals, doctrines, and history, the New Testament rests upon the Old." ³

What has become of the strongly stated motif in the table of contents: "Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament"? It has disappeared. And that by virtue of Tholuck's stress on the shadowy-ness, imperfection, indefiniteness, unconsciousness, and "sensateness" of the Old Testament witness "which falls so far short of the glorious splendour of the reality, that it can excite but very faint ideas

1. Ibid., p.259f.
2. Ibid., p.259f.
3. Ibid., p.261.

of it." Thus "Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament" falls out of the picture. It was never really in the picture for Tholuck -- only in his table of contents, but nowhere in the text, and certainly not in the summary. And what do we have instead of this in text and summary? How great Israel was as a nation, how fine the literature in the Old Testament. And we are really very disappointed, for the table of contents had promised so much. For Tholuck "the old theologians were very extravagant on this point," so it is his purpose to formulate "such a settled and liberal view of the types of the Old Testament, as shall not be shaken¹ by those who are to come after us."

If Jesus Christ is sum and substance of the Old Testament, then we feel that Tholuck should say so explicitly in the body of his treatise. If he cannot, then let him exclude it from his table of contents -- if he really does not wish to say that. That Jesus Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament is the true importance of the Old Testament and its only claim to interest -- by no means does its importance hinge upon its antiquity, doctrines, historical documents; or upon ~~its~~ Israel's antiquity, steadfastness, or wise legislation. It may indeed have been that many theologians were extravagant and found Jesus Christ in every verse of Old Testament Scripture, still we agree with Witsius -- he who sees Christ every-

1. Ibid., p.257.

where in Scripture is less blameworthy than he who sees Him nowhere. That Jesus Christ is sum and substance of the Old Testament is a statement of faith and must be proclaimed. What Tholuck failed to see is that the Old Testament witnessed Christ in expectation -- albeit unclearly and imperfectly (which itself is part of the greatness of the witness, and the obedience of the Biblical writers to their object, Jesus Christ). They witnessed revelation in expectation. It is far from the case that "semina eternitatis" were implanted in the soul and grew into "ideas" among the Jews about Jesus Christ (as Tholuck believed).¹ These men were witnesses of and respondents to God's mighty acts -- they were not introspectionists. So it is not enough to present a "settled" view of the types of the Old Testament, avoid extravagances, and mention but fail to discuss the fact that Jesus Christ is sum and substance of the Old Testament.

But we must here qualify our remarks by stating that Tholuck did affirm that the Jews most certainly expected the Messiah to come -- David, Jacob, ²Isiah, et al, did await a Redeemer; The Messiah is foretold in Genesis 3 and 44, Psalms 2 and 110, Malachi, Wisdom literature, etc. We further add that Tholuck has more to say elsewhere in this regard, as we shall soon see.

1. Ibid., p.242.

Tholuck seems more at pains to distinguish between the Messiah of the Old Testament and the New Testament Christ, than he is to assert their identity. In his chapter on "Die Messianische Weissagung" in Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, he declares that the Messiah of the prophets is not the Jesus Christ of the New Testament or the Church, and yet He is that for him who recognises in the truths and institutions of the Old Testament religion the "preformation¹ of the higher stage of development" of Christendom. Here we find ourselves in the midst of a "Heilsgeschichte", but one asserted in a rather tentative way. We shall deal with "Heilsgeschichte" in the next section, but here it suffices to note that for Tholuck the Messiah is not Christ in one-to-one ratio actually, but He is that ^{in the} heart of him who believes in "Heilsgeschichte" -- a very subjective judgment indeed. But we must remember that, for Tholuck, subjective judgments are all important, in as much as they rest upon "seeds of eternity" implanted by God in the mind. All Old Testament forms (kingdom, priesthood, prophecy, etc.) are "shadows" of the New Testament substance (Col. 2:17), and are hidden in the depths of temporal history. There is a distinction between "temporal form" and "eternal reality" unknown to the prophets. The Messianic time appears to the prophets as the end of God's "Reichsgeschichte", and the New Testament distinction between the two Parousias is not noted in Old Testament prophecy.

1. Tholuck, Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, p. 149.

And so the chapter continues, in a very cautious way, to make it quite clear that there are indeed numerous dissimilarities between the accounts of the Messiah and the Christ. This perhaps deserves to be said as a corrective to "extravagant theologians" who ignore the "shadowy" element of the witness to Christ in the Old Testament. But it does not deserve to be stated as the primary thing in a discussion on "Die Messianische Weissagung". What does deserve to come out in full force is that these prophets were in fact witnessing in expectation to Jesus Christ, the Messiah. It is to miss the point ~~to~~ ^{to} even hint that the differences between the witness of expectation and recollection indicate that the Messiah is not Jesus Christ in fact, but only in the hearts of believers. It does not seem to have occurred to Tholuck that the object upon which both witnesses of expectation and recollection focussed was one and the same, and that the accounts differ because they are human words of human men writing in different times -- before and after the Christ-event. And because the accounts differ due to the differences of time, it is quite wrong to say that two objects are being witnessed to -- that the Old Testament Messiah is not in fact the New Testament Christ. Nor should we be impatient with the Old Testament men for not having seen more. They saw what was shown to them and no more. Their obedience was to record that, and nothing more. But what they did see, what was shown to them, what they did witness to and

report on -- is Jesus Christ, the Messiah. That is what we must say under "Die Messianische Weissagung", and that is the importance of the Old Testament; and the New Testament rests upon the Old, not in terms of "ethics" and "ideas" and "doctrines" (like God and immortality), but only in terms of Jesus Christ.

In Tholuck's essay on "The Sacrifice and Priesthood of the Old Testament, and on Christ, as the Sacrifice and Priest in the New Testament," he connects those two parts in the last chapter, and declares that Christ is the completion of -- man's dependence on God (Christ is the burnt offering of the Old Testament), of what is defective in his thanksgiving and supplication (peace offering), and the substitution for penal suffering (sin offering).¹ Next comes the point which Hebrews makes: Jesus Christ is witnessed in the Old Testament in as much as He is the completion of that which is imperfect (Christ is superior to Aaron, etc.). The essay continues along the same path. The priestly institutions were only "the shadows of the good things to come" (Heb. 10:1, etc.). They were inefficacious, and only kept alive the feeling of guilt (Heb. 10:2,3).

"In contrast to these, the all efficacious sacrifice of Christ was presented, which evinced its spirituality, by combining in one person the offering and the priest." 2

1. Tholuck, "Sacrifice and Priesthood", Hebrews II, p. 291
2. Ibid., p.293f.

This is all very true. But we never get the other side of the picture. In Tholuck's emphasis on the inferiority of the Old Testament institutions, we are never permitted to see how great and important they were in their typical witness to Jesus Christ.

Be that as it may, we are encouraged that for Tholuck an important problem was the relation of Christ to the Old Testament, a problem to which he often returned. He says (1856):

"The great task of the present age ... is to understand the relation in which Christ stands to the form of religion embodied in the Old Testament: avoiding two opposite errors; that, namely, of degrading Christianity to a merely internal phenomenon of Judaism; and that of representing Judaism as Christianity under a veil, and thus affecting as near an approximation of the two as possible. I am bound to confess that the further my studies have extended, the more clearly have I seen that the religion of the Old Testament and the Gospel constitute one revelation, and the higher has been my consequent estimate of the Jewish economy."¹

We submit that his statement of 1821 (his twenty-second year) that "Christ is the sum and substance of the Old Testament," was the right direction. But it was a statement he never seriously urged, a direction he never ultimately followed. But we shall not obscure his contribution to Old Testament studies. It is significant that at the time so many theologians rejected the Old Testament

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, op. cit., p.v.

as useless, Tholuck proclaimed it to be the root of New Testament faith. He saw in its prophecy and liturgy references to and types of Christ. We have elaborated what we feel are his weaknesses, in order to show precisely where we are at variance with him. But now we must delve further into his use of typology, in anticipation of finding many solid insights which we may hold up as definite and worthwhile contributions to Old Testament interpretation. For one thing, to Tholuck, typology is indispensable to the understanding of the Old Testament.

Tholuck concludes his history of the methods of Old Testament interpretation by suggesting that,

"...it is acknowledged, that that use (the typological) of Old Testament expressions is by no means 'without a foundation,' but that a true parallelism of the Old Testament and New Testament ideas, a real indication of New Testament facts in the Old, lies at its basis." 1

There is a certain view-point which must accompany any typological interpretation, according to Tholuck. He cites a quotation from Bilroth on 1 Corinthians 1:19 to this effect. According to his custom, the Apostle Paul supports his assertions by passages from the Old Testament, which in a strictly historical sense do not always suit, as if the writers meant what Paul means in the connection in which he introduces them, but which according to the words have a resemblance. Bilroth,

1. Tholuck, "On the Use of the Old Testament in the New," Hebrews, II, p.186f.

in order not to involve Paul (as well as the other writers of the New Testament and Christ Himself) in a charge of ignorance or insincerity, maintains that the Old Testament as a whole is a type of the New; so that, e.g., the predictions of the prophets are not to be applied to the Messiah, as if the writers had consciously referred to the historical Christ, who was born under the reign of Emperor Augustus (that this is not the case, he says, any child can see), but so that in these words they utter, the same Spirit of God expresses itself, which penetrates the whole history organically, and which has also appeared in Christianity.¹

The "organic" view of the Old and New Testament relationship is very important to Tholuck. He adds:

"If, indeed, the Apostles knew how to extract from the Old Testament an anticipation of the New so entirely pertinent, and such anticipations, types, and points of connection could be found nowhere but in the Old Testament writings, one and the same divine Spirit must have superintended on both sides, -- there to ordain the points of connection, and here to impart the capability of receiving and laying hold of them. What is it that gives to analogies taken from the spheres of nature, to illustrate spiritual relations, that power of conviction over the mind? Is it the simple parallelism? or is it the inseparable conviction of the unity of the Spirit that rules in both departments?"²

Now Tholuck presents the Old Testament citations in the New, in three classes: "direct prophecies," "typical prophecies," and "supports and adaptations." Under direct

1. Ibid., p.187.
2. Ibid., p.188.

prophecies, Tholuck understands Psalms 11 and 102 as Messianic prophecies (i.e., not "literal predictions of history," but "the future itself springing out of the past."). Why these? Because for Tholuck they express the Jewish hope, the earnest desire, "a great distinguishing characteristic of Israel." Also Psalms 110 and 2, 2 Samuel 7:14, Jeremiah 31:31-34, Haggai 2:6, fall clearly in this category, says Tholuck. But here we must note an interesting statement on the substance of the Messianic prophecies.

"According to 1 Peter i.11. the Spirit of Christ was present in the prophets, and thereby they prophesied what hereafter would be realised in Christ. The substance of the Messianic prophecies is the Psyche of the New Testament, hidden under the chrysalis envelopment of the Old Testament." 1

"But as the latter is still a Psyche, even while concealed under its thick covering, so also the prophecies wear an envelope, which they can be divested of only by him who perceives their historical fulfilment." 2

Tholuck declares that all who have the "organic view of history" will acknowledge types and typical prophecies. The ground of types is, again, that ^{the} "Psyche of the New Covenant lives in the chrysalis of the Old Testament, and it will now and then give signs of its vitality." 3

"The New Testament teaches us to consider the Old Testament as a *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν* and thus constitutes the justification of typical

-
1. Ibid., p. 189f.
 2. Ibid., p. 190.
 3. Ibid., p. 193.

things as well as typical words. Not only in outward appearance is the man preformed in the child, but also the expressions of the child are, in manifold ways, prophecies of what the man will become. ...If Old Testament circumstances and events are outward prefigurations of what must be fulfilled in a spiritual sense, the men placed in those relations would use expressions, which, in a higher sense, would be fulfilled in the representation of the New Covenant. The typical character of the men of the Old Covenant is shown most clearly by the fact, that the Messiah bears the title of the other David. Jer. xxx. 9. Ezek. xxxiv.24,25. Hosea iii. 5. From this point of view, then, no one can hesitate to allow a typical character to many expressions of the Old Testament." 1

This is then generalised to cover the whole of the Old Testament:

"Israel in all its institutions and its history, was a prophecy of the future; and where individuals prophesied, there the prophesying Spirit, which lived in the very substance of the people, concentrated itself; as in a writer of genius, his individual great thoughts appear like lilies on the surface of the water, groundless and rootless, and yet are sustained by one common soil, so also the individual prophets of God's people are not to be regarded as scattered manifestations of the Divine Spirit, but rooted in one common soil, in the prophetic subsistence of the nation itself and its institutions." 2

Next, Tholuck proceeds to show that Christ and His apostles acknowledged and used typical prophecies. Declaring that the Old Testament witnessed Him, Jesus Himself referred principally to its typical aspect. Elijah, e.g., is for Jesus a type of John the Baptist; and Jesus uses the Psalms typically in describing His death. ³ He proved to his disciples

1. Ibid., p. 193f.

2. Ibid., p. 194.

3. Ibid., p. 196. Cf. Mt. 11:14, Mk. 9:13, Mal. 4:5, Lk.1:17, Jno. 13:18, 15:25, Ps. 41, 49, Lk. 22:37.

the necessity of His sufferings and His glory from Moses and all the prophets. ¹ Tholuck cites many more examples; then he adds:

"And certainly all typical references of this kind are taken in their full significance only when the Old Testament saints, as well as those of the New, are considered as members of one and the same mystical Christ who is described in history." ²

The class of adaptation and support differs from that of typical prophecy in that in the former, "the notion of a ὑπό-
νοια intended by God is altogether abandoned, and the parallel is rather taken by the author than given by God." A support is where a "citation is only a substratum of the author's own thoughts, where it is woven into the discourse without any former quotation, or after it has been introduced with a form of quotation, serves as a warp (stamen) for the woof (subtegmen) of the author's own thoughts." Adaptation is the "citation of a parallel with a direct form of quotation." ³

In summary of Tholuck's typology, we cite his quotation from De Wette:

"'Long before Christ, the world in which he was to appear was prepared: the whole of the Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and who did come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw, in spirit, long before-hand the coming of Christ, and had

-
1. Ibid., p. 196. Cf. Lk. 24:27, 44, 45, Acts 13:19, 17:3, 1 Cor. 15:4, 1 Pet. 1:11.
 2. Ibid., p. 198.
 3. Ibid., p. 208.

presages of the new doctrine in prophetic anticipations, varying in clearness. The typological comparison of the Old Testament with the New, was no unmeaning amusement. And it is scarcely a mere accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important points, runs parallel with the Mosaic." 1

"Accordingly, typology errs in proportion as it attaches itself only to individual points in the Old Testament, which do not stand in any organic, but only in an outward, relation to New Testament facts." 2

Thus, for Tholuck, typology is a legitimate and, indeed, necessary hermeneutical principle, because the Old and New Testaments are "organically" related. Their unity is in terms of a common "Spirit" or "Psyche" dwelling in both of them -- the Spirit of Christ (1 Peter 1:11), in fact. In the words of the Old Testament men "the same Spirit of God expresses itself, which penetrates the whole history organically, and which has also appeared in Christianity." Another way of saying this is that the Old and New Testament men are "members of the one mystical Christ in history."

Israel is one people through^{out} all the ages. God's deeds are once-for-all, but they are always made present in the "Vergegenwaertigung" of Israel's recounting them. His salvific acts are immediate, but in mediate form, in the faithful remembrance of them on the part of His people. And we in this age can and must do this too -- because the Church is Israel also. The dramatic events of God's dealings with Israel spring

1. Ibid., p. 222.
2. Ibid., p. 222.

right into our midst, and we are there too -- spectators of all He does -- because the event is, in the remembrance of it, freshly and vividly present to us here and now. Why? Because there is continuity of the people of God in all generations. In Tholuck's terminology, the writers of the Bible are "members of the one mystical Christ in history." But we are members too. And that implies that events which happened among them are our events too. In light of the "one mystical Christ in history," we can and must interpret them as meaningful to us, because they are "vergegenwaertig" to us. Tholuck, and the bulk of Protestant theology, is quite right to insist that the Bible is interpreted only by men of faith, in the Church, in the one body of Christ. But we must be careful not to follow Tholuck and much of Protestant theology when he internalises and subjectivises these realities and claims primacy for that orientation. This faith, this one body of Christ, these salvific events, are objective deeds of God. This is what we must stress, not our feelings about them. Thus, unity of Scriptures and authority of Scriptures are because of Jesus Christ, the object of Scripture, to whom the writers witness, and in whom they are one, and we together with them.

Though we disagree with Tholuck on his formulation of the unity of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, yet we must acknowledge his seeing and stating that there is such a unity.

From this position he was quite right to assert the validity of the typological method. And it is this affirmation of typology that we consider a valuable contribution of the Old Testament work of Tholuck.

b. "Heilsgeschichte"

"Heilsgeschichte" as we know it consists of several elements: Gods dynamic working out of His salvation-deeds, confronting His people in the depths of their existence along the road of history. There is a "Nacheinander" of "Heilsg~~s~~tatsachen", proceeding according to a fore-ordained plan of God, extending from Creation to Parousia.¹ In this salvation-history, the Christ-event stands at the centre, illuminating **and** determining the whole movement, constituting the solidarity of the people of God in all times, and calling forth man's response in obedience.²

We have noted that Hofmann is said to be the champion of "Heilsgeschichte" in his time. We found in him some of these major elements. Christianity is not doctrines, but "Tatsachen"; Christ is the centre of all history, etc.

Tholuck may be said to be contributor to or follower of ^{motif of} Hofmann's/"Heilsgeschichte", but for Tholuck, that motif was no major emphasis in his theology. Though not nearly as strongly asserted as in Hofmann, still several of the

-
1. Ott, H., "Heilsgeschichte", Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3. Aufl., III, p.187f.
 2. Ibid., p.187f. Cf. also Loewith, The Meaning of History, Cullmann, Christ and Time.

elements of "Heilsgeschichte" were there: a "Heilsplan", movement, the historicity of the "Heilstatsachen", and God as the Lord of "Weltgeschichte".

Tholuck's second point in his "Hints on the Importance of Old Testament Study" is "The profound wisdom displayed in the providential leadings, and in the religious institutions of the Hebrews." Here we would expect from an adherent of "Heilsgeschichte" a full display of the "Tatsachen" of God, a dramatic presentation of God's "mighty acts". Instead, we find:

"'History,' says Leibnitz, 'instructs us in the true philosophy.' The observation of Clarke also is well founded: 'In religion men are apt to be more easily wrought upon, and more strongly affected, by good testimony than by the strictest arguments.' Mankind, therefore, who are so much under the dominion of sense, cannot receive the truth by means of a system of abstract demonstrations, but only by means of facts; as he alone can rightly be said to believe the doctrines and wonders of Christianity, who has himself experienced and witnessed their power. The language of Providence is the most familiar language of God, addressed to the heart of any individual. Doctrinal and ethical knowledge was communicated, therefore, to the Israelites, by means of the leadings of Providence." 1

Where we had expected Tholuck to launch out with the "facts" of God's activity with His people, in clear opposition to "arguments" and "abstract demonstrations," his "facts" consist of "doctrinal and ethical knowledge." So the tenor of Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte" is at the outset centered in -- not facts really -- but "abstract demonstrations" actually, in terms of "doctrinal and ethical knowledge." Then Tholuck tells us that the Jews were chosen to be God's

1. Tholuck, "OT Study", op. cit., p. 208.

people because of their relative capability, how they excelled in the humble and genuine knowledge of God, how belief in God led to piety and compassion. ¹ "Visible divine interpositions" are alluded to, but never seriously developed. The Law, liturgy, and the prophets are items for consideration, but nowhere in a true "heilsgeschichtlich" sense.

There is movement in Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte", a real development and progress in the understanding of revelation. The Old testament is indeed the "Pre-formation of the higher stage of development". But what is the nature of this development, progress, and movement? In the Old Testament we find the New Testament ethics -- humility, faith, love; then the process moves on, and after the captivity come other developments: immortality, resurrection, universal judgement, ² demons (all are ideas). And there is more movement yet:

"There are implanted in the human soul certain "semina eternitatis" -- seeds of eternity ... As examples of such "seeds of eternity," we may mention the notions of God, of Liberty, and of Immortality ... the notion of a primeval happy condition of man, of an intimate connexion between the spiritual and material world, of a revelation from God, of a Saviour of the world, and of a blissful eternity... Among the Jews, however, this seed grew gradually till it became a tree, 'so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.'" ³

-
1. Ibid., p. 210ff.
 2. Ibid., p. 225-228, 235.
 3. Ibid., pp. 240-242.

The development continues, and after some hundreds of years were evolved the notions of the Logos, Wisdom and Word of God; and the anticipation of the Messiah's kingdom with its peace, prosperity, holiness, righteousness, and salvation.¹ Yes, there is progress and movement -- but of "ideas," "notions" -- "abstract demonstrations." The "seeds of eternity" implanted by God in the mind grow and blossom into a tree. Where are the "mighty acts of God"?, the Tatsachen with which God mightily confronts His people along the road of history?

Tholuck is interested in history -- but primarily in the sense of the historicity of the Biblical accounts. He takes pains to show that what Moses writes in the Pentateuch really happened -- Creation, Fall, etc. -- "Nor can anyone mistake the truly historical colouring which shows itself in the history of the patriarchs."² The account of the expedition of the five kings against Sodom could not have been invented in a later age, because everything about it indicates the pen of a contemporary. "What an aire of genuine antiqueness prevades the whole! How truly historical! Would not all this in the annals of every other people be received as history?" So with the accounts of the patriarchs, "that 'rust of antiquity,' that childlike simplicity of manners" "is a witness for their authenticity" and genuineness.³ But

1. Ibid., pp. 249-251.

2. Ibid., p. 197f.

3. Ibid., p. 200f.

that kind of effort to prove the historicity of the Biblical accounts is so remote from what we understand today as "Heilsgeschichte" that it hardly deserves consideration under the same term. Yet, in origin, "Heilsgeschichte" did have this element. The difference is that the early proponents of "Heilsgeschichte" had no knowledge of Scripture as the objective, human witness to the objective Jesus Christ -- and in that sense "unhistorical", i.e., uninteresting to fact-finding historians of modern historical methods, and thus a "skandalon"; but rather they viewed the Biblical accounts as provable history, appropriated subjectively through a highly internalised "Holy Spirit" who (in Tholuck's case) has planted "semina eternitatis" in the soul of man; and thus the Bible is "felt to be" the Word of God.

The relationship of Jesus Christ to Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte" is indicated in the only place, to our knowledge, where the word "Heilsgeschichte" is used by Tholuck:

"The mediation of the prophetic position is that through the instructing word, the priestly through the reconciling deed, the kingly through the perfecting Lordship. The latter, for which the first two prepare the way, is the goal -- the Lordship of the Father through the Son in the perfected humanity the last result of "Heilsgeschichte". Among all the names of the Messiah, the kingly one is therefore the predominant one." 1

1. Tholuck, Propheten, op. cit., p. 177.

Christ has by no means the central place in Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte", as we observed in the statement above. Nor is the Christ-event concentrated upon in any definite way in the elaboration of that perfected Lordship of the Father through the Son. The parallels of Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte" with that of the present time are superficial at best. His "Heilsplan" is the evolution of the germinating "seeds of eternity" which grow into full-blown New Testament ideas and notions. "Heilstatsachen", the very stuff of modern-day "Heilsgeschichte", have no importance here. His movement is the progress of "ideas" and "notions". The mighty acts of God are only ways to understand these ideas. Tholuck stresses history -- not God in history confronting His people -- but the factual occurrence of what the Bible says happened. He has Christ as the Son through whom the Father obtains Lordship, but no Christ-event as the centre of "Heilsgeschichte".

There is much in present-day "Heilsgeschichte" theology which we shall have to reject. It often sets itself up as the only interpretation of the Old Testament and of the his-¹ tory. It is a rationalistic construct, as held by some, and therefore unbiblical -- continuity is no Biblical concept.² "Heilsgeschichte" conflicts at times with the essential non-

1. McIntyre, J., Christian Doctrine of History, pp. 8, 108, 113.
2. Ibid., pp. 8, 108.

history, "Jenseitigkeit," of Biblical events.¹ It often endeavors to "get behind" the words of Scripture -- Christ meets us in Scripture; Geschriebensein is valid, and this conflicts with "Heilsgeschichte".² But, on the other hand, "Heilsgeschichte" proponents in this day have asserted the strong objectivity of the Scriptures in witness to the "Tatsachen" of God centred in Jesus Christ. Earlier "Heilsgeschichte" theology, in Hofmann particularly, hangs together with "experience theology", and apologetics³ -- these we have found in Tholuck's version, and it is precisely here that we reject him.

c. "Gattungen" in the Psalms

Another point on Tholuck's work in the Old Testament field is his following his predecessor in Berlin, De Wette, in his categorising the Psalms into various "Gattungen". For this point we are indebted to Professor H-J. Kraus of Hamburg. Professor Kraus commends Tholuck because he asked "about the actual content of the Bible", and led his students to approach the Holy Scriptures "with the feeling of reverence."⁴

-
1. Steck, K.G., "Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte," Theologische Studien, p.35.
 2. Steck, op. cit., p.58.
 3. Ibid., p. 35.
 4. Kraus, H-J., Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments, p. 197.

He notes Tholuck's position on "Heilsgeschichte" as the link between the Old and New Testaments as follows:

"As Johann Tobian Beck, so also Tholuck, taught the unity and continuity of the Biblical expressions, certainly without ever having developed a closed system of "Heilsgeschichte". The factual connection between the Old and New Testament was to him more meaningful than any other thing." 1

Then follows a well documented account of Tholuck's use of De Wette's "Gattungen". Kraus points out that Tholuck, in striving to comprehend the "divine content" of the hymns and prayers in the book of Psalms, gave for each Psalm in his commentary an introduction differentiating it according to its historical setting, "as it were in secret and without programmatical announcement." Kraus believes that this indicates that Tholuck has taken over De Wette's designation of "Gattungen" and has worked it up in a unique manner. Thus Psalm 1 is designated a "teaching psalm". "Prayer-psalms" are Psalms 3, 20, etc. "Psalms of trust" one finds in Psalms 4, 11, etc. "Psalms of Complaint" are in Psalms 5, 6, 7, 12, etc. "Psalms of praise" are Psalms 8, 16, 19, etc. "Psalms of Thanksgiving" are Psalms 9, 21, etc. Psalms 15 and 24² Tholuck takes to be "Feast-songs". Kraus admits that to these designations not too much importance was attached by Tholuck, compared to the treatment given them by De Wette and Gunkel. Certainly, these notes are only in small print --

1. Ibid., p. 197.
2. Ibid., p. 197.

they should supply a presupposition to the understanding of the 'characteristic', but they are nevertheless not to be undervalued.¹ These categories are used by Tholuck because he is interested in the historical context, the concrete "Sitz-im-Leben" in which the various Psalms were written; for these situations have a definite determination of the "actual content" of any Psalm.

Kraus calls attention to Tholuck's statements about the "situation", which follow the short explanation of the "Gattungen". So, e.g., it says for Psalm 29: "In order to correctly sympathize with the singer's feelings, one must think of an eastern storm, viz., of mountainous Palestine, which spreads terror over man and beast, destruction over city and field. It comes with a horrible sound in the mountains lying about and frequently with the downpour of a cloud-burst."²

Another example is the introduction to Psalm 35, explained in all brevity as follows: "The situation of the poet is, as we know it by David, cunning persecution (v.7,8), false excuses (v.11), one sided conciliation, freedom from vindictiveness (v. 12, 13)."³

Then Kraus concludes the paragraph by pointing again to Tholuck's intention of hearing the actual content of Scripture. He says that after that manner of relevant introduction and reflection, the actual explanation of the text

1. Ibid., p. 197.
2. Ibid., p. 197f.
3. Ibid., p. 198.

follows. It seeks only to hear and understand the Holy Word. And we recognize now clearly how the Biblical-theological reactions to the critical-analytical power of disposal over the word of the Bible led away to a reverent meeting with the Holy Word of God, seen in its humanity -- to a meeting in which the scientific task takes a subordinate place over against the hearing of the actual divine content.¹

Thus we see that Tholuck's interest in "Gattungen" came not from a consuming desire to analyse and classify for the sake of scientific exegesis. On the contrary, it arose from his desire to really hear the Scripture, approaching it in reverence and awe. And to this end, he felt that he must understand the real content of a passage from the historical situation in which it was written.

This is Kraus' contention, and it is essentially correct. But the use of the words "the hearing" and "a reverent meeting with the holy Word of God" sounds more like Barth than Tholuck. For Barth, the "feeling of reverence" is the awe with which we stand before the Word of God because of the sheer power of that Word, which shatters all our presuppositions, philosophies, and systems of thought. For Tholuck, it is a feeling (Gefuehl), and as we have noted, his tendency is to attach more importance to the feeling than to that objective thing which causes it. Hearing the words of Scripture is Barth's emphasis. Feeling

1. Ibid., p. 198.

them warm the heart is Tholuck's. And these are not the same thing.

In conclusion to this chapter, it appears that Tholuck made many good contributions to the hermeneutics of the Old Testament. He saw that the Old and New Testaments were organically united in terms of a common Spirit which interpenetrated both. This was excellent insight, especially in his day. Though the connection between Old and New Testament was for Tholuck most often in terms of the Spirit (or "Psyche"), he did not ignore the place of Christ as Messiah of the Old and Redeemer of the New. Yet he did not lay great stress upon this identification because of earlier extravagance on this point. Instead, he thought in terms of ideas, seeds of eternity, etc., as the unity of the two Testaments. Furthermore, he thought of the writers of the Old and New Testament as "members of the one mystical Christ in history". In all of this, however, Tholuck's tendency to subjectivise, which we have noticed before, comes forth from time to time. Nevertheless, he is quite firm on the unity of the Testaments and presents a sound view on typology.

Tholuck's "Heilsgeschichte" is more in terms of abstract ideas in progress than in terms of concrete events in history. Tholuck's interest in concrete history, however, takes the form of an insistence upon the historicity of Biblical accounts and events. Christ and the Incarnation seem to have no central place in Tholuck's scheme. This is, of course, a very weak "Heilsgeschichte".

In the Commentary on Psalms Tholuck makes a good contribution by a somewhat informal classification of Psalms. His idea, according to Kraus, is not to set up a system of classification but to find "the actual content" of the Bible by delving into the historical context of each Psalm. This is true and Tholuck does this quite skilfully. Even though Tholuck's inclination to subjectivity enters the picture here, still he is quite right to seek for the actual and divine content of the Scriptures by a close examination of the concrete situation in which the writer finds himself. And, as we have said, the ability to do this is one of Tholuck's strongest points as an interpreter of the Bible.

Part IV, Chapter VI - Tholuck's Exegesis

Professor Piper has rightly remarked that it is easier to draw up hermeneutical rules than to follow them in the actual practice of exegesis.¹ It is now our task to look at Tholuck's exegesis itself, in order to see how his practice corresponds with his principles.

A. The Text.

1. The Printed Text

Tholuck indicated dissatisfaction with the editions of the Greek New Testament of his time.² The received text was the Elzeverian of 1624, which Griesbach altered in cases of importance only.³ Lachmann, Tholuck notes, resolved to construct a text from the oldest manuscripts, but his work did not result in a usable one,^{for} he employed two few codices (which themselves contained errors which Lachmann copied), and ~~because he~~ failed to divide the text into verses. Tholuck recommends for manual use the texts of Knapp and Hahn. Titmann's (1828), he felt was the most convenient, but it was disfigured by errors of the

-
1. Piper, O., "Modern Problems of New Testament Exegesis", The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, 36/1, August, 1942, p. 14.
 2. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology", Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 1844, p. 353, "We have, as yet, no critical edition of the Greek Testament, which meets the demands of the scientific theologian."
 3. Ibid., p. 353f. Cf. for what follows, p. 354.

press. He thought that the best critical apparatus was in Griesbach's large edition of the Greek New Testament, and in his Symbolae Criticae.¹

In 13 places where Tholuck differs from Nestle in Romans and Hebrews, Tholuck follows Knapp (1840) everywhere, except in one very minor instance.² This indicates that, though Tholuck is dissatisfied with the received text, and with the limitations of Griesbach's text, he prefers to use texts (Knapp, Hahn, Titman) which follow Griesbach, than to use Lachmann.

In a way, Tholuck cannot be blamed for rejecting Lachmann's method. Lachmann's first edition appeared in 1831, without any statement respecting the authorities used or the principles followed, except for a brief note indicating that he had aimed at reproducing the most ancient eastern texts, and where there was doubt, he used the readings supported by the Italian and African Churches, and that he had ignored the "Textus Receptus".³ For further information the reader was referred to Lachmann's article in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1830. "The

-
1. We must remember that when Tholuck wrote his commentaries, he did not have the benefit of the continuous text of B, first published in a reasonable edition by Tischendorf in 1867; ², 1862; or C, 1843 (though there were some good collations of B and C in the eighteenth century). Knapp and Titmann "more or less faithfully followed Griesbach", and Hahn was an editor of Titmann. (Eberhard Nestle, Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, 1901, p. 18.)
 2. The 13 cases are listed on p.157. The exception lies in Romans 1:16, where Knapp has [τοῦ Χριστοῦ] and Tholuck τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
 3. Kenyon, F.G., Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1926, p.287.

natural consequence of his reticence was that the work was misunderstood, even by those who most likely would have sympathized with it." ¹ Later, however, when his work came to be more appreciated, he produced another edition (1842-50), with a full statement of his authorities and principles, and in which he used the Vulgate as well as the Greek text.

Tregelles strongly objects to Tholuck's criticism of Lachmann:

"Lachmann's censors (such for instance as Tholuck) who did not apprehend his plan, or had not truly investigated the facts of the case, copied from one another, in representing Lachmann's range of Greek authorities as more confined than it really was, especially in his larger edition." ²

Tregelles quotes Tholuck as follows:

"Since there are so few codices written in uncial characters, and are preserved entire, Lachmann has been obliged sometimes to adopt readings which are authorised only by a single codex. Thus he has given the whole text, from the fourth to the twelfth chapter of 2 Corinthians, according to no other authority than that of the Codex B, and the whole text from Hebrews ix, 14 to the end on the basis of Codex A merely." ³

Then Tregelles replies:

"Such statements have misled students; for it is supposed that they would not have been advanced, except on grounds of competent knowledge. But how do the facts stand? In the passage of 2 Corinthians, the whole, up to chap. x. 8, is contained in C..., and the whole of the chapters, said to rest on B only, are contained in D..andG...: in the latter part of the Hebrews, the hiatus in C is from x. 24 to xii. 15, and in D there is no defect at all". ⁴

-
1. Ibid., p. 287.
 2. Tregelles, S.P., An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, 1854, p. 105. It should be noted that "his larger edition" may not have appeared before Tholuck's statement was made in 1842/43.
 3. Ibid., p. 106.
 4. Ibid., p. 106.

Tregelles is correct in calling Tholuck's hand on failing to understand Lachmann's plan. It may, of course, be replied that Lachmann nowhere made his plan and purpose clear for his text of 1831 prior to Tholuck's statement of 1842/43. Also, most scholars agree with Tholuck that Lachmann uses too few manuscripts.¹ Tregelles is anxious to defend Lachmann against such statements as De Wette's that Lachmann's work was a waste of time and labour.² This is certainly unfair, as was later fully recognized; for most scholars in the field consider Lachmann's text of 1831 to be the beginning of the era of constructive criticism.³ Lachmann was the first to break away from a false reverence of the received text, and the mere adding up of witnesses. He set textual criticism upon a proper course of "weighing" the manuscripts with reference to their antiquity.⁴

Lachmann's delay to clarify his procedure and aims resulted in unjust criticism from Tholuck and others. It was a misfortune that Lachmann had to express, in the second volume

-
1. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 287.
 2. Tregelles, op. cit., p. 99.
 3. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, Nestle, et al.
 4. Also in defense of Lachmann it needs to be said that he sought not the purest or most original text. His aims were more modest. He sought to discover and present the most accurate fourth century readings which could be found. This would serve as an intermediary text from which other critics could explore for earlier readings. Thus Tholuck, as Tregelles suggests (p.104f) is quite wrong to reprove Lachmann for dropping τὴν ἀγάπην from the text in Eph. 1:15. Lachmann omits these words as not being found in A and (apparently) B. "But he gives this reading not as the true passage, ...but as being (he thinks) an early mistake, - a hiatus, in fact, of early copyists." (p. 104f.) But again we cannot blame Tholuck too severely for his misunderstanding since Tregelles himself observes (p.113): "The simple truth is, that Lachmann's text was looked on as kind of wholesale innovation and this was enough to give offence to the whole generation of adherents of what they had traditionally received."

of his larger work, his hope that his work would "be approved by posterity... more than has been the case from this age."¹ It was also unfortunate that the earlier commentaries of Tholuck and others were consequently not informed by Lachmann's work, and that they had to consign themselves to working with inferior texts.

2. The Manuscripts.²

In 13 instances,³ in the 24 passages which we have used in this study, Tholuck differs from Nestle's reading. In these 13, Tholuck uses the Koine 12 times, and rejects it in no cases. He uses the Hesychian twice,⁴ both agreeing with the Koine; and he opposes the Hesychian 8 times, always when at variance⁵ with the Koine.

-
1. Tregelles, op. cit., p. 115.
 2. Our method in this section has been: 1) to select the following 24 passages (127 verses): Romans 1:16,17; 2:5-11; 3:21-26; 4:20-25; 5:6-11; 6:5-11; 7:21-25; 8:31-37; 10:14-17; 11:11-16; 12:3-8; 13:11-14; Hebrews 2:14-18; 3:12-15; 4:11-13; 5:7-10; 7:6:16-20; 23-28; 8:6-13; 9:11-14; 10:19-25; 11:13-16; 12:1,2; 13:10-16. 2) to compare Tholuck's reading of each passage (commentaries on Romans and Hebrews) with the readings in Nestle's text (1952). 3) to note all instances where Tholuck differs from Nestle, 4) to record the MSS. favouring Tholuck's reading, and those opposing it, 5) to conclude from this how Tholuck evaluated particular MSS. and constructed his texts. 6) We have also noted the texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Stephens, and Elzevir on those instances where Tholuck and Nestle differ. (For this latter we have used Tregelles' Collation of the former six with the text "in common use.")
 3. Romans 1:16, τοῦ Χριστοῦ; 2:8, κεν; 3:22, καὶ ἐπὶ...; 5:6, ἔτι γὰρ, omit the second ἔτι; 7:25, εὐχαριστῶ; 8:34, omit Ἰησοῦς; 10:15, καθὼς; 10:17, ῥῆμα θεοῦ, 11:13, ὑμῖν γὰρ 12:5, ὁ δε καθ'; Hebrews 9:11, μελλόντων, 11:13, λαβόντες. Tholuck uses L for the thirteenth instance: Romans 7:23. (The symbols are those used in Nestle's apparatus.)
 4. Romans 5:6, 10:15; the words are in the footnote above.
 5. When against the Koine: Romans 1:16, 3:22, 8:34, 10:17, 11:13, Hebrews 11:13, Romans 5:6, omit second ἔτι; Romans 12:5.

In the 13 instances, Tholuck uses the reading in A 5 times, always with the Koine or L, and rejects it once when used against the Koine.¹ He favours B in one case, when it supports the Koine, and rejects it in 5 cases, when opposed to the Koine.² He uses C once, and rejects it in no place.³ Tholuck uses D 6 times, always with the Koine, and opposes it 4 times, always when used against the Koine.⁴ He favours the reading in G three times, always with the Koine; and rejects it three times, always when against the Koine.⁵ Six times in these cases of variant readings, Tholuck favours the Syriac: 5 times when the Syriac agrees with the Koine, and once when it agrees with ACL; he rejects the Syriac once, when used against the Koine.⁶ The Sahidic is not used by Tholuck, but is rejected twice when opposed to the Koine.⁷ These are the chief variants in the 13 instances. No other authorities of any kind are used or rejected here more than twice (and only Clement twice).

We conclude that Tholuck almost invariably uses the received text, however much he may have been dissatisfied with it.

-
1. Uses A in Ro. 2:8, 7:23, 7:25; 10:17, Heb. 9:11; rejects it in Ro. 5:6 (om. 2nd $\epsilon\tau\iota$).
 2. Uses B in Ro. 8:34; rejects it in Ro. 2:8, 5:6 ($\epsilon\tau\iota \gamma\alpha\rho$), 7:25, 10:15, Heb. 9:14. There was no continuous B text until 1867.
 3. Uses C in Ro. 7:23 with AL pm sy. Tholuck had collations of C (1751/52), but not until 1843 did he have continuous text.
 4. Uses D in Ro. 3:22, 5:6 ($\epsilon\tau\iota \gamma\alpha\rho$), 8:34, 10:15, 11:13, Heb. 11:13; rejects it in Ro. 2:8, 5:6 (2nd $\epsilon\tau\iota$), 10:17, Heb. 9:11.
 5. Uses G in Ro. 3:22, 10:15, 11:13; rejects it in Ro. 2:8, 5:6, (om. 2nd $\epsilon\tau\iota$); 8:34.
 6. Uses Syriac in Ro. 5:6 (om. 2nd $\epsilon\tau\iota$), 7:25, 8:34, 10:17, Heb. 9:11, Ro. 7:23 (ACL); rejects it in Ro. 11:13.
 7. Ro. 5:6 ($\epsilon\tau\iota \gamma\alpha\rho$), 7:25.

It is obvious that he has little regard for what was then known of the Hesychian text, which he uses only when it happens to coincide with the Koine.¹

We may approach this another way by observing that in the 13 instances in question (where Tholuck and Nestle vary), Tholuck follows Griesbach in one case, where Griesbach favours the Koine reading.² Tholuck opposes Griesbach in three places, and in each case Griesbach prefers other than the Koine reading.³ But the distance between Tholuck and Lachmann is far greater than that. Only once do they agree.² But Tholuck differs from Lachmann in as many as ten places.⁴ In each of the ten, Lachmann rejected the Koine.

We shall now inquire into Tholuck's commentaries on The Sermon on the Mount and the Gospel of John. Our method shall differ from that previously used, and we shall examine the 30 most important places in the two commentaries where Tholuck

-
1. If the Koine is Tholuck's favourite text, the Syriac is his next most frequently used authority, though only when in agreement with the Koine. It should be noted that Tholuck does favour A in most cases, but here again, only when A supports the Koine.
 2. This is found in Tregelles' Collation, op. cit., Appendix. The instance referred to is Ro. 5:6, ἐτι γὰρ (S R Dpl Mcion Th...) Lachmann concurs here also, doubtless because the Hesychian text has the same reading.
 3. Ro. 1:16, 3:22, 7:25.
 4. Ro. 1:16, 2:8, 3:22, 7:25, 8:34, 10:17, 11:13, 12:5, Heb. 9:11, 11:13.

deals with problems in textual criticism.¹ At the outset we find that Tholuck has not slavishly followed the Koine in all or almost all instances, as before. He favours the Koine in 15 places, and rejects it in 10. He favours it with Θ 7 times and rejects it with Θ 10 times. He favours \mathcal{RD} 6 times and rejects it 3 times. He favours $\mathcal{RD}\Theta$ 3 times and rejects it two times. He uses the Hesychian text far more often than earlier. He favours \mathcal{S} 5 times and rejects it 9 times. He favours $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}$ once and rejects it 3 times; $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{D}$, 4 and 2; $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{I}$, 0 and 3.

But we shall now look into the reasons which Tholuck gives for his choice of manuscripts in each case, and then we shall have a broader basis for evaluating his work in textual criticism than just the mere symbols. The most interesting places for beginning our inquiry are those where Tholuck rejects the Koine reading. The first such place is Matthew 6:1 in the Sermon on the Mount.

-
1. These places are the following in which Tholuck reads $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$, Matt. 5:11; $\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta$, 5:22; omits $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$, 5:27; reads $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon \dots \epsilon\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omega\gamma$, 5:44; $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, 5:47; $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$, 6:1; omits $\epsilon\nu \tau\omega \phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\omega$, 6:4; $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\chi\eta \dots$, 6:5; $\alpha\phi\iota\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$, 6:12; omits $\rho\omicron\tau\iota \sigma\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \dots$, 6:13; reads $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, 6:34; $\omicron\tau\iota$, 7:14; $\omicron \mu\omicron\nu \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, John 1:18; $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$, 1:41; $\text{'}\text{I}\omega\nu\alpha$, 1:42; $\omicron \omega\nu \tau\omega \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omega$, 3:13; omit η , 5:1; omit 5:3,4; $\iota\delta\omega\nu$, 6:22; $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$, 7:18; $\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\gamma$, 7:39; omits 8: 1-11; omits $\tau\eta\varsigma \alpha\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$, 8:34; rejects $\pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\tau\alpha$, 10:4, reads $\pi\rho\omicron \epsilon\mu\omicron\delta$, 10:8; $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma \epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu \upsilon\mu\iota\nu$, 10:26; $\kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\epsilon\gamma \dots$ 13:24; $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, 15:7; $\pi\alpha\varsigma\alpha\nu \tau\eta\nu \alpha\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$, 16:13.

Here Tholuck prefers $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ (B $\alpha^3 D$ pm latsy) to $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ (R θ al f. k.)¹

"But it is difficult to see how $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ could come to be read, if it had not been the word which stood originally. It is very unlikely that a definite term, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$, would have been supplanted by the more general one, $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$: while on the other hand, it is easy to conceive that the more definite word was introduced to explain the more general term." 2

For that choice Tholuck presents both external and internal reasons.

The next place is Matthew 6:4, in which Tholuck shows that though certain words may be suspicious on external grounds, they may fit into the sense of the passage. He shows that $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (R D al S; Nestle) is omitted by BKL (Nestle: S), and rejected by Lachmann and Tischendorf, but "forms, if genuine, a pointed antithesis to a reward from men." He notes that $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}$ (Nestle: R θ al itsy^s) is omitted in "BDZ, Vulgate, Coptic, min. and patres" here and also at verse 6, and by still a greater number at verse 18. Bengel regards it ^{as} doubtful in all three places, Lachmann and Tischendorf omit it. Then says Tholuck, "We might wish to retain it for the sake of rhetorical emphasis, as standing

-
1. The symbols here, as above, are from Nestle's text, 1952. Tholuck formulates the attestation as follows: for $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ Cod. Z. Dubl. rescr.; Ulf.; Philox.; Coptic; Ethiopic; Origen; Chrysostom. For $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$: Cod. B, D, Itala, Vulgate, Syriac Jerusalem and others.
 2. Tholuck, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Translated from the fourth ed. by R.L. Brown, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1860. ad loc.

over-against ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ : as regards the sense, we must always suppose it to be implied. In addition to Tholuck's preferring S to R here, and to his placing in juxtaposition the external and internal evidence, it is worthwhile to note that he is now using Lachmann as an authority of no little weight. This latter point is a change from his earlier position. In Matthew 6:13 Tholuck omits the reading of (RΘ al) and favours S D pm: om. ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, κτλ. He finds little objection to these words internally but decides on basis of the external arguments against their genuineness. Tholuck has a full discussion of this and notes that the words are omitted by the best Greek codices, Vat. and Catab.: the Latin translations and earliest Latin Fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, the Alexandrine codices, Origen, the Coptic, Arabic, Persian translations, and in Luke in all codices.¹ From this we note that Tholuck holds B and D to be the best Codices here.

In Matthew 7:14 Tholuck's decision on basis of internal evidence led him to the position commonly held today on basis of external evidence. He explains thus:

" Τί is read, instead of the ὅτι of the Recept., by Cod. B. secondhand (A.D. are imperfect), C.E.G.K.L.M. S.U.V.Δ., Pesch., Vulg., Ulf., Arabic Pol., Persian Wheloc... In favour of ὅτι there is only among the codices, Cod. B. first hand: a second hand has struck out the ὅ of the ὅτι ... External authority seems therefore to decide for τί. Internal arguments, however, are in favour of ὅτι. Tischendorf also retains it (2nd Ed.)."

1. Ibid., ad loc.

This is an interesting conclusion because Nestle also decides for ὅτι on basis of B* L* al, and against τί, C R Θ pm latsy; S.

In Tholuck's commentary on John he again prefers in several cases the reading in the Hesychian to that of the Koine. On John 5:1 he notes that, "The weight of the testimony for the reading εὐρη without an article is decisive, (Griesbach, Lachmann)!" Thus Tholuck supports the readings of B D G Θ Φ al Nestle and rejects that of L C R λ pm; Th^r. But there are grammatical reasons as well for omitting the article, because "the genitive τῶν Ἰουδαίων is already sufficiently definitive." Once again Tholuck supports Lachmann and the better codices, and brings to the fore grammatical material as well.

Tholuck has a good and learned discussion of the text of John 5: 3,4. He notes that:

"Cod. B & C* omit v. 4 and the close of v. 3; some Coptic MSS. also, and Nonnus, Cod. C., and some of the less important MSS. omit v. 4. Most of the Minuscc. mark it with asterisks, that is, with the sign of its being suspicious, or with obelus, the sign of spuriousness; the last words of v. 3, ἐκδεχ. - κίνησιν, are wanting in A.L. 18. On the other hand, this passage is found in the ancient Vulgate and Peschito versions, and so early as Tertullian ... Notwithstanding the antiquity of the witnesses which accredit the passage, we must adopt the (opposite) view, particularly when regard is had to the numerous variations in those which

have the passage, and to the fact that no reason for the omission can be given ... We think, therefore, that the addition originated with some reader in Palestine, who held the opinion that angels pre- side over the particular powers of nature..."

Thus Tholuck sides with $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A}^* \mathfrak{q} \mathfrak{sy}^c$ in rejecting 3 b, against $\mathfrak{R} (\mathfrak{D}) \mathfrak{\theta}$ pl latsy $\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Chr}; \mathfrak{hr}^2$; and with the $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{D} \mathfrak{f} \mathfrak{l} \mathfrak{q}$ $\mathfrak{vg}^{\text{codd}} \mathfrak{sy}^c$ in rejecting verse 4, and against $\mathfrak{R} \mathfrak{\theta}$ al.

Another good discussion of the documents occurs at John 7:8.

Tholuck favours $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{k}$ and rejects $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{\pi}\mathfrak{\omega}$ for the following reasons:

"a majority of the authorities give ... the $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{\pi}\mathfrak{\omega}$ of the received text, (Knapp, Lachmann) ... this reading is suspicious, as there is no difficulty in understanding how it may have arisen from an explanatory or apologetic gloss, the object of which was to remove from Christ's lips the apparent untruthfulness -- the fickleness of purpose; the reproach of fickleness resting on $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{k}$ as the reading, had been brought against Christ by Porphyry, already... In vi. 17, also, where accuracy would require $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{\pi}\mathfrak{\omega}$ instead of $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{k}$, we have in the Cod. BDL the explanatory $\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{\pi}\mathfrak{\omega}$."

Thus on the basis of internal evidence, Tholuck makes the decision now supported by $\mathfrak{u} \mathfrak{D} \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{R}$ latsy^{sc} Nestle, and opposed by $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{R} \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{f} \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{q} \mathfrak{x} \mathfrak{w}$.

Tholuck gives a full discussion of John 7: 53-8: 11 and finds that the genuineness of the section is "more than doubtful." Though found in $\mathfrak{D} \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{M} \mathfrak{U}$ and nearly 200 Minuscula, it is wanting in ABC (though parts of them are defective, which is also true of D.) Several codices mark it suspicious or reject it, and there are a great many variations within the passage itself. The Church Fathers and earliest translations omit it. To these arguments Tholuck adds strong internal evidence.

On 10:4 Tholuck notes that Lachmann BDL, Copt. al read τὰ ἴδια πάντα instead of τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα . Tholuck suggests that πρόβατα was apparently added by a transcriber by way of explanation (also Fritzsche). Thus Tholuck rejects R^Θ pm, follows Lachmann and the main MSS.

Thus from the passages we have just considered, we conclude that Tholuck in later years became less enamoured of the Koine text and more appreciative of the antiquity and authority of the Hesychian and therefore also more inclined to use Lachmann as an authority. Tholuck assesses well the merits of the various variants and often provides internal as well as external evidence for his decisions.¹ Many decisions are in fact based mostly on internal data.

We shall now look at a few passages in which Tholuck supports the Koine reading and rejects the Hesychian; for in many cases Tholuck presents very cogent arguments for the position he takes.

In the Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, in Matthew 5:11, Tholuck favours the retention of ῥῆμα with πονηρόν,

1. Another example of this is Tholuck on ψευδόμενοι in Matthew 5:11. D., Itala, Fritzsche, Lachmann, and Tischendorf omit the word. Griesbach finds it doubtful. (Nestle says: *D itsys Tert. S* omit it). But Tholuck feels that to expunge it from the text is unjustifiable in light of the whole testimony of eastern and western witnesses; and that the only ground for omitting the word is that it is superfluous. But Tholuck denies the superfluity of it, and suggests that it determines the clause ὅταν ὀνειδίωσι κ.τ.λ.

for this is the LXX translation of לִשְׁמֵרָה , Numbers 14:36; so that $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu \rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$ is a Hebrew phrase. B²D Iatsy^{sc} omit $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$, C R Θ pl. retain it. This argument from the LXX is not a strong argument, since it is nowhere proven that Matthew 5:11 and Numbers 14:36 have anything to do with each other.

On the word $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ in Matthew 5:22 Tholuck has a long discussion. He accepts the word because it is in the received text, in some of the Greek codices and most early translations, Iren., Chrys., Theod., Cyrill, Hilary, and in Wettstein, Matthaei and Griesbach. Tholuck, however, recognises the weighty authorities against the word: B, Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Mill, Bengel, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ethiopic and Arabic Polyglott, Vulgate, Origen, etc. On internal grounds, however, notwithstanding all the external arguments above, Tholuck agrees with the most recent critics in removing the word from the text, because its insertion weakens the sense. The authorities for $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ in Nestle are R D Θ pl. itsy aeg Ir h^{rs}, against it are B² pc vg Ju.Or. It is thus interesting to see that here Tholuck decides for a particular reading on grounds of internal evidence only.

Tholuck does a similar thing with $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon \tau\omicron \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\text{-}\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ [R(D) Θ pl. (lat. Cl.)] in Matthew 5:44. These words are omitted by B, Vulgate, seven times by Origen and fathers, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf. But Tholuck says that despite this strong testimony, it is uncertain whether the words ought not to be retained. The meaning of the clauses is so similar that omissions in their citation might easily occur. The conclusions,

1. $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$.

which are so similar, might occur in the transcriptions. Further, in Luke 6:28, from which the words might have been introduced into our passage, *καλῶς ποιεῖτε* comes after the rest. Finally, the words in Matthew mark a "fitting progression from the spirit to the word, the deed and the prayer."

Where there is no real difference in meaning in variant readings, Tholuck will often only state the differences and the authorities for them without informing us of his preference. Such places are, e.g., Matthew 5:47, where he notes that Cod. *E K L M S, Ulf.* et al have φίλοι, but B D and the translations have ἀδελφοί, or the corresponding word. He adds that Griesbach takes φίλοι, to correspond to the Hebrew ἀδελφοί, and that in order to have a proper antithesis to ἔθνικοί, we must take ἀγαπῶντας in the sense of fellow-countrymen. Another place where Tholuck seems to make no firm choice between readings is Matthew 6:5, where he observes that instead of the singular προσεύχη οὐκ ἔση B Z, most translations, Lachmann and Tischendorf read the plural. Tholuck's only conclusion is this: "It is true that the singular may have originated from a wish to conform the word to the singulars before and after it; but it is also true that the plural might arise from the use of the saying among Christians as an exhortation."

Thus we conclude that when Tholuck chooses the Koine and rejects the Hesychian, he generally has good internal reasons for doing so. For on the whole, internal considerations are

of great significance for him. He may even hold in tension two readings, one on grounds of the external evidence, the other on basis of the internal. And at other times he may have or express no preference, but merely present the variants. In all events he was a careful and deliberate textual critic.

B. Historical Exegesis

We saw how important it was to Tholuck that the interpreter of the Bible should know as much as possible about his author - his character, mental habits, distinctive views, environment, and heritage of thought. Tholuck praised Calvin for his ability to identify himself with each Biblical character, the good and the bad, and to speak from within the inner life of the author. In Tholuck's four requisites for interpreter of the Bible, the first three have to do with the interpreter's knowing the author and his times, etc., and only as a last item is "philological exactness" called for.¹ The commentator should possess the spirit of the author, or transfer himself into that spirit. The writer must be explained psychologically. The interpreter must be transported into the identical situation. He should explain the meaning of a Biblical writer in the spirit of ancient history. He should have in mind the whole mode of life of the early Christians and Jews. How well did Tholuck do this?

1. Tholuck, "Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology", op. cit., p. 356f.

Tholuck's strength as an interpreter was precisely in this regard. The best example of his historical exegesis is his Commentary on Hebrews. In the 124 page introduction (in the Biblical Cabinet), Tholuck uses the first 71 pages to discuss the question of authorship. He cites fully all of the external evidence for and against Pauline authorship, trying to examine fairly all opinions. The question is decided, however, upon the internal evidence, in which the arguments for non-Pauline authorship appear weightier, especially on grounds of language and style. If an author must be named, then a likely possibility is Apollos. The thing to notice here is that Tholuck is quite at home in the background period of Hebrews, and can evaluate internal and external data. He is familiar with Clement of Rome, Eusebius and Origen, and the later authorities. From his knowledge of the times, of Paul's activities, and of the state of the Church in the New Testament period, Tholuck is competent to adduce references in Hebrews which throw light upon the question of authorship, destination, etc. He has a long discussion on Hebrews 13:23,24 in regard to Timothy and those from Italy, which is very profitable.

Tholuck points out the doctrinal likenesses and differences of Paul and Hebrews. The agreements are these:

"I. God the principle and end of all beings. ii.10, Comp. Rom. xi.36; 1 Cor. viii.6. - II. The doctrine of Christ as εἰκὼν of God, and Mediator in the creation of the world ...i.1-3. Comp. 2 Cor. iv.4.; Col. i.15,16. - III. The doctrine of Christ's humiliation, i.4; ii.9. Comp. Philipp. ii.8,9." Hebrews, I, p. 27."

We question whether Tholuck's use of Hebrews 2:10, 1:4, and 2:9 is appropriate to what the verses say. It seems that in these verses and some which follow, the thought of Paul or Hebrews is rather forcefully put upon the other. On the other hand, many of Tholuck's comparisons seem quite apposite. For example:

"IV. That Christ has deprived death of his power, ii.14. Comp. 1 Cor. xv.54,55,57; 2 Tim. i.10. - V. That Christ died, once for all, for sin, and is, therefore, raised above all suffering, ix.26,28.; x.12. Comp. Rom. vi.9,10. - VI. Christ is the Mediator, μεσίτης, between God and men, also ἱερεὺς in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, we shall presently see, there is some difference from, but also an agreement with, the idea peculiar to Paul." Ibid., p.27.

Tholuck demonstrates that it is not doctrine but style and use of language that denies Pauline authorship to Hebrews. The "termini technici", the use of particles, participles, oratory and rhetoric, and the absence of anacoluthon, show Hebrews to be non-Pauline.

The remaining six chapters of the Introduction are dealt with summarily by Tholuck. It may be questioned, however, if Tholuck can substantiate from the text his point that the recipients of Hebrews were in danger of lapsing into Judaism; and whether he treats at all the nature and extent of sufferings of the recipients (Chap. V.). Tholuck makes some valuable points on the "Canonicity and Authority" of Hebrews (Chap. VI.) - the distinctiveness of the Apostles, the use made of the Septuagint by the writers of the New Testament, the crude and material views of Hebrews, etc. Finally, Tholuck gives a good account

of the "Expositors of Hebrews", giving credit to those who had well understood and faithfully unfolded the words of the Epistles.

Equally important to the Introduction are Tholuck's two dissertations in the Appendix to his commentary on Hebrews. The first is "On the Citations from the Old Testament contained in the New". The main question concerns "the apparently arbitrary citations from the Old Testament". Such citations are legitimate, Tholuck contends, because at bottom there lies a parallelism of the Old and New Testaments, in which the Old, taken together, is a type of the New, i.e., the same Spirit of God speaks in both. This is the organic conception of historical phenomena, and it violates neither philology nor history. The Old and New Testament people find their unity as "members of the one mystical Christ in history."

Though Tholuck's dissertation does not deal exclusively with Hebrews, it is a background study which takes up one of the major problems connected with that Epistle, viz., how the Old Testament is understood and used by the writer and readers of Hebrews.

The second dissertation is "On the Sacrifices and Priesthood of the Old Testament, and on Christ as the Sacrifice and Priest in the New Testament." Tholuck examines first "The Old Testament Sacrifices and Priesthood" from "extensive research in the knowledge of antiquities". He looks into the "Institution of Sacrifices" as a religious phenomenon, and gives

special attention to the types of offering in the Old Testament. He then examines current views on the relation of sacrifice to atonement, and on the subjective reaction of the worshipper. Here he uses appropriate passages in Leviticus and Hebrews. Under the heading, "The Institution of Priests", Tholuck examines such terms as $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma, \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma, \text{אֲלֹהִים}$, etc. He understands (with Schleiermacher) that to everything outward in the sacrificial ceremony, there belongs something inward as its origin. These offerings point to a future, a new covenant with universal significance pre-figured in the old. Tholuck notes some passages from the Old Testament connecting this with the Messiah, by whom it is to be effected. ^aIsaiah 52 and 53 is especially considered. The second main point is "The Nature of the Priestly Office of Christ", which is taken up "from extensive research in speculative dogmatics". Redemption is, for Tholuck, the synthesis in Jesus Christ of God's love and holiness. Man is drawn into the sufferings of Christ by mystical unity with him. These sufferings make satisfaction for sin. The third heading, "The Priestly Office of Christ under the Old Testament Form", draws upon "extensive research in Old Testament exegesis". "Christ as Sacrifice" fulfils every type of Old Testament sacrifice, and believers take part in His suffering and life. Tholuck shows the inefficacy of the Old Testament system in contrast to the perfection of Christ's. "Christ as Priest" is peculiar to

Hebrews only in designation, not in idea. The hypostatic union is the practical medium of reconciliation. Then Tholuck examines in detail the important words in Hebrews in this connection: τελειοῦν 2:10; 5:9; 10:14; 11:40; 12:23; ἁγιάζειν, καθαρίζειν, ἐγγίζειν.

This dissertation of Tholuck's is a good contribution to the historical exegesis of Hebrews, for "sacrifice and priesthood" is an important motif in the Epistle.

Tholuck's Introduction to his Commentary on Romans demonstrates his acquaintance with the background of that book. He is well prepared, e.g., to discuss the relationship of Paul and Peter to the Church in Rome.¹ His knowledge of the Talmudists enables him to compare the features of Paul's style and diction with theirs.² Tholuck examines the arguments of those who understand Romans 15 and 16 to be intended for recipients other than those in Rome, and concludes from a study of the names, etc., mentioned in those two chapters, that that opinion was forced, and that the two chapters were probably added by Paul as an after-thought, but written for the Church in Rome.³

A perceptive account of Paul's character is given by Tholuck in his Life of Paul. 19 pages are spent describing Paul's early life and education; then Tholuck pictures him as

1. Tholuck, Romans, p. 9ff.

2. Ibid., Sec. IV. He concludes that Paul had some of their features, but none of their extremes.

3. Ibid., Sec. VII.

pious, melancholic, mystical and introspective.¹ Yet, at the same time, Paul is a man of action. He has a choleric temperament,² the zeal of a religious reformer, a small body, but with the energy to do great things.² He appeals to thinking, as John appeals to feeling; he shows ardour, power of personality, and love in his writing.³ Tholuck is seeking to speak from within the mind of Paul. This is what he endeavours to do in all his commentaries - to speak from the vantage-point of the writer of Scripture.

In Tholuck's introduction to the Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount he begins by comparing the Matthean and Lucan accounts. He gives an historical survey of comparisons of the two and concludes that those who held a narrow view of the inspiration of Scripture (in which view Scriptures could not contradict each other) maintained that the discourses were uttered upon different occasions. Tholuck maintains the oneness of the two discourses, on grounds of the similarity of their beginning and ending and the sequence of parts, and from the similar contexts. He further declares that Matthew's account deserves the preference for greater fidelity because there is greater continuity and unity in Matthew; for it seems that statements which fit logically into the context of Matt-

-
1. Tholuck, Life of Paul, p. 19.
 2. Ibid., p. 20.
 3. Ibid., p. 24f.

new are broken up and inserted into peculiar places by Luke. Tholuck concludes that Matthew, if not an ear-witness of the discourse must at least have stood in intimate relation with its original hearers.¹

In the next section of the Introduction the "Time of the Delivery of the Sermon on the Mount" is dealt with. Tholuck discusses the problem of chronology in Matthew and contends that though the Evangelist is not interested in a strict chronology, he is writing a history and not without plan. He suggests that the Sermon on the Mount occurred somewhat later in the ministry of Jesus than the place in the account of Matthew had given it, but that it was placed there early in Jesus' ministry to draw the contrast quite firmly between Jesus and the religion of the Pharisees, and between Jesus and the Law of Moses.²

Tholuck notes that the occasion for the discourse was the choosing of the twelve. The twelve compose the inner circle of Jesus' audience, and the crowd, the outer. Jesus' object was "to exhibit Himself as the Fulfiller of the law, and to enunciate the magna charta³ of His new kingdom." Tholuck views the distribution of the discourse as follows: 5: 13-16. Introduction: Conditions of Membership in the kingdom. 17 - 20, Subject - The Messiah comes to fulfil the law in its depth and breadth.

-
1. Tholuck, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Edinburgh, 1860. (Transl. from the 4th Edition by R.L. Brown). p.7.
 2. Ibid., p. 12f.
 3. Ibid., p. 14.

21 - 48, The same developed and applied. 6: 1 - 18, The motive of Christian righteousness - to please God. 19 - 34, The righteousness of the kingdom of God the highest good, the end of life. 7: 1 - 11, Divers unconnected admonitions. 12, The general canon for our duty towards our neighbour. 13 - 20, The more difficult the way, the greater the need of faithful guides and teachers. 21 - 27, Peroration: the Divine doctrine¹ makes blessed only when it is taken up into the will.

Under the "Authenticity and Genuineness of the Discourse," Tholuck points out that the most recent critics of all theological opinions concur in recognizing the immediacy and originality of the Sermon on the Mount, and that the genuineness and authenticity of these discourses of Jesus, so far as the matter of it is concerned, is an unquestionable fact. As for the form, however, after comparing various parallel passages in Matthew and Luke, Tholuck decides that Matthew's version is the more continuous and to it must be accorded the preference² for originality.

The next section in the Introduction is an important one: the "Relation of the Sermon on the Mount to the Evangelical Doctrine of Salvation." Tholuck gives an historical survey on the problem, with special attention to the older Protestant Theology. The issue of course is faith and works, and Tholuck makes the acute observation that even Paul, who most distinctly

1. Ibid., p. 17.
2. Ibid., p. 33.

teaches the doctrine of justifying grace, insists that believers are to be judged according to their works.¹ "The fruits of the grace so freely given and graciously offered in the beginning, are inexorably demanded" ... "Most certainly it is not as merita that those works have any worth in the judgment, but only as documenta fidei."²

The last section of the Introduction deals with "Literature on the Sermon on the Mount", but Tholuck's exposition of the first two verses is entitled "Historical Introduction". Using grammatical and geographical materials, Tholuck decides that Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount upon a hill not far from Capernaum, one with a large surface of plain.³ He notes that the scenery there is uncommonly beautiful.

In the introduction to the Commentary on John, Tholuck begins with a good study of the "Particulars of the Life of John the Evangelist" based upon many citations from the Scriptures and the Church Fathers. He delves into the character of Zebedee and Salome, the parents of John; speaks of John in relation to Peter and James and Paul. Tholuck discusses the writings of John (which he believes to include the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, bearing his name).

The "Character of John the Evangelist" is taken up next. Tholuck finds him to be feminine, tender, selfish, loving,

1. Ibid., p. 37.
2. Ibid., p. 38.
3. Ibid., p. 54.

- but not soft, of rather a fiery disposition. In this section Tholuck relates the story by Clement of Alexandria of John's seeking and saving a young man who had become the captain of a band of robbers. He notes Jerome's statement that in extreme old age and frailty, the only thing John would say was "Little children, love one another"¹.

Tholuck next discusses the "Language, Period and Place in which the Gospel of John was composed." On external and internal grounds, Tholuck maintains that the Gospel was written in Ephesus in about A.D. 100, with Revelation being composed in A.D. 68/69, thus allowing maximum time for the change in style² between the two writings to occur. Tholuck finds the writer to be unfamiliar with writing Greek, and the consequent simplicity of the style. An example of this is the frequent use of *δέ*, *οὖν*, and *καί*, in places where native Greeks would use more involved forms. He further suggests that all of the ideas in John are reduced to a few basic terms: *μαρτυρία*, *δόξα*, *ἀλήθεια*, *φῶς*, *σκότος*, *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, *μένειν*³, etc. Tholuck then cites examples of John's good and bad Greek.

As for the "Design and Plan" of the Gospel, Tholuck remarks that it has the general object of arousing faith in the readers (20:31). More specifically, it has a didactic character

-
1. Tholuck, Commentary on John, Edinburgh, 1860, p.8.
 2. Ibid., p. 9.
 3. Ibid., p. 10f.

and moves in a different "circle of truth" from that of the other Gospels. It is assumed (3:24, 11:2, 1:32) that the reader is familiar with the ordinary circle of tradition and that the Church's desire to have an account from the Apostle John himself led to John's writing this Gospel. The theme of it Tholuck finds to be "the eternal conflict between the divine light and the corruption of men, exhibited in the opposition between the inimical Jewish party and the appearing of the Son of God, and protracted until the light is victorious."¹ Tholuck is justifiably wary of arguments to the effect that John's Gospel was written as a polemic to defend or refute a particular doctrine or tendency, and he challenges F.C. Baur and others on this point.

The "Contents and Form of John's Gospel as compared with the first three Gospels" Tholuck finds to be simple language with contemplative profundity. He submits that the events recorded in the Gospel are historical (i.e., that they really happened in that way) and that the discourses were the reproduction by the Evangelist of the original content, if not the original form. Tholuck does not take John to be the novel departure from the ordinary circle of tradition which so many make out. He finds the doctrines alleged peculiar to John in the Synoptics as well;² e.g., Tholuck shows that the John

1. Ibid., p. 17.
 2. Ibid., p. 32.

the Baptist of John is perfectly consistent with the Synoptics and the Old Testament. There is therefore no grounds for believing that John makes up his material out of his imagination. Also, the form in John is not so completely different from that of the Synoptics.

Tholuck makes a careful examination of "the Genuineness and Authenticity of John", and concludes on basis of external evidence in its favour.

In his Commentary on the Psalms, Tholuck tells us in the Preface to the German Edition that the authenticity of the titles given above the Psalms have been accepted by him with few exceptions, but not as an article of faith or of any special religious importance.¹ He complains that much of the current rejection of the titles rests upon no weighty reasons.

In the Introduction to the Commentary Tholuck discusses "The Psalter in the Christian Church." He approaches it with reverence for it expresses the deepest religious feelings. It has been used in the Church, in fact, for liturgy and devotions because of its subjective piety. Jesus Himself employed the Psalms for devotional and prophetic purposes. Paul and Silas in prison, Paul in his letters, and the early Church generally, used the Psalms. The congregations sang or said² them antiphonically in worship. The stress was upon con-

1. Tholuck, A Translation and Commentary of the Book of Psalms, London, 1856, (Tr. by J.I. Mombert). p.xiv.

2. Ibid., p. 2.

gregational singing, as opposed to artistic singing, unnatural and difficult on the part of the few. Some Psalms answered particular ends: penitence, thanksgiving, praise, etc. Then Tholuck adds the testimonies of various theologians and others to the merits of the Psalms.

The Psalms, or songs sung with musical accompaniment, are in form, says Tholuck, the parallelism of the verse members.¹ Rhythm and metre were used to express feeling, and thus even the dance was joined to the worship in the Old Testament. And there is also assonance in the original of the Psalms, and symmetry of thesis and antithesis in thought. Tholuck discusses the division of the Psalms into five books, the contents of each, and reasons for the exclusion of many other psalms, e.g., of Solomon and David. Respecting the design and use of the Psalms, Tholuck divides them according to content into the "songs of praise, of thanksgiving, of complaint, and instruction." Some are prayers, some are for the use of the congregation on special occasions.² From the time of David onward in the Old Testament community the Psalms were used in worship, and were specifically appointed for such by Hezekiah, Ezra and Nehemiah, and David himself. Tholuck discusses the instruments and the type of singing used in the Temple worship.

1. Ibid., p. 11.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

As for "the Authors of the Psalms", 74 are ascribed to David, of which Psalms 2 and 110 are Messianic, says Tholuck. The features of David's Psalms were childlike warmth and simplicity, energy and courage. Other authors were Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, Moses and Solomon.

Next Tholuck looks into the "Doctrine and Ethics of the Psalms". He treats five basic points, "1. God and the Government of the World" - the good can never fare ill, etc. "2. Man and Sin". 3. The Piety and the Morality of the Psalmists". Here he deals with the imprecatory Psalms, and defends them on grounds that the enemies of Israel are the enemies of God; and that the New Testament has passages which are just as harsh as those Psalms. "4. The Future" has in store the completion¹ of the Kingdom of God which has and has not yet come. "5. The Messiah." Here Tholuck deals with Psalms 2, 110, 72, 45. He makes a distinction between matter and form in such Psalms. He suggests that we can retain only the general thoughts of the figures used, and should not press for the form.²

-
1. Ibid., p. 35. Tholuck suggests that after death there is not perfect bliss for Christians, because we are not yet complete. But there will be some kind of bliss.
 2. Ibid., p. 39. This is true of the other "Messianic" aspects of the Old Testament. E.g., Christ desired us to regard the entire sacrificial system, as well as other phenomena of the Old Testament -- such, e.g., as the history of men like David -- as typical and predictive of what should be completely fulfilled by Him -- every jot and tittle of the law. (Ibid, p.41.) Some Psalms, says Tholuck, are so true of Christ and none other that they defy explanation. (Ibid, p.42).

We shall mention some specific passages in which Tholuck, as it seems to us, has well understood the Biblical author, and has elaborated the context of the passage, so as to be a great help in our understanding of it. In Hebrews 9:14, Tholuck fills in the background of ἔργα νεκρά¹ by citing the same in 6:1 as works "in which the vital power of the love of God is wanting." Then he draws out the contrast of "dead works" and service to the living God, and the contrast of touching the bodily dead with touching the spiritually dead. Here we are made to feel the horror of the people of the Old Testament over the touching of the dead.

"In place of the spiritually dead works, there must come the service of the living God. He must be served as a living God, and in a living manner."

Tholuck then aptly cites Hebrews 9:13, 10:22, Romans 12:1.

At Hebrews 10:25, Tholuck suggests that,

"The παροξυσμὸς ἀγάπης must manifest itself especially in the meetings of the community, which afford such fair opportunities for παράκλασις, and, on this account, no one must absent himself from them...It is by no means against the spirit of the first Christian age to ascribe so much importance to the Christian's presence in the assemblies of the church. Comp. in Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. c.13...'Let it be your care, therefore, to come more fully together, to the praise and glory of God. For when ye meet fully together in the same place, the powers of the devil are destroyed, and his mischief is dissolved by the unity of your faith.'"

This, it seems to us, is well within the spirit of this text. Added to this, Tholuck notes that "the solemnity of the admonition

1. So also Westcott and Moffatt (ICC), ad loc.

is heightened by reminding the reader how near is the approach of the day of judgment", to which he refers us further by citing ver. 37 and Ro. 13:11.

We believe that on Romans 3:21¹ Tholuck is breathing the spirit of the author. He notes that "Paul has stated the grounds on which all men stand in need of some salvation", and refers us to 1:16,17².

"He has thrown Jew and Gentile into perplexity as to the way of obtaining justification before God, no one being capable of securing it by fulfilment of the law. He now therefore at once draws aside the curtain, and exposes to the eyes of mankind an entirely new and hitherto unheard of scheme, devised by God, and calculated for the justification of the whole human race."

Then Tholuck quotes appropriately from Oecumenius.³

Tholuck notes:

"Νυνὶ δὲ is not a particle of transition, but designates the time, now, in the revelation of the New Testament; ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, v.26 ... χωρὶς νόμου without any respect to moral obligations, without the law, in so far as it is a νόμος ἔργων v.27. Δικαιοσύνη is the same as in c. i. 17."

In light of ver. 21b, Tholuck has to qualify his statement above, that the scheme is "entirely new and hitherto unheard of" (though that is the force of νυνὶ in 21a). This he does with an excellent quotation from Theophylact on

-
1. On this passage James Denney (EGT) suggests: "But the Cross is 'the Divine theodicy for the past history of the world' (Tholuck); we see in it how seriously God deals with the sins which for the time He seemed to pass by."
 2. So also Dodd (Moffatt series).
 3. "Having shown them that they were destitute of all help from the law, and brought them to desire some effectual way of salvation, he casts them opportunely into the faith of Christ."

πεφανερωται.¹

In his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount Tholuck in very many places unfolds the meaning in a most apposite way by reference to the context. In Matthew 5:2, e.g., he explains that ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα is a graphic introduction which excites the reader's interest in the words to follow.² He then bids us to compare Job 3:1, 32:20, Acts 8:35, 10:34. Tholuck suggests that it is a Hebraism, though it occurs in classical use with various shades of meaning, some of which he notes. But here, he says, the expression denotes "the solemn and the dignified."

In Matthew 5:3 Tholuck quite skillfully combines the Matthean "poor in spirit" with the Lucan reading "poor" by noting the account of Jesus's appearance in the synogogue of Nazareth (Luke 4) and His reading of Isaiah 61:1. Tholuck concludes that "the idea of physical poverty is here carried over into the sphere of poverty of spirit; that, in a word, those poor are pronounced blessed who are also sensible of their spiritual poverty."³

Tholuck makes a lengthy exposition in the second part of the same verse of the expression βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

-
1. "He uses well the word manifested, showing that, although hidden, it was ancient date, and, in like manner, when he says, it was witnessed by the law, he declares the same, even that it is not of to-day.
 2. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p.58.
 3. Ibid., p.71. Tholuck continues the exposition thus: "Christ has given in its πλήρωσις to the Old Testament in this respect as well as in others, in that He has unfolded the stamina of great truths which lay slumbering there; (this is) ...true with regard to those sayings, as Isa. lxi.1,2, in which the salvation which the Messiah should bring was promised to the poor, the captive, and the sorrowful..."

He compares 5:10, 19, 20, 6:10, 7:20 and finds that the Kingdom of God is an "organic commonwealth, which has the principle of its existence in the will of God" and had already been established, but imperfectly realized, in the Jewish theocracy. Tholuck examines the Old Testament data and finds that the principle of Divine theocracy was limited by nationality but that there was a consciousness of its universal application.¹ Tholuck goes on to present Christ and the Apostles' view of the kingdom as present and future; a growing and becoming kingdom. Then most helpfully Tholuck stresses the importance of gaining the main point under which all the elements of the meaning of the kingdom may be grouped, and to this end he examines the genesis and history of the conception. In this verse, Tholuck decides for the broadest meaning, implying the fulness of riches, making the blessing to correspond to the promise.

Another example of Tholuck's good exposition by means of a firm grasp of the context of a passage is in Matthew 5:15. At the outset he declares that the meaning of the verse is that, "as in a house a candle is not lighted for the purpose of putting it under a bushel, but with the object of giving light to others, so the light of the disciples was kindled at the light of Christ for the sake of men walking in darkness."² Then Tholuck explains the eastern customs concerning the lamp and candlestick. Or again,

1. Ibid., p. 72.
2. Ibid., p. 114.

on Matthew 5:27 Tholuck holds a learned and lengthy discussion (7 pages) on the Rabbinical rules dealing with adultery. At Matthew 6:2, from his knowledge of languages and of the background of the text, Tholuck easily disposes of the view that $\sigma\alpha\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ refers to the ring of a piece of money.¹ At Matthew 6:5 Tholuck goes into detail on Jewish prayer habits.² Prayer occupied a very prominent place among the outward manifestations of virtue. It became more and more a matter of form. Prayer was to be said thrice daily, the people assembled in the synagogues for prayer on three days of the week. One should spend nine hours a day in prayer. Long prayers were regarded better than short ones. Prayer was offered in the street at the hour of prayer. At that hour, all activity must stop for prayer.

-
1. Ibid., p. 299. Tholuck's argument is as follows: "In the first place, $\lambda\iota\tau\upsilon\alpha$ was the name only of the vessels set apart for the temple-monies; the alms-boxes, on the contrary, were called $\eta\theta\upsilon\rho$; and of what shape they were, is unknown to us. Then it is not easy to see how, even the vessels shaped like the $\lambda\iota\tau\upsilon\alpha$, the donors could succeed in imparting a louder reverberation to one piece of money than to another. Supposing them to have trumpet-shaped vessels fixed to the ground, one coin must have sounded like another. Then, $\sigma\alpha\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ would not be a fitting expression for the ring of a piece of money (tinnire): for this, the word would rather be $\kappa\rho\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\kappa\rho\tau\omicron\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, or $\eta\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ = $\eta\chi$ 1 Sam. iii.11; 2 Kings xxi. 12. And lastly, be it observed, this could apply only to the $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota$, and not to the $\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$."
 2. Ibid., p. 303ff.

At Matthew 6:9 Tholuck deals with the Old Testament understanding of God as Father.¹ It was more the recognition of God as Father of the nation, not yet of the individual, for to Him they owed their existence as a nation (Deut. 32: 8ff., 14:1,2.) and as the source of their blessing and protection (Ps. 68:5, Isa. 9:6). He finds the same child-like national feeling in the Apocrypha (Tobit xiii.4, Mac. vi.3,8), but here individual feeling is already developing (Wisdom ii.16; Sirach xxiii.1,4 (li:10), and it continues in the Rabbins after the time of Christ. Yet there is also a hesitancy as if due to a felt impropriety in the use of Abba for God, as e.g. in the Targum of Jer. 3:4,19. It is true that the Old Testament community was conscious of itself as a nation rather than as individuals. But it may be questioned if individual awareness came as a "development". Tholuck does appear to be correct, however, when he suggests that God as Father was never a major designation in the Old Testament, but that Jesus certainly made it such.²

Tholuck shows good insight on Matthew 6:11, where he suggests that this petition relates to the supply of temporal wants as necessary in order to the spiritual life;³ In the same verse Tholuck has a full discussion on ἐπιούσιος. He begins with a word-study and examines in detail the alternative derivations:

-
1. Ibid., p. 329.
 2. Cf. J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, on Matt. 18: 1-4.
 3. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 341.

εἶναι and ἰέναι . He concludes that though the former possibility presents great problems, still that view must be preferred, because otherwise it would have no meaning in its context. Tholuck assumes that the word is formed upon the model of περιούσιος . Then Tholuck discusses what meaning is to be attached to the word, and decides that it means "that which is servicable and necessary to existence". After an examination of the spiritual interpretation, Tholuck presents good reasons for discounting it.¹

At Matthew 6:28 Tholuck provides us with much information about the lily in the East. It is commonly red, orange, and yellow. It grows wild in the fields, it blooms speedily, and as quickly fades; often it is parched by the south wind sweeping over the fields. Tholuck joins this to the next verse (v.30) by noting that when the dried grass is gathered to heat the oven, the withered lily is caught up in it.²

Turning to Tholuck's commentary on the Gospel of John we find at John 1:1 a 20 page treatise on the Logos.³ The first part deals with the doctrine of the Logos in its historical aspect, and in this the Old Testament counterparts are considered, as well as the Platonic and Philonic Logos. In the commentary itself at 1:1 Tholuck notes something that many overlook, viz. that though there is a strong par-

1. Ibid., p. 352f.

2. Ibid., p. 388.

3. Tholuck, John, pp 57-70 (from the 6th edition) and pp 435-440 (from the 7th edition), Krauth's translation.

allel between this verse and Genesis 1:1, ἀρχή refers to something entirely different than what לְוַאֲרֵבֶּרֶת¹ designates. At 1:11 Tholuck well understands ἰδία to broaden in meaning and to include Israel first and then the world. This is a theological expansion of the grammar which the Evangelist may well have had in mind. At 1:14 Tholuck makes a good point, following Calvin, that σὰρξ cannot mean a body merely though the stress is upon the earthiness of flesh. Such a definition is against the real meaning of the word and is also Apollinarian. In 1:18 Tholuck makes a valuable comment when he connects this verse with ἀληθεια in the previous verse.

In John 2:17 ff. Tholuck provides some good background material on the story of the cleansing of the Temple.² He cites an excellent paraphrase of verse 19:

"Carry on your desecration of the sanctuary, of which you have just been giving an example, carry it on to the destruction of the temple itself, the centre of your symbolical worship, and in a little space of time I will establish a new spiritual temple in its place."

But he rightly argues against reading ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις as "in a short time". Further, Tholuck tries to reconcile this account with that of Matthew 21 and Luke 20, and decides, on basis of the omission on part of the Synoptists of the important saying of Jesus (v.19), that they narrate a different occurrence.

1. ἀρχή designates a timeless existence, without really a "beginning", and thus a "time" far prior to the creation.
לְוַאֲרֵבֶּרֶת refers to the beginning of the creation itself.

2. Ibid., p. 105ff.

At John 3: 29,30, Tholuck delves into the Old Testament background on the subject of weddings.¹ He notes that God is frequently designated as the husband of His people. He cites also 2 Cor.11:2, Eph.5:32, Rev. 21:2,9. He then explains "friend of the bridegroom" as a "terminus technicus" for the mediator in the marriage suit and contract (נֹשֵׂא הַכֶּתֶר , παρὰνύμφιος), a sympathetic spectator who takes no part.

Quite often Tholuck develops the context of a passage most fruitfully by a reference to the geography of places mentioned. He makes such a reference at 4: 1-4,5. He notes the custom of the Jewish traveller of circumventing Samaria by journeying² on the east side of the Jordan in Perea. He also locates Sychar on the direct road to Jerusalem and speaks of Jacob's Well lying in a vale bordered by high mountains and plantations of olive and fig trees. To the left of it Gerizim rises to a height of some 800 feet, its base covered with lively green, and on the right the less watered and steeper² Ebal.

At John 4: 30-34 Tholuck gives a good interpretation of the "spiritual harvest". He suggests that already, while conversing with the Samaritan woman, and even more when Jesus beheld the people streaming forth from the city, did the prophetic glance of His spirit open upon the future spiritual harvest among the Samaritans.³

1. Ibid., p. 127f.

2. Ibid., p. 132f. He quotes from Schubert's Journey in the East, iii, p.137.

3. Ibid., p.140.

Again at 6:1 Tholuck gives a descriptive sketch of the scenery which was in the context of the passage.¹ But first Tholuck quickly notes the order of events: the disciples return from their first missionary journey to Christ, to whom they could hardly come because of the great throng of people about Him. The Lord retires into solitude with the disciples to the eastern side of the sea to Bethsaida Julius (Luke 9:10). The crowd, however, follow on foot, attracted by the healing of the sick, and perhaps they were joined by the caravans of travellers on way to the feast. (vss 4,5). Jesus' discourses hold their attention fast, and the third hour has arrived (Matt.14:15). There is no nearby village where food may be bought. Then Tholuck quotes Robinson on the Sea of Tiberias:

"The lake presents indeed a beautiful sheet of limpid water, in a deep depressed basin, from which the shores rise in general steeply and continuously all around. The hills are round and tame."

On John 7:37 Tholuck gives information on the Old Testa-²ment understanding of the feast of Tabernacles. He discusses the pouring of water, which was a part of the ceremony, and which he feels John is alluding to. On every day of the feast the priest brought into the forecourt in a golden vessel water from the spring of Siloah and poured it, mingled with sacrificial wine, into two bowls upon the altar, and

1. Ibid., p. 167.

2. Ibid., p.208f.

thence from holes in the bowls it made escape. At this time trumpets and cymbals were sounded and Isaiah 12:3 was sung. This, says Tholuck, has a Messianic reference, and expositors have assumed with probability that Jesus cried out the words of verse 37b, just when the priest brought the sacred water through the forecourt, and the people were rejoicing loudly at the sight of this symbol. Tholuck further takes *κοιλία* as an allusion to the *κοιλία* of the golden vessel from which the water was poured out. He follows Bengel in this suggestion.

Tholuck gives some helpful background material on sheep-¹ folds in John 10:1,2. He states that a reference to the shepherd-life in the East is essential to an understanding of the images used here. He suggests that at evening the flock was led into a roofless enclosure made by a low wall of stones (hence the "climbeth up"), and sometimes an armed servant kept watch at the door. In the morning the shepherd comes, is admitted by the servant and calls the bell-wether. The particular sheep had their own names. Robbers often scaled the wall at night. Then Tholuck notes that Israel was often compared to a flock, and God (and often the leader of the people) to the shepherd, in the Old Testament. The point of likeness is the care of the shepherd and the defencelessness of the flock.

1. Ibid., p. 255.

At John 15:17 Tholuck shows good insight into the Spirit of the text when he makes the transition from this verse to the next by saying that this love for each other among the followers of Jesus is commended, as it were, as a compensation for the enmity they would receive from the world, of which verse 18¹ speaks.

At John 18:38 Tholuck offers some interesting information about Pilate.² Tholuck is refuting the argument that Pilate's question makes him a seeker after the truth. Tholuck first points out from the words of the passage that after Pilate posed his question, he immediately departed without waiting for an answer. If he were really interested he could have asked Jesus in private. Further, no friend of truth would so easily have given over to death one whom he knew was innocent. Third, in 19:9 would Christ have been silent if Pilate really sought after truth? Tholuck makes further points from the immediate context of the verse. Then to these he adds historical data. He cites Josephus and Philo who tell of hateful things Pilate did to the Jews which excited insurrections. For this he was **d**eposed and, as Eusebius the Historian notes, he died by his own hand.

In his Commentary on the Psalms Tholuck prefaces almost every exposition with an historical context. He draws upon the titles of the Psalms for help in many instances where

1. Ibid., p. 347.
2. Ibid., p. 388f.

such help is given. This is of course an excellent procedure in interpreting Psalms. Often he uses hints from the accounts in the historical books of the Old Testament to sketch in the background of some of the Psalms. Often from the words of a Psalm Tholuck grasps the situation of the Psalmist and fills in the scene from other sources. An example of the latter is Psalm 29 where Tholuck suggests that it is a Psalm of Praise sung during a tempest which shakes heaven and earth, and thus demonstrates the great power of God.¹ Tholuck adds that to rightly appreciate the feelings of the poet, one should experience a storm in Palestine accompanied as it is by terrific echoes of thunder from the encircling mountains, by torrents of rain and widespread destruction.² He gives a description of such by Wilson, the traveller.

At Psalm 30 Tholuck skillfully harmonises the title and contents with an historical background. The background he suggests is that David composed it when he dedicated the place for building the Temple on which God commanded him to erect an altar after the deliverance of the country from pestilence (1 Chron. 21:18, 22:1). The title and contents of the Psalm do allow such a suggestion for an historical context, as Tholuck handily demonstrates.

There are some places, however, where we feel that Tholuck

1. Tholuck, Psalms, p. 125.

2. We noted that this example was cited by H.J.Kraus who pointed to Tholuck's skill at bringing out the facts relevant to the situation of the Psalmist.

has not expressed the spirit of the Biblical writer. Such a place is Heb. 3:13:

"Now this has either the meaning: 'so long as that today of the Psalm is called to you'..., or: 'so long as the predicate today is called, i.e. used'...i.e. so long as your earthly life endures (iv.7). And as the danger is every day renewed, so must we give heed καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, and so much the more as the period of this call ceases for the individual and for the whole race is at hand, x.37."

It seems to us that the whole force and urgency of this verse, and of verses 7 and 15, comes forward in the word "today".¹ If this is so, then Tholuck's undecisiveness on the word causes a loss of meaning.

We believe that another such place is Hebrews 11:16:

"The last words in ver. 16 are of importance, as they direct us in the exposition of Luke xx.37,38. By this direction many expositors have not profited at all, and others not sufficiently. The reason why God honours those patriarchs, by connecting His name with theirs, is, that they are immortal. The God who, according to the Old Testament law, may not come into contact with anything dead, would never place himself in so close a relation to mortals destined to everlasting destruction."

Tholuck seems to us to be correct in holding Luke 20:37, 38 to be a parallel to our text, but wrong in his interpretation of it.² As for Heb. 11:16, it is not because Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are immortal that God is not ashamed to be called by their

-
1. We take the word "today" to be one which has great power behind it: "Today, while there is still opportunity! When you hear his voice - do not harden your hearts as our fathers did, who died in the wilderness! Today, while it is still called today, exhort each other every day, that none be hardened!" So also Dods (EGT), Moffatt (ICC), ad loc. Westcott, however, gives a variety of meanings similar to Tholuck's.
 2. "God however, will never call Himself the guardian God of mortals (νεκρῶν), but only of such as live forever (ζώντων)." (Tholuck). We submit that the text does not speak of "immortal" men, but of mortals who have died and have been resurrected (vss. 35-37). Thus He is in fact the guardian God of mortals - not of the dead (νεκρῶν); but of mortals who have died and by the resurrection of Christ live.

names.¹ On the contrary, there is a far different reason. Since they desire a better (heavenly) country, since they live by faith (vss. 8-12) and died in faith (v.13), strangers and exiles on earth (vss. 13-15), God is not ashamed to be called by their

names.² Far from having a God who will have nothing to do with mortals (Tholuck), our God is not ashamed to be known by the names of men. Tholuck uses an alien source here:

"The most recent philosophy has endeavoured to shew, that God and immortality are correlative notions, and rise in the various religions to a proportionately higher degree. This mode of contemplating the subject may find an initial point in the passage before us."

A third passage is Hebrews 13:12, which Tholuck does not comment upon at all. We think that the verse is crucial in the passage, for ver. 11 describes the disposition of bodies of the animals for sacrifice on the Day of Atonement - they were burned ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς. And the point of this is to make a comparison with Jesus who also (διὸ καὶ) suffered ἔξω τῆς πύλης in order to sanctify people through His own blood. This is a striking and powerful analogy, which we believe should not be passed over.³

The comparison is carried further by ver. 13: "let us therefore go forth to Him ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, bearing abuse for

-
1. διὸ... refers to their desire for a better country (Cf. note 3). γάρ cannot be taken in the sense of "therefore" here.
 2. Westcott says: "διὸ...) wherefore..., because their thoughts were directed to spiritual realities, God, who is spirit, acknowledged them as His own, revealing Himself as 'the God of Abraham...'. So Dods. But we feel that it was not because the patriarchs were so like God (spiritual or immortal, etc.) that He called Himself by their names (else why should it occur to anyone that He should perhaps be "ashamed"), but that they were obedient men.
 3. Dods, Westcott, and Moffatt stress this analogy also.

Him." Tholuck leaves out the middle term (ver. 12), and loses the meaning of the three-part analogy.

The three texts above prepare us for the next point. Already we see a looseness of philological detail in Tholuck's method. It should be obvious that in Hebrews 3:13 the emphasis falls upon "today", with great urgency. But Tholuck removes the urgency with "so long as your earthly life endures". It should be clear in Heb. 11:16 that God calls Himself by the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to show to His people His faithfulness to their fathers who were His faithful men. But Tholuck ignores this and drags in the completely foreign notion of "immortality". And in the strong three-fold analogy of Hebrews 13:12, Tholuck fails to see the point of comparison. In such instances, lack of precision and exactness has rudely distorted the text. At stake is the fundamental rule of all hermeneutics and literary criticism: careful attention to what the text says, to its words and context.

C. Grammatical Exegesis

It was no accident that Tholuck placed philological exactness at the end of his requisites for an interpreter of the Bible.¹ Philology was not his strength;² indeed, he was annoyed by the

-
1. Tholuck, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 354. The order is inverted, however, in *Die Bibel*, p.67.
 2. Wach, Joachim, *Das Verstehen*, II, p.249, cites Witte and Kähler to the effect that philology was not "seine Sache".

"flat, tasteless, and subtle" exegesis of some unbelieving grammarians.¹ Fritzsche wanted an impartial setting forth of the real words of a text, and the laying aside of what one wants the meaning to be. To prove the place of a particular thought in the mind of the author and its general validity is the task of the dogmatician, not the exegete. Tholuck disagreed, and pled for "the religious sense".² His question against Gesenius was, "Of what avail is all the grammatical knowledge if it is not conducive to Christian faith, and thus lays the foundation for a holy Science of Exegesis?"³

We shall examine several texts. The first is Romans 1:16, the sense of which Tholuck finds to be:

"This doctrine begets a power in man, which leads to salvation, from the moment he receives it, i.e. admits it into his inward consciousness, experiences in himself its truth."

Tholuck's first statement about the text is that "The gospel exerts a power which conducts man to blessedness, 1 Cor. i. 18." "The condition of this divine efficacy on the part of man is πίστις." "πίστις is a spiritual impulse founded in the moral and religious nature of man. Whatever, in virtue of this principle, a man receives, must become vital within him, and determine his whole mind." Each successive statement becomes a greater departure from the text. We go from the ob-

1. Ibid., p. 250.

2. Ibid., p. 250.

3. Tholuck, "Sacrifice and Priesthood", p. 280.

jective statement about the Gospel to the subjective appropriation of "a power in man which leads to salvation". First of all, the text speaks of the Gospel as the $\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ - we are talking about God's own power, not "a power in man".¹ If it is God's own power it is a power outside of man; a power which lays hold on man. It is a power $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. The Gospel does not beget a power in man which leads to salvation; it is ($\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$) the power of God which itself is $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$.

In the next verse, Tholuck takes $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as if it were $\delta\iota\kappa.\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau.\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, which he thinks is also the case in 3:-21,22. He rejects $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as a subjective genitive; for "this does not, however, suit the context, seeing that the knowledge of God's penal justice is for man, no $\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. Besides, $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta$ here forms an antithesis to the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\psi\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \omicron\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma$ in v. 18... Accordingly we thus expound, 'The gospel makes known a way to that perfect fulfilment of the law, which is required by God.'"

It is clear that Tholuck's rejection of the subjective genitive is based upon dogmatic grounds alone, and it is very suspicious theology at that, in our opinion.²

-
1. Sanday and Headlam (ICC) say, "St. Paul might well have written $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ here, but the choice of $\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ throws the stress rather more on the source than on the process." Cf. also K. Barth's Epistle to the Romans, and A Shorter Commentary on Romans, ad loc.
 2. Tholuck himself believes that "There cannot..exist..a manifestation of God's justice, which is not, at the same time, a manifestation of His love.." (on 9:21, p.335. We take this to contradict his position on $\delta\iota\kappa.\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. We believe $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ to be quite consistent with the Biblical presentation of the active righteousness of God. Cf. N. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament; Kittel's Key Words. / Reference continued over page

Tholuck again reads subjective meaning into the word "righteousness", in the Sermon on the Mount, at Matthew 5:10 where he suggests that those persecuted for righteousness' sake are those who possess righteousness.¹ A similar thing is done in Matthew 5:13 where Tholuck takes the passage to be an indirect reference to the disciples' own possession of spiritual salt and light.² It seems to be clear that the text is describing a relationship between the disciples and the world and not a possession of the disciples. Therefore it is rather suspicious for Tholuck to

Reference contd. from previous page

The two terms are connected here by τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, in which (ἐν αὐτῷ) precisely because it is the δύναμις Θεοῦ εἰς σωτ. the δικ. τ. Θεοῦ is revealed. Furthermore, it is almost everywhere understood that the δικ. τ. Θεοῦ far from being the antithesis to the ἀποκάλυψις τῆς οργῆς, is in fact the ground for it. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, Dodd, Barth, Denney. For this reason ἀποκαλύπτεται is used with both δικ. Θεοῦ (v.17) and οργῆ (v.18).

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 100. "Those whom He addresses are regarded as already in possession of the δικαιοσύνη, which goes forth from Christ, as ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ shows." It seems obvious to us that ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ is one of many indications that it is the righteousness of Christ or God that is being referred to and not that possessed by any followers of His. A similar misunderstanding of righteousness occurs in Tholuck's Psalms, p. 344, where he comments that at Psalm 118:19 "'The gates of righteousness' are so called, as may be inferred from verse 20, since really none but the righteous were to be admitted. (Psalm 15). We believe that they were called the gates of righteousness because they were the gates of the Temple where dwells the righteous God. Kirkpatrick, ad loc, agrees and cites Jeremiah 31:23, Psalm 20:2, 65:5. Is it not curious that when the word "righteousness" appears without modifier, Tholuck immediately takes it to be the righteousness of man, rather than the righteousness of God?"
2. Ibid., p.109f. "But when it is said, Ye are the light of the world the expression surely implies that they actually possess in themselves something which energizes outwardly in a manner as natural as the salt does... If the disciples possess a seasoning efficacy for the world, if they have a power which is rooted in the Holy Ghost, for the benefit of men, then they must of necessity possess that power, that efficacy, also for themselves ...: only, this point is not brought prominently forward."

insist upon the "possession" aspect. He thus betrays his subjectivist bias. Another text similarly handled, and of which we have already mentioned, is Matthew 5:14, in which Tholuck declares that the medium through which the new life to be diffused by the Apostles (v.13) was to be conveyed to men is a new knowledge based upon feeling, i.e., experience.¹ This is a rather obvious case of an extraneous meaning being read into the text, for the text has nothing at all to say about feeling or experience, nor can such be reasonably inferred.

As we saw at Matthew 5:10, Tholuck often blur~~x~~s the line between God and man. He finds occasion to discuss this at Matthew 6:22f.² He suggests that Jesus ascribes to man, as man, the possession of an inward eye capable of discerning the true end of life. Tholuck agrees with the Rationalists that this implies Jesus' recognition in fallen man of an efficacious principle of affinity to the Divine. Here Tholuck cites John 8:47, 18:37, which have little to contribute to the argument. He further suggests that Church doctrine also posits a "lumen naturae", "notiones de Deo innatae" in man. He is surprised that neither the Socinians, Arminians nor the orthodox have used the passage in their arguments. He also notes that Beza, Chemnitz, Gerhard and Calov substitute "the eye enlightened by the word and Spirit of God." We appreciate the theology of Beza et al far more than that of Tholuck on this

1. Ibid., p. 113.

2. Ibid., p.378f.

point. But we feel that both are wide of the mark as to the proper interpretation of the text. The verses before and after these two indicate that the meaning of the sound and the bad eye is ^{the} declaration that the eye can be focussed on one object only -- God or earthly goods -- not both, and on what the eye focusses that the whole body follows.¹ If this be the correct interpretation, Tholuck has here improperly introduced an irrelevant discussion, in which, as often, continuity is posited between God and man.

A like motif occurs in Tholuck's discussion on the doctrine of the Logos in his Commentary on John. By a reference to Romans 1:20, Tholuck finds that in the Word lies the *κόσμος νοητός*,² the counterpart of God. He then suggests that the other counterpart of man, by which man is conscious of his individuality, is external to him, God has it in Himself, in His Word. First, with reference to this counterpart God is love; for love finds oneself in another. This love has reference eternally to the world rendered objective to Him in the Word, in His own essence. It is then not a counterpart for itself, but only for Him. By virtue of His love it attains now also existence for itself, that is, the *κόσμος νοητός* becomes realized in the *κόσμος αίσθητός*; the creation of the world ensues. Hence the Biblical formula, the world was created of the Father,

-
1. A similar exposition is made by A. M. Hunter, Design for Life, p. 78.
 2. Tholuck, John, p.69.

by the Son. This explains too, Tholuck adds, why every revelation of God, whether in the Old Testament, in the consciousness of the human soul, or in Christ, is referred to the Logos. For the expression "God reveals Himself" means that He imparts the "thought, the knowledge of Himself", and God's thought of himself;

"God objectively conceived is the Logos. In Christ, however, the Logos has become man, inasmuch as this man is the archetype of humanity, which was contemplated in the Logos, which archetype, in virtue of that, views God with the same absoluteness of knowledge, is participant also of the love of God, in the same way as the Logos in his preexistent state." 1

This bit of metaphysics and theology takes further shape when Tholuck comments on John 1:4,5. As the existence of beings has its root in the Logos, so also has their life. This life, however, was in men a self-reflected life, a consciousness of God effectuated by self-consciousness. That $\phi\omega\varsigma$ does not strictly designate the self-consciousness, is manifest from v.5 and 9, (Cf. Matt. 6:23,) yet the consciousness of God presupposes a capacity of self-consideration,² says Tholuck.

This tendency of Tholuck's to draw together God and man in terms of consciousness becomes clear at 1:14 where Tholuck says that:

"in men, in general, the Logos was divine consciousness as potential, but not come to energy in will or cognoscence; in Christ, the divine consciousness alike in will and cognoscence attains to absolute energy, and therefore unites itself with the self-consciousness in personal unity." 3

1. Ibid., p. 70.
2. Ibid., p. 73.
3. Ibid., p. 76.

We believe that Tholuck's interpretation is really quite opposed to the text. Not only does the Prologue fail to include Tholuck's notions of continuity between God and man on basis of a Logos defined as consciousness, but it positively forbids it. If anything, the Prologue shows that there is a connection between God and man only at the point where the Logos of God became flesh in Jesus Christ. The Logos in John is God, the Word of God -- and not consciousness of God, and certainly not a consciousness of God shared in by Christ absolutely and man potentially.

At John 5:26, Tholuck interprets "to have life in Himself" as "He is Himself the principle of life."¹ He favours this because of the analogies of 4:14 and 7:38, which texts Tholuck understands to imply that for believers "the life received from Christ becomes an independent principle in them." We feel that not only do the texts cited fail to bear this out, but also that the theology of giving believers an existence independent of God is the exact opposite of what Scripture (and Christian experience) teaches. As if it were not enough to posit a common essence (the Logos) mutually shared in by God and man (to greater and lesser degrees), does Tholuck now go a step farther to suggest that

1. Ibid., p. 156.

believers have sufficient divine life in themselves to be in some way independent of God?¹

We believe, then, that we have shown through the above examples that Tholuck is apt to read into the text a subjective meaning which the text will not at all allow. He has a peculiar affinity for ascribing a characteristic of God, most notably "righteousness", to man, and he often considers a gift of God, (salt, light, life) not primarily in the aspect of a gift, but in the aspect of a possession of man now somehow independent of God. Furthermore, in a great many instances Tholuck blurs the line between God and man and posits a common essence in which both share to greater and lesser degrees, in terms of the Logos, consciousness, life, etc. Perhaps he goes a step farther and considers the gifts of God to include the bestowal of the divine essence upon man, and suggests that this gift of divine life now makes man in a sense independent of God.

Another undesirable characteristic of Tholuck as an interpreter is his tendency to "allegorize" or "spiritualize".

1. At 7:38, pp.209,211, Tholuck continues to speak of the "self-dependent" spring of water flowing up within believers. Nothing in the words of the text, however, substantiates the "self-dependent" aspect; and everything in the context refutes it: viz.; The words in the mouth of Jesus and John 4:10-15 indicate that the water is given by Him, and therefore depends upon Him as its source. Or, on the other hand, the Evangelist refers the waters to the Spirit, who had not yet been given (7:39). In any case, there is no "self-dependent" spring of water in a believer. For a believer depends not on himself for anything, but upon Christ.

In Hebrews 9:14 Tholuck says,

"The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us clearly to understand by this very expression ('the Messiah offered Himself through this eternal spirit', which means 1) 'in a spiritual manner', 2) 'eternally'), that the outward shedding of blood, as such, does not constitute, in his mind, the chief thing in the act of Christ, but that inward act of offering which must have preceded the outward, and which is expressed in the discourses of Christ, in the words: ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάσω ἑμαυτόν — John xvii.19., and, in this Epistle, by the ἰδοὺ ἤκω, τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ θεὸς, τὸ θέλημα σου x.7."

We submit that this is a false "spiritualizing of the text." ¹

The point of comparison is this: if the sprinkling with the blood (and ashes) of animals purifies the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ (not the inward act of offering) purify your consciences.²

In Romans 6:6, Tholuck allegorizes συνεσταυρώθη .

"The application here made of the special kind of death suffered by our Saviour, to the spiritual death of the old man, is the more emphatic, inasmuch as the former is peculiarly accompanied with pain, and resembles the way in which the love of sin is actually extinguished in the Christian. Crucifixion, first painfully robs a man of all power of action. He still lives, but lives under constraint and torture. By slow degrees does he sink away, until the breaking of his limbs puts an end to him at last. In like manner it might be said, is the love of sin pierced through by the impressions which the Holy Spirit makes upon the heart. It can no more do what it

1. It is τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ which καθαρῶς τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν, and the clause, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος ἀϊωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τ.θ. describes Christ in regard to the manner in which He offered Himself. Tholuck confuses the two.

2. This is also the general understanding of Moffatt, Westcott, and Dods. Tholuck's treatment of "eternal spirit" seems to have little to do with the Holy Spirit of God, and it appears to have led him to separate Jesus' "outward shedding of blood" from His "inward act of offering", which is unnecessary, misleading, and loaded with danger. This is another example of Tholuck's fondness for rendering a subjective interpretation when the text does not warrant one.

would, but still it does not expire. As the opposite thirst for holiness, however, which flows from and keeps pace with the believer's growing passion for his soul's invisible friend, augments in fervour, the love of sin feels itself miserable and tormented, and declines a pace until death inflicts upon it the finishing stroke, and conducts the Christian, purified by the contest, into the peaceful bosom of the Saviour."1

Another example of allegory is Tholuck's use of Hebrews 6:19,20.

"...a beautiful double image: 1. The world is the sea - the mind is the vessel - the bliss beyond this world the distant coast - the strong hope in Faith the anchor, which prevents the vessel from being driven to and fro by the waves. 2. The world is the Fore-court - the human mind the uninitiated - the bliss beyond this world the sanctuary - Christ the Priest, who gives the consecration, so that the uninitiated may enter through Him into the sanctuary. The former is found also in xi.13, the latter is based upon the noble idea of the general priesthood of Christians."

When we multiply images to extend the analogy, we go outside the bounds of our text. Here the text is not concerned with the world as the sea, the mind as the vessel, future bliss as the distant coast, etc.

The third type of weakness in Tholuck's grammatical interpretation is a general carelessness which results in a misunderstanding of the text.

-
1. We reply that συνεσταυρώθη does not refer to "the special kind of death" Christ died] crucifixion, as over against some other kind of death. That this is so is indicated by the use of the general words ἀποθνήσκω and θάνατος, in every other place in vss. 1-10. Furthermore συνεσταυρώθη is aorist (passive), not present, and therefore cannot be applied, as a process of dying, to the believer. We have already noted Tholuck's allegorizing of Matthew 7: 9-11 (p.94) in his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, p.411, where the fish is faith, the bread is love, and the egg is hope.

It seems to us that Tholuck is careless in grammar, contextuality and theology at John 13:3, where he resolves εἰδώς into "although."¹ His reason is that to him the words that follow give prominence to the contrast between the consciousness which Jesus had of His dignity and the lowliness of the action of washing the disciples feet. Grammatically it is doubtful that εἰδώς can be taken to imply "although". It would come nearer to implying "as" or "because". In the context of this passage we submit that Jesus had on His mind His death, His hour which had come (v.1), and His comfort was the knowledge "that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He had come from God and was going to God" (v.3). This main preoccupation did not produce in His mind ideas of "His dignity", but rather led Him to think of His disciples there whom "He loved to the end" (v.1). He wanted to give them an example for their lives and also an explanation of His death. Further, as a theological consideration, is Tholuck right to insist upon the contrast of Jesus's dignity and lowliness? This does not seem to be true to John, who understands Christ's δόξα in terms of His death as well as of His resurrection.

Another place where we feel Tholuck to be somewhat wide of the mark is at John 20:19ff. where he is overmuch concerned with the kind of body Christ had and how He got through the door.² The text, however, does not bid us to speculate upon

1. Tholuck, John, p.309.
2. Ibid., p. 413ff.

these matters, but to stand in awe of them. Clearly the mention of the closed doors is for the purpose of showing the miraculous character of the entrance and of the body. It would therefore be against the mood of the text to pry into these mysteries. Further, unseemly curiosity distracts from the point of the narrative, which is what Christ said and did: how He spoke peace and brought peace to His frightened disciples, how He showed them His wounds, gave them a mission, breathed upon them the Holy Spirit, and gave them authority to forgive and retain sins. Tholuck says too little about these.

From the weakness of Tholuck's grammatical and theological interpretation demonstrated above it would be false to infer that his discernment of the fine grammatical and hermeneutical points is universally wanting. To be quite clear in the matter we shall list some instances in which Tholuck's skill as an interpreter, and in particular in grammatical and theological exegesis, is brought out.

In the Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 7:6, Tholuck brings strong lexical proofs to bear against the argument that the words τὸ ἄγιον were a mistaken translation of the Aramaic for "amulet" or "ear-ring", אֲוִיִּן.¹ Tholuck argues that to suppose an error in translation is always a dangerous thing; that to suppose such we must also suppose an error in transcribing - here Tholuck uses the Syriac to indicate

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 405. Those holding such views were Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Bolten, and Kuinoel.

a dissimilarity in the two words in that language; and further, that if "ear-ring" had been intended, Christ would not have used the singular, but the plural, which could not be misunderstood. Finally, Tholuck says that we have no evidence that ear-rings were used as pearls and precious stones to denote a thing of value. Proverbs 11:22 does not prove it.

At John 11:33 Tholuck understands ἐμβριμάομαι, according to the analogy of language if not the usage, to mean "to be moved with grief".¹ He notes that βριμάομαι designates the noisy manifestation of emotion, not only of indignation, but also of fervour; for the related βριμάσσω designates a shaking with petulance, βράσσω, intransitive, "to ferment", transitive, "to shake violently". Ἐμβριμάομαι could² therefore signify the shaking and groaning produced by grief. We feel that Tholuck presents a good case grammatically for the "grief" aspect, and we believe that the context supports his view rather than the other (vss. 33a,35,36). Here Tholuck has hit upon the probable meaning while others have failed to do so.

To summarize this section on Tholuck's grammatical exegesis, we have said that often his tendency to read a subjective meaning into the text gets the upper hand. Also we observed that in some places Tholuck is rather careless with the words of a text and

-
1. Tholuck, John, p.280.
 2. So Calvin, Hoskyns, ad loc, Augustine, Ohlshausen, Neander, DeWette, Maldonatus, Against this: Barratt, Macgregor, (Moffatt), Dods (EGT) who feel that anger is expressed.

either misses the meaning of them or elaborates upon a minor theme to the neglect of the major one. Again, he has a tendency to allegorize or spiritualize. But finally, despite these weaknesses, which are significant, Tholuck in many other places exhibits a fine exegetical tact.

D. Comparative Exegesis

We noted that Tholuck's hermeneutics include the principle of "Scriptura scripturae interpres". In the actual practice of this rule in exegesis, Tholuck is quite skillful in most cases. He explains certain words in a particular text by reference to the same words in other passages. We saw that in his comments on Hebrews 2:14, his use of this method was not careful. But by and large he uses it with success.

At Romans 7:22, e.g., Tholuck comments:

"With respect to the *συνήδομαι*, we understand it to mean an actual delight in the law, and a longing after its fulfilment, such as the spiritual man experiences even although still in a legal state, Ps.cxix."

This, we feel, is precisely the sense of the text and of Psalm 119 (e.g. at vss. 97ff., 145ff.). A reference also to Psalm 19 would be apt.

At Romans 8:35, Tholuck clarifies the words, and then adds:

"If desirous, moreover, of fully feeling the weight of this question, and fully appreciating the divine power which enabled the Apostle to express a sentiment of the

kind, we must here remember that he speaks as one experienced in suffering, and who, for his Saviour's sake, was made as 'the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things,' 2 Cor. xi. 23-32, 1 Cor. iv.10-13. All that he says of persecution and hunger, nakedness and the sword, was just what he himself had gone through, as he describes in the texts quoted. The man who, in such circumstances, as according to (2) Cor. vi.4-10, he represents himself to have been ... chastened, and not killed; sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; dead, and yet alive, was enabled to endure, yea even to exclaim, 'In all these things we are more than conquerors!' in that man Christ was of a truth become the life, and it was not himself merely who bore it all." 1

We find it apposite that Tholuck at Hebrews 2:18 uses Hebrews 4:14-16 to help him explain παρὰθεῖς.² He also refers to Christ's temptations in the wilderness, at Gethsemane, and before Golgotha, as basically parallel temptations to forego the way of suffering and death. Similarly, Tholuck understands Hebrews 5:7 to be a reference to Gethsemane.³

At Hebrews 11:13 Tholuck refers us to John 8:54.⁴ He notes that "The centre of those promises was the Messiah." This we feel to be good insight.

Tholuck notes in his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount at Matthew 5:10 and 11 that 1 Peter 3:14 and 4:14 have more than an accidental similarity to the Matthean beatitude.⁵ These we take to be good comparisons. Other fine parallels Tholuck makes at Matthew 7:15 on the matter of sheep and wolves.⁶

-
1. Denney refers to 2 Cor. 6:4-10, 11:26f., 12:10; Sanday and Headlam mention 2 Cor. 11:23ff., 32f., 12:10, 11:26,27, 1 Cor. 4:11, 15:30.
 2. Westcott, Moffatt, and Dods also refer to Hebrews 4:14-16.
 3. Westcott, Moffatt, and Dods agree that the writer of Hebrews has Gethsemane in mind.
 4. So also Dods and Westcott.
 5. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 100.
 6. Ibid., p. 419. Isa. 11:6, 60:25, Sir. 13:17, Matt. 10:16, John 10:12, Acts 20:29.

Indeed, most of the parallel passages cited by Tholuck are quite apposite. To illustrate from his commentary on John, at John 3:5 Tholuck suggests that the same antithesis exists in this passage as at 1:13.¹ Also at 3:14 he concludes that in light of Nicodemus' subsequent actions (7:51, 19:39), Jesus' words were not wasted upon him.² Again at John 4:13 Tholuck declares the sense to be determined partly from 6:35.³ At John 11:50 he likens Cai^aphas to Balaam, as a prophet against his will.⁴ At 17:17 Tholuck aptly understands ἁγιάζω in connection with the theme in Hebrews of Christ as the sacrifice and priest.⁵ At John 17:24 he cites 2 Timothy 2:12 and Revelation 3:21.⁶

We must, however, point out that in other places in his commentaries Tholuck was not careful in his use of comparative exegesis. He sometimes blunted the point of a text by mentioning contradictory passages. At Matthew 7:1 Tholuck comes to an understanding of κρίνειν largely by means of comparative exegesis.⁷ He notes that κρίνειν is expressly required for Church discipline in Matthew 18:15-17, 1 Cor. 5:12, so that at Matthew 7:1 what is forbidden is a faulty judgment from an un-

-
1. Tholuck, John, p.116.
 2. Ibid., p. 122.
 3. Ibid., p. 135.
 4. Ibid., p. 286.
 5. Ibid., p. 370.
 6. Ibid., p. 374.
 7. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 396f.

just standard of judgment. Tholuck notes that the idea of condemning and punishing always clings to $\epsilon\theta\omega$ and likewise to $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$. Here he cites John 3:19, 5:29, Romans 2:1, 14:3. But he doubts that that is the meaning of the text here because of Luke 6:37, in which $\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ is followed by $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$. But this is not a very sound argument, for it is by the parallelism in the above passages from John and Romans that it is concluded that condemning and punishing are involved in $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ in those texts, and for the same reason Tholuck should see that that aspect of $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ is supported by $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$ in the Lucan text. This is a case of drawing the wrong conclusions from the right comparisons. Tholuck decides that $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ here means to pronounce upon with judicial authority; thus the admonition is directed against setting oneself up as judge and against judging for the pleasure of judging. Thus the wise and humble Christian will never wish to judge others without a good cause. But Tholuck returns to his initial qualification in which he makes room for judging of some kind, and states that upon occasion the Christian may judge and in fact is required to do so; indeed the gift of the $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma \tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$ is numbered among the special $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, and proceeds from the inward working of God: 1 Cor. 12:10, 2:15, 1 John 4:1, 2 John 10, 1 Thess. 5:21. But we feel that these qualifications go against the meaning of the admonition "Judge not", for in the text no such qualification is anticipated.

Tholuck makes similar uncalled-for qualifications at Matthew 7:7,8.¹ He enumerates conditions upon which God will answer petitions: prayer must be offered in the name of Christ, in faith, with a clear conscience (Matt. 21:22, Mark 11:24, John 14:13, 15:7, 16:23,24, 1 John 3:22, James 1:6), with the right disposition and for the right things. Then follows a story of Monica's prayers for Augustine not to go to Rome. All of this not only misses but also detracts from the point of the text of Matthew 7:7-12. For this text encourages us to ask and it makes no restrictions which might prejudice full belief. **Its** purpose is to assure us that receiving comes almost automatically from asking, and it does therefore not defeat its purpose by sowing doubts in terms of presup^Positions and conditions.

Likewise at Matthew 6:19 Tholuck takes away from the force of the text by hedging it round with qualifications which he has brought in from other texts. He dwells upon Michaelis' point that the prohibition to amass wealth or goods is not absolute. If corn were not stored up, e.g., the country would be exposed to famine. Tholuck's own view is this:

"Undoubtedly the words of the text, in this popular form of exhortation, express the thought with a certain one-sidedness...; in consequence of which, we must frequently take into consideration other passages besides, in order to apprehend the proper limitation. As regards the present case, it must be borne in mind, that it is possible so to gather earthly treasures that the sovereign treasure of the favour of God is thereby multiplied and increased: everything depends upon the object in view." 2

1. Ibid. , p. 409.
2. Ibid. , p. 373.

Then Tholuck shows that parents are enjoined by 2 Cor. 12:14 to gather up for the children. Once again Tholuck's comment threatens and perverts the text by robbing it of its "one-sidedness". It is no true commentary upon the text and stands only as a destroyer of its point.

Yet another case of this is at Psalm 127: 2 and 3, where Tholuck concludes his Commentary in this manner: though it is true that the Lord can and does give bread to His people while they are asleep, yet there is also the injunction of the apostle, "If any will not work, neither shall he eat." (2 Thess. 3:10). It does little service to a text when the final words of a commentary say the very opposite of what the text says.

In Hebrews 2:14, Tholuck considers three questions:

- "1. In how far has Christ, through His death, destroyed death?
2. In how far has He, through His death, destroyed the devil?
3. In how far has the devil the power of death?"

We complain that the verse says nothing about "1.", but rather, ἵνα... καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, i.e. the devil. Tholuck get 1. from 2 Timothy 1:10, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον. It is true that the same verb is used (καταργέω), but with different objects. Nevertheless, Tholuck writes 4½ pages on 1., ½ page on 2., and one page on 3. 2 Timothy 1:10 may have a meaning similar to Hebrews 2:14, but in an exposition of the latter, we believe that appropriate space should be given to the words of the latter. The matter of appropriate space is important, as e.g., in this

case in which only $\frac{1}{2}$ page is given to Christ's partaking of the same nature with His brethren (14a). There is here no real development of this point, which, we feel, is the main point of vss. 14-18, as borne out by v. 17.

But then in other places we find Tholuck quite circumspectly and explicitly refusing to combine the formulations of Paul with those of the Johanneⁿ Christ for fear of reading into one the view of the other. At John 10:1,2 Tholuck in refuting Lampe makes a valuable point about distinguishing between the thoughts of Jesus and those of Paul. Lampe suggests that Christ designates Himself the door (vss.7,9) inasmuch as He confers the true righteousness of the kingdom of God, and "he that entereth in by the door" is that leader of the people who is previously prepared by this righteousness. But Tholuck answers that this conception of righteousness through Christ is Pauline and cannot be introduced here.¹ We take this to be a good precautionary note in comparing Scriptures: that the theological formulations peculiar to Paul must not be attributed to the words of Jesus. Tholuck here is being very careful in his use of comparative Scriptures.

Especially interesting are the many places where Tholuck compares New Testament texts with Old Testament ones or vice versa. We have already mentioned several: the "poor" in Matthew 5:3, fatherhood in 6:9, the kingdom in 6:10. We could also

1. Tholuck, John, p. 257.

point to 5:5 and Psalm 37:11, the "pure in heart" in 5:8 and in many Psalms. At Matthew 5:38 Tholuck cites Exodus 21:23-25, Leviticus 24:19,20; Deutoronomy 19:21.¹ We saw too that at John 3:29,30 Tholuck brings in the wedding customs from the Old Testament, and at 7:37, Old Testament material on the fountains of water.

At John 19:24 Tholuck notes the reference to Psalm 22.² He adds that in this Psalm David speaks of his own sorrows, but the hopes expressed in Ps. 22:24ff. are so extraordinary and historically inexplicable (e.g., his deliverance as a banquet for rich and poor, in consequence of which all nations shall turn unto the Lord), that we cannot but recognize in him a condition of prophetic ecstasy. Further, the same prophetic spirit caused him in certain particulars to use expressions which were literally fulfilled in the sufferings of Jesus.

Tholuck employs the same device quite often in Psalms: i.e., he will acknowledge the Psalmist's statement as rooted in the Psalmist's own historical situation, but he will further claim that the expression is even more true of Christ, of whom the Psalmist is a type; that the **statement** goes far beyond the situation and knowledge of the Psalmist, so that it may be said that the Psalmist was in prophetic ecstasy or in some other way "wise beyond his years."

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 266.

2. Tholuck, John, p. 395.

We have already noted Tholuck's statement that Christ desired us to regard the entire sacrificial system, as well as the other phenomena of the Old Testament, e.g., the history of men like David, as typical and predictive of what should be completely fulfilled by Him.¹ Some of the Psalms Tholuck considers typical and they defy any explanation that seeks to limit them to the historical time and place of their origin.²

Such passages are at Psalm 18:51 where Tholuck suggests that this prophecy has ultimate reference to that seed of David, who is to build the house of the Lord, and to wear the crown when all earthly crowns have ceased, and the Israel of the flesh shall have become Israel of the Spirit. The praise mentioned here, though perhaps not perfectly realised by David himself, points ultimately to Christ and His kingdom, to "the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, who hath prevailed to open the book and to loose the seven seals thereof." (Rev.5:5)³

Another Psalm is Psalm 22 which includes, says Tholuck, "a prediction of successes which David could never have said of himself as a man".⁴ Tholuck's explanation of it is that here the Spirit of God raised the Psalmist to such high consciousness that he affirmed what in a quite subordinate sense only met its fulfilment in himself, though in the fullest sense in

1. Tholuck, Psalms, p.41.

2. Ibid., p. 42.

3. Ibid., p. 97.

4. Ibid., p. 106.

his great Descendant.¹ Tholuck translates verse 17c thus: "They pierced my hands and feet"; and observes that this expression, which to David could only be a very striking figure of speech, carries him far beyond his own circumstances, and was fulfilled on Golgotha.²

At Psalm 40:9 Tholuck says that the Spirit of God put these words into the mouth of David, but in their fullest sense they could only be uttered by the Son of God who said "I seek the will of my Father", and "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me."³

Tholuck considers Psalms 96-98 and 100 Messianic because they set forth the work of Christ and repeat the prophecies of Him. The theme is the Messiah's advent, His establishing a kingdom of righteousness; His holding a judgment in which idols shall be demolished, the only true God receives universal homage,⁴ and the God of Israel is preached over the whole earth.

Though differing from the Messianic Psalms, Psalm 8 is treated by Tholuck in a Christological way. At verse 8 Tholuck comments that the presentiment of man's dominion of the

-
1. Ibid., p. 106. "A higher spirit must have come upon him, at whose suggestion he expressed descriptions and hopes far beyond his human sphere, which though possibly containing a certain subordinate truth in his own case, met their full realization in his antitype, the Messiah. Our Lord himself no doubt regarded this Psalm in this light, when at his approaching death he uttered its opening words...".
 2. Ibid., p. 109f. As for verse 19, Tholuck would expect the Psalmist to complain of shameless robbery rather than of his enemies raffling for his vesture. Thus Tholuck recognizes another typical reference to the future.
 3. Ibid., p. 161.
 4. Ibid., p. 303.

earth was again experienced when we beheld the perfect image of God on earth, "who by the simple act of His holy will could quench disease, sway His sceptre over death, command the storm, and walk on the waves of the deep."¹ Tholuck underlines the point that "the Son, who alone is free indeed, can make us free too". (John 8:36). This is why this passage, "All things are put under his feet", is applied in the New Testament to Him, in whom God and man were manifested in perfect unity. (1 Cor.15:27). So in this most appropriate way Tholuck demonstrates His ability in comparative exegesis by linking Genesis 1:26,27 and Psalm 8 with the passages from John and 1 Corinthians. And the result is a solid theological point that Christ Himself is the "Imago Dei" and that through Him only does man's domination of the world, according to the promise of God, come about.

In conclusion to this section on Tholuck's comparative exegesis, we must say that he exercised good tact in most cases. Sometimes he was not careful (Heb. 2:14), often he blunted the point of a text by bringing up all manner of contradictory passages and thoughts (Matt. 7:1,7,8, 6:19, Ps. 127:2,3). Yet he shows in John 10:1,2 that he is careful not to confuse Jesus with Paul, and thus here he becomes quite precise. We have given numerous examples, on the other hand, to indicate Tholuck's success in the use of comparative exegesis: Rom.7:22,

1. Ibid., p. 65.

8:35, Heb. 2:18, 5:7, 11:13, Matthew 5:10,11, John 3:5,14, 4:13, 11:50, 17:17, 24, Psalm 1:2,. This success is also manifest in Tholuck's comparisons of the Old and New Testament texts. (Matt. 5:3,5,8,38, 6:9,10, John 3:29, 30, 7:37). But by far the most interesting ones of this category are those in Psalms in which a statement from the Psalmist about himself is taken to be rooted in his own historical situation, but only subordinately -- and primarily it refers typically to Christ. Such are Psalm 18:51, 22:17, 19, 40:9, 96-98, 100. Finally, we observed Tholuck's skill in comparing Genesis 1:26,27 and Psalm 8 with John 8:36 and 1 Cor. 15:27 to produce the sound finding that Christ is the "Imago Dei".

E. Exegesis and the Church.

We mentioned some of the ways in which Tholuck carried on his exegesis from within the Church and for the Church. His long pastorate at the University Church in Halle and the sermons he preached in that place affirm this. All of his commentaries and writings, since his conversion, were for the Church; but his Commentary on the Psalms and his Hours of Christian Devotion were especially for the people of the Church, for their instruction and edification.

-
1. Cf. the prefaces to these works. We noted Tholuck's other activities as a Churchman - the part he played in the union of Churches and in the establishment of the "Kirchentag" in Germany. When we speak of Tholuck's exegesis, we must remember that it is this man, this man of the Church, within the context of the Church, making his exegesis for the Church.

The slightest perusal of Tholuck's commentaries will indicate that he knew and heeded the results of past efforts in interpretation. Perhaps this demonstrates a belief in the "communio sanctorum". In his Introduction to his commentary on Hebrews, Tholuck writes 14 pages on the expositors of the Epistle.¹

Of the Fathers of the Church, he discusses the works of Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact and Oecumenius; he cites the most worthy of the writers in the Roman Catholic Church: Erasmus, Zegerus, Benedict Justinianus, Cornelius a Lapide, Calmet and Klee. Among those in the Evangelical Church, "Calvin and Beza are distinguished"; others are Piscator, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Pellicanus, Drusius, Louis de Dieu, Dan. Heinsius, Cameron., and the two Cappels. (p.114). Coccejus and his school, Owen, Hammond, and Whitby are others of the Reformed faith who wrote on Hebrews. Of importance in the Lutheran Church are the works of John Gerhard, the two Schmids, and Calov. The works of the Socinians and Arminians are also noted: Schlichting, Sykes, Grotius, Clericus, Limborch, Wetstein. In the eighteenth century the philologico-antiquarian interests prevailed over the dogmatico-polemical. Such were the paraphrases of Doddridge and Pierce, Michaelis' translation, and the works of Zachariä, Blasche; more dogmatic are Cramer and Storr. Ernesti, Dindorf, Morus, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Beausobre, Abresch and Valckenaer; Tholuck finds good. More recently are the works of Heinrich, Schultz, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Klee, Menken, and Bleek. Tholuck knows and uses these.

1. Tholuck, Hebrews, pp. 110-124.

In his commentary on Romans, Tholuck includes in his Introduction a chapter on the "principal commentators upon the Epistle."¹ These are: Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Pelagius, Hilary, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Hugo St. Victor, Aquinas, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zwingli, Beza, Bugenhagen, Bucer, Hunnius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Balduin, Grotius, Coccejus, Calov, Critici Sacri, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Alp. Turretin, S.J. Baumgarten, Bengel, J.B. Carpzov, Wolf, Heumann, Chr. Schmidt, Koppe, J.F. Flatt, and others.

This is Tholuck's practice in his other commentaries. He listened to his fathers in the faith, and to his brothers in the Church around him. He did his own work for the Church of his time, and for those who should come after.

We noted that in his Commentary on Psalms Tholuck's Introduction begins with "The Psalter in the Christian Church."² In this he shows how the Psalms were used in private devotions and public worship. He cites the examples of Christ, Paul, and the Early Church, and how they used the Psalter. He brings the account forward and demonstrates the place of the Psalms all along the road of Church history. Tholuck observes that the Psalmists rise from individual to general experience; they identify themselves with the Church and they address the Church.³ At Psalm 69:7 Tholuck suggests that the sufferings

1. Tholuck, Romans, pp. 22-27.
2. Tholuck, Psalms, p.1.
3. Ibid., p. 128

of a servant of God are never confined to him as an individual.¹ Whenever the Lord succours His people, it is a seal of mercy to every individual among them; and vice versa, the cause of the individual is equally the cause of all the rest. The Church is **one** body, you cannot touch one member without affecting the whole body. Here Tholuck quotes 1 Cor. 12:26 and concludes: happy is the servant of the Lord who suffers not as an individual, but as a member, for the whole body suffers with him, strengthening his cause in the Lord.

At Psalm 76:2 Tholuck posits a continuity of God's blessing from the Old Testament community to the New Testament community to the Church.² He writes that we Christians read and repeat this verse with joy because we know that every title to grace, every privilege, has passed from the Israel after the flesh to the Israel of Galatians 3:16. In words reminiscent of Calvin Tholuck speaks of the Church of true believers as the theatre of God's glory. The Church in which is manifested the manifold wisdom of God is a glorious revelation even to the principalities and powers in heavenly places. (Eph. 3:10). We know ourselves to be members of the same body, conjointly with the people of the ancient covenant.

1. Ibid., p. 228.
2. Ibid., p.251f.

In the Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount Tholuck suggests at Matthew 5:32 that the Church should exert discipline on the question of divorce.¹ Thereupon he makes a long excursus on the history of opinion on marriage and divorce. Again at Matthew 7:1 Tholuck discusses Church discipline in connection with the prohibition to judge.² He decides that a type of judging is necessary.

At Matthew 6:5 Tholuck presents a good history of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the Church.³

In John 17:4, Tholuck takes ⁴ἐργον to be the gathering and institution of the Church.

And in very many other places in his writings, whether or not he refers to the Church in so many words, the Church is certainly the background and goal, the source and end of all that he writes and does.

In conclusion, we shall draw together the main lines of criticism which we have made so far. In his earlier commentaries, Tholuck preferred the Koine to the Hesychian text. He laid heavy stress on historical exegesis, understanding the text in terms of the writer and the whole context, and was generally most successful in penetrating into and unfolding the background of the Scriptures. But Tholuck's great weakness as

1. Tholuck, Sermon on the Mount, p. 237.

2. Ibid., p. 397.

3. Ibid., p. 322.

4. Tholuck, John, p.366.

an interpreter was his unconcern for philological precision. We noticed that in some texts Tholuck wanders from God as subject to man as subject (Ro. 1:16,17); we suspect it was because of his notion of continuity between man and God. In other places (Ro. 6:6, Heb. 6:19, 20), Tholuck allegorizes, and thus shifts from the text to other fields. In yet other places (Heb. 2:14) he brings in passages which do not say the same thing as the text before him. Elsewhere (Heb. 9:14), Tholuck stresses a minor theme which results in a false spiritualization of the text. These are no insignificant mistakes, for they have the effect of distorting the Scriptures, so that all that we hear is what we want to hear, our selves speaking to us. In comparative exegesis, however, Tholuck was generally quite careful to use apposite parallel texts. And finally, it is obvious from his work that Tholuck carried on his task of exegesis within the Church of his day, with his eye upon the Church of yesterday and of all past times, and for the benefit of the Church of his own day and the Church to follow after him.

PART V, Chapter VII - Tholuck's Hermeneutics in regard to his Preaching.

We may assume that any proper hermeneutics determines and lives for preaching. Therefore we shall expect that Tholuck's hermeneutics will find a practical expression in his preaching.¹ We need not here bring in and follow the outline of our section on "Tholuck's Hermeneutics", because of the fact that hermeneutics and preaching are not exactly the same thing. But we do anticipate that the main lines of Tholuck's hermeneutics will manifest themselves in this chapter on his preaching.

A. The Purpose of Preaching

We begin our discussion by inquiring, Why, according to Tholuck, do or should we preach? What is the aim of preaching? What is it supposed to accomplish? Among the several answers Tholuck gives, we may mention first, that the purpose of the sermon is that we grow in the service of the Word.²

But we need not look far to find in Tholuck some sub-

1. Martin Schellbach, in Tholuck's Predigt, 1956, p. 24, says that Tholuck's exegesis cannot be understood apart from his preaching.
2. Nebe, A., Geschichte der Predigt, III, p. 289.

jective reasons for preaching. One of these, and properly so, is that preaching aims also at giving the congregation strength for the week.¹ In his sermon on 1 Corinthians 2:1-5, "The Substance of Preaching and the Disposition of the Preacher," Tholuck affirms this by suggesting that preaching is the "only way a minister advances the congregation in faith".²

How, we may ask, does preaching make for growth in the service of the Word, give strength for the week, and advance the congregation in faith? By its "manifestation of the truth to the heart and conscience".³ And what truth may that be? Randenborg is quoted in Doehring's Predigtweise August Tholucks as follows:

"The ultimate goal of the preacher Tholuck is not to describe the greatness and inconceivability of the justifying act of God, but to bring the doctrine of justification into harmony with the experiences of the pious soul".⁴

We shall consider Tholuck's use of the doctrine of justification later, but this will suffice to show the subjective orientation of Tholuck's preaching, which we may well have expected from our prior consideration of his hermeneutics.

1. Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 289.

2. Tholuck, Selection of University Sermons, p. 11.

3. Ker, John, The History of Preaching, p. 321. Schellbach op. cit., p. 34, says that Tholuck's purpose was not to find out the words of Scripture, but to impart the truth of God.

4. Doehring, Johannes, Die Predigtweise Tholucks, p. 63.

B. The Nature of Preaching

What is preaching? What does the preacher preach? Not his own wisdom, says Tholuck in his sermon on 1 Cor. 2:1-5.

"And now, my brethren, you can see how great the temptation may be to the preacher, particularly in a large metropolis, who cares for those who are without, to preach that which will be pleasing and acceptable to men; and even with a good intention, to mix up the plain preaching of the Word of God, with human wisdom and human ornaments. Is not the temptation great to preach such doctrine, as to please men? Is not the danger great that the word of the Lord should be handled deceitfully?" ¹

The preacher's own wisdom will not suffice, for we want to hear from One who is higher.² It is godly wisdom that we must preach and hear, even the offence and foolishness of the Gospel.

"The messenger dares preach nothing else but what the Lord has commissioned him to speak. Nothing therefore but godly wisdom must be the substance of our preaching, although to one it may be a ³ stumbling-block, and to another, foolishness".³

Preaching is the Word of God, the powerful Word which overcomes the world, the sword of the Spirit.⁴ Preaching is human words, yes, but it proceeds "not merely from human instruction, but at the same time from the revelation of the divine Spirit."⁵ Said in another way, preaching is the witness of the Spirit. "We have not merely the

1. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 11.

2. Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 290.

3. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 11f.

4. Ibid., pp. 1-10.

5. Quoted in Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 285.

witness and evidence of the Word, but also that of the Spirit."¹

"But, concerning the form of preaching, there is indeed an authorised condescension to the wishes and wants of men, which Paul has elsewhere spoken of. But, even here, he excludes one kind of preaching entirely; that preaching which would only be a proof, and not a witness from the Spirit of God in the heart of the preacher, to the Spirit of God in the conscience of the hearer."²

John Ker, in his History of Preaching, puts this thought of Tholuck's into a graphic word-picture. He says that for Tholuck the efficacy of preaching is from faith to faith. The preacher is the "conducting rod between the Holy Spirit in the Word and the Holy Spirit in the heart of the hearers."³ This is not exactly what Tholuck said. A more precise formulation would be, that preaching is the "conducting rod" between the "Spirit of God in the heart of the preacher" and "the Spirit of God in the conscience of the hearer."⁴ That Tholuck divides "the witness and evidence of the Word" from "that of the Spirit" is a glaring and fundamental weakness of his theology of preaching. The Spirit is in the Word. He speaks to us in the Word. The dichotomy of Spirit and Word is bad theology, and it opens the door to all manner of strange and disobedient practices.

1. Ibid., p. 287.

2. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 11.

3. Ker, op. cit., p. 321.

4. That Tholuck did not say what John Ker understood him to say is, we feel, significant. That he omits the Holy Spirit in the Word from consideration here is a great fault in his formulation of what happens in preaching.

The origin of preaching, for Tholuck, is the Holy Spirit; and this he enunciates several times in his three sermons on preaching from 1 Corinthians 2.

"Apostolic preaching proceeds not from the teaching of men, but from the revelation of the Spirit of God. ...And so it is impossible to preach the apostolic word, with real understanding, so long as the Spirit of God, by whom the word was given, rules not in the heart of him who would preach it."¹

In his third sermon in this series, "The Condition Necessary to Effectual Preaching," Tholuck's first point is that "Preaching proceeds from the Spirit of God in the teacher."² His term for this is "Begeisterung", the unity of the Holy Spirit with the preacher's spirit, by which all preaching is for him properly determined.³ Our question is, If the Holy Spirit is separated from the Word, as we suggested above, who can say what spirit determines the preaching? It may be the preacher's spirit, it may be some other spirit; perhaps it is not, after all, the Holy Spirit.

C. The Content of Preaching

For Tholuck, Scripture, and therefore Jesus Christ, the Alpha and Omega, is the content of preaching. In Tholuck's early years, he came to the decision that God is found in

1. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., pp. 21, 29.

2. Ibid., p. 36ff.

3. Drews, P., "Bedeutung Tholucks fuer die Predigt der Gegenwart," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1912, 1, p. 96.

the personal meeting of Jesus Christ by him who seeks.¹

What the hidden God and the veiled heart of man are, are first learned and revealed in Jesus Christ.²

"The word of Gospel is not weakened by age, it is an eternal Gospel, and neither shall the fear of man, nor yet the wish to please men, hinder us from making this (after the example of St. Paul), the centre of all our preaching, the alpha and omega of the whole Gospel; viz., 'Jesus Christ, and him crucified, who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification.'"³

But there is one particular aspect of Jesus Christ which engrosses the interest of Tholuck: the salvation and justification of the believer in Him. Tholuck, says Doehring, has one theme: how sinners become saved.⁴ Doehring suggests that Tholuck discovered Luther's preaching of justification which had been lost by the strife over the doctrine of justification between the Pietists' justification "in nobis" and the Orthodox' justification "extra nos".⁵ Tholuck understands justification from the stand-point of "Awakening" and "Conversion"; thus, according to Drews, almost all of Tholuck's sermons are "Sermons of awakening and conversion".⁶ Thus the spot-light shifts from Jesus Christ to faith in Him, faith in His reconciliation; then the theme becomes: our own faith in reconciliation redeems us.

1. Doehring, op. cit., p. 15.

5. Ibid., pp. 57-65.

2. Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 324.

6. Drews, op. cit., p. 97.

3. Tholuck, op. cit., University Sermons, p. 12.

4. Doehring, op. cit., p. 42.

We should now evaluate the theology which underlies this in terms of two questions. First, does it suffice for the preacher to preach only or mainly "Sermons of Awakening" or "Conversion"? Second, is it proper to preach sermons on justification predominantly from the stand point of "in nobis"? We can answer the first question with questions: Is revelation the equivalent of atonement? Does God transcend the human contradiction? Dogmatics must be Christology, and only Christology -- but in no limited sense. It is not exclusively the atonement, even though the atonement is at the centre if it. The atonement is only one moment in the activity of God for man, and cannot be isolated or abstracted.

We shall render a negative answer to the first question for two reasons. First, preaching justification exclusively (or almost so) is an abstraction from God's other activities on man's behalf. Second, "the preaching of conversion", as a predominant emphasis, has the effect of putting the means of salvation into our own hands, at our own disposal.

The second question concerns the propriety of preaching justification mainly from the standpoint of "in nobis". The Word of God is the sovereignty of God asserting itself against man's opposition. There are four factors which must be considered here: 1) the covenant and sin: 2) the atonement in the person and work of the God-man, Jesus Christ: 3) man's subjective appropriation of atonement: 4) man as judged and accepted (ethics).¹

1. Barth, Church Dogmatics, 1/2, p. 881f.

If this grouping is acceptable, then it may be said that Tholuck emphasises only one of the four factors in the doctrine of atonement, viz., 3). This is, of course, an inadequate presentation of the atonement, and therefore an incomplete picture of the content of preaching.

D. The Use of Scripture

Doehring considers as a basic point in the discussion of Tholuck's preaching, "Tholuck's new understanding of Scripture as the Foundation of his preaching." This new understanding of Scripture is that of a faith-knowledge that God stands behind and determines the completeness of Holy Scripture.¹ The first article of faith is faith in the reconciliation as redeeming faith. The second, faith in the historical truth of the Bible. A unified revelation stands behind the Bible. The theme of the Bible is the same throughout. Scripture is of one piece, a wonderful work, the building of God. No one understands the Scriptures without knowing that its content is the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Preaching, then, becomes, not opinion, but God's truth. It is not a work of man, but it is something always given anew. Thus Tholuck makes the distinction: not the literal, but the "spiritual" interpretation is correct. That is, the "spiritual" interpretation is that made in the light of the whole Scripture. Thus a passage must be interpreted according to the "analogia fidei", according to the whole of Christian doctrine, according to the Spirit of

1. Doehring, op. cit., p. 17. Cf. for what follows pp. 17-21.

Christ; all of which derive from Scripture. In the Bible there are many stories; but actually, only one: the mercy of God, new every day, to a fallen race -- how a Father seeks His lost son. This, according to Doehring, led to the new birth of exegesis.¹ We are on familiar ground here, in as much as we have considered these things in a previous chapter. The use of Doehring's opinion above allows the elements of Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture once again to pass in review before our eyes.

One of Drews' major points, in his article on Tholuck's preaching, is that for Tholuck the text is always the inner Foundation of the Sermon.² It rules and determines the content; never is it a mere motto. Tholuck, not, however, free from every one-sidedness, has in general a "Conformity to the text", but never such a pedantic following of the literal meaning of a text as to offend. He always preached the "spirit" of the text. Often the thought was prior in his mind to the text. He often preached only a word or a verse of a text. His "Conformity to the text" was that in the higher sense, in which he always developed the inner meaning of the text.³

In light of what Doehring and Drews have said, we shall investigate "Tholuck's new understanding of Scripture" and his "Conformity to **the** text", from the stand point of Tholuck's sermons,

1. Ibid., p. 24.

2. Drews, op. cit., p. 122. cf. p. 121f.

3. Ibid., p. 122.

in order to determine what those terms mean, and to evaluate them. The expression which first interests us is the concept "spiritual" interpretation. This, according to Doehring, is interpretation in light of the whole of Scripture, according to the "analogia fidei", etc. Drews' interpretation of the term is slightly different. For him, Tholuck's "spiritual" interpretation is the preaching of the "spirit" of the text, its thought and inner meaning.

Typical of Tholuck's good use of Scripture to interpret Scripture is one reference in his sermon on John 3:1-17, entitled "Wash ye one another's feet." Here he brings into consideration the saying of Jesus in Matthew 20:28, "the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve."¹ This we consider a proper parallel, since the point in both passages is that the followers of Jesus must imitate His example of service to others, even to the extent of humiliation, and they must disclaim all desires to be served. But it is interesting to note that on the Sunday after he preached this sermon, Tholuck uses the same text, and treats it according to the following outline: "The Gulf between Knowledge and Practice" -- 1) What proves it? The history of the world and of our own hearts. 2) What produces it? The lack of "understanding", i.e., inward knowledge, feeling. 3) What destroys it? A desire for this inward knowledge, which produces good fruits.² The first sermon on John 3:1-17 may be construed to illustrate Doehring's formulation of Tholuck's "spiritual" interpretation; the second, Drews'.

1. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 65.
 2. Ibid., p. 76ff.

In one series of Passion sermons, Tholuck presents character sketches of some of the major figures in the Passion week. For each of these a short text is used to demonstrate the characteristic Tholuck emphasizes. Some of the texts refer specifically to the person in mind, e.g., "The History of our Saviour's Passion reveals in Pilate, to what a Degree the human Heart is capable of Shallowness and Vanity," John 18:38; "The History of our Saviour's Passion makes manifest in Peter, to what an extent the human Heart may waver in its Attachment to Him in whom it has confessedly found the Words of Eternal Life," John 6:67-69, Luke 22:60-62; and "The History of the Saviour's Death and Resurrection reveals in Mary, the Mother of our Lord, what a human Heart may become under the Training and Discipline of God," Luke 2:34-35. But especially interesting are these: "The History of our Saviour's Passion makes manifest in Cai^aphas, to what a degree the human Heart may harden itself against the Truth," Matthew 13:14-15; and "...in Judas, to what degree the human Heart may harden itself..., after having once known the Way of Righteousness," 2 Peter 2:20-21. These to some extent illustrate both determinations of "spiritual" interpretation. First, in Doehring's sense, Cai^aphas and Judas are used to illustrate texts which do not specifically apply to them, but the two men may be considered to be fitting examples by which these texts may be understood. Second, in Drews' way, it is hardly likely that Tholuck began these two sermons from an exegesis of the texts, and then found that the texts would apply to Cai^aphas and Judas respectively. The unity of

that series of sermons is none other than the effect of Jesus' death, etc., upon those in nearest proximity to it. We can well imagine that Tholuck thought of the characters first and then later found texts suitable to portraying them.¹

This leads us to inquire into Drews' statement that for Tholuck the text is always the "Foundation of the sermon" ruling and determining the content, and never a mere motto. We shall ask if this statement does not clash with Drews' formulation of Tholuck's "spiritual" interpretation, the "Conformity to the text" in a higher sense, the development of the inner meaning of the text.

We refer again to Tholuck's second sermon on John 13:1-17, which he understands as a text on "The Gulf Between Christian Knowledge and Practice," the point of which is that inner knowledge, understanding in terms of feeling, is the knowledge of godly things. We do not understand that text in quite that way. We much prefer his first sermon on that passage, "Wash ye one another's feet," because that is what the text says. John 13:1-17 relates that Jesus washed the feet of the disciples, that Peter protested this but later gave way, and that Jesus commanded the disciples to wash one another's feet after the example He had given them, etc. The second sermon may be Tholuck's form of "spiritual" interpretation, the "Conformity to the text" in a higher sense. But it does not say what the text says. It is no listening to the text. It is not therefore in the primary sense appropriate to the text. We deny that the text is the "Foundation" for Tholuck's "Gulf between Christian Knowledge and Practice," that the text

1. The above mentioned sermons are in Light from the Cross.

determines the content of the sermon.

Tholuck has seven sermons on 2 Timothy 3:15-17. The first is an introduction to the series, "What must one bring with him to the reading of the Bible, in order to take something away with him from the reading of the Bible?" The answer is "Longing" and "Faith".¹ This may sound satisfactory, if we do not go into what is meant by these two words, but it does not stand in the text. Part of it could perhaps, with some imagination, be inferred from verse 14. But verse 14 is not in the text. The remaining six sermons come as answers to the question, "What can one take with him?" There are three sermons on "Teaching", one each on "Reproof", "Correction", and "Training in Righteousness". In light of the content of the sermons, we propose the question, Is one entitled to preach a sermon on one word? What can one say about one word, and how does he prepare a sermon on it? For one thing, he will have to think out his own content. Thus, e.g., Tholuck understands "Teaching" under these three categories (each a separate sermon): "Why and how does the Bible teach?", "What does the Bible of the Old Testament teach?", "What does the Bible of the New Testament teach?". Under the second one in this group, Tholuck says that the Old Testament teaches history, sermons, and prophecy.² We offer the suggestion that one cannot properly preach whatever comes into his mind, or into his pious heart, however dedicated. The authority of the Church, and of preaching, is the Holy Scriptures. If this is the case, preaching must derive from

1. Tholuck, Predigten ueber Hauptstuecke des christlichen Glaubens und Lebens, IV, p. 50.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

Scriptures, say what the Scriptures say, in order to have any authority. If this is true, it should mean that what one selects as a text actually says something in itself, has a structure and movement of thought. This structure and movement are not to be abstracted from the text as universal principles, but they are rather to determine the structure and movement of the sermon. What then can we say about the preaching of a one-word text? We are left to our own devices to conjure up a structure and movement for a sermon on it. We quoted Tholuck in the last section on the point that a word cannot be understood without regard to its relation to the sentence, the sentence to the paragraph, the paragraph to the whole. We shall hold him to this order, and further suggest that one must not jump from a single word to the whole work, ignoring its connection to sentence and paragraph. This means that our sermons are not to be taken out of the lexicon or the concordance.¹ This means that we shall not attempt to preach on one word, because in itself, isolated and abstracted, as Tholuck affirms in theory, it says nothing. We understand the human words about God in Scripture, which He uses as His own Word, as essentially intelligible words -- not jargon, not mumbo-jumbo words -- and therefore not words abstracted, isolated, and spoken of according to whatever reaction they produce in our minds. There is a psychological game in which the psychologist speaks a word, and his client responds immediately with whatever flashes first into his mind. God does not

1. Cf. James Barr, op. cit., on this point.

play this game with us, for He is interested that we hear from Him words which, in faith, make sense; and that our response to these words is not just any reaction on sudden impulse, but an obedient hearing and obeying of these words. Jesus Christ himself confronts us in the words of Scripture; but always in His own way, upon His own terms. We must also preach accordingly -- not throwing out single words which we fill with meaning, but honestly unfolding meaningful words in a meaningful pericope -- which have meaning because God Himself fills them with meaning intended for our understanding.

There are many more sermons of Tholuck's, the contents of which we are not able to justify by the criteria of our own interpretation of "Conformity to the text" defined above. Some of these are, e.g., 2 Cor. 13:14, "New Year's Salutation," Luke 10:17-20, "A Child-like Heart the Best of Gifts," Rev. 5:8-10, "The Kingdom and Priesthood of Man," Heb. 9:27-28, "The Solemn Preaching of a Death-Bed."¹ Another is Luke 2:34-35, "The Appearance of Jesus in the Flesh is the Test which tries and brings to Light what is in every human Heart."² And there are many others. Our complaint is, as above, that Tholuck does not say what, according to our interpretation, the text he has chosen says. Here, however, we make two qualifying statements. The exceptions which we have taken to some of Tholuck's sermons does not at all mean that we find his preaching questionable as a whole.

Indeed, there are many of his sermons with which we must

1. In University Sermons, op. cit.
 2. Tholuck, Light from the Cross, op. cit., pp. 11-20.

heartily agree. We have made reference to his good use of Scripture. We have not elaborated the sermons which we consider "Appropriate to the text", because our point at present is to test the statement of Drews', that for Tholuck the text is always the "Foundation of the sermon", the rule and determination of its content, and never a mere motto. We have thus far registered our dissent. The second thing is that there is yet a whole category of Tholuck's use of Scripture which we have not considered, and which sheds light on the entire subject of his "Conformity to the text". To this category we now direct our attention.

Doehring makes the clever observation that, while for Luther the Bible was the standard by which to measure experience; for Tholuck, experience is the standard by which to measure the Bible.¹ Scripture is the explication of what Tholuck had experienced, and that is the weakness of his exegesis. Stier complained that one must preach from the text only, not from experience: "Tholuck has his theme, the text plays a subordinate role." The text for Tholuck is thus only a motto. His own thoughts are primary, and behind them the text often disappears.

L. Witte suggests that for Tholuck, what makes the sermon is what is inside the preacher; "The subjective consciousness" is the only standard.² Drews' observes that for Tholuck "Everything is subject to experience"; Tholuck does not first appeal to the Bible, but to how "it stands recorded in the books of the human hearts."³ Even if the Bible were silent,

1. Doehring, op. cit., p. 24. Cf. pp. 22-32.
 2. Witte, L., A. Tholucks Ausgewaehlte Predigten, p. 11f.
 3. Drews, op. cit., p. 98f. For what follows, cf. p. 98f.

what counts is how it stands with the human heart. Drews quotes Tholuck as follows:

"Yet it is also a settled fact, that though the Book of Books were silent on this high knowledge, does it not stand recorded in the books of the human hearts over the wide earth?"¹

Why do we read the Bible? Because "behind it there stands a common experience".

"Yes, the preacher uncovers his own interior in the expectation that therewith shall be uncovered the interior of his listeners themselves."²

Nebe testifies the same. Tholuck, he says, often preached the theme of a text, not the text itself.³ Nebe's judgment on the matter is the same as Kaehler's, that to start with a theme and then to take a text is never to preach or apply the text. Tholuck found God through his heart, not his head, and therefore what mattered most to him in preaching, as in life, was subjective faith, with no objective form or norm.⁴ Most other authoritative commentators on Tholuck's preaching also complain against Tholuck's subjectivism, especially Broemel in his Homiletische Charakterbilder.⁵

Where Tholuck errs in this direction may be seen by the following statement of Dietrich Ritschl, Die homiletische Funktion der Gemeinde, p. 60f. "Finally it must be said that one must be careful with the current assertion that the preacher may preach only what he himself really believes and has experienced. As undeniably true as that is, yet it must immediately be added that it can never mean that the preacher's personal experiences of faith are the basis or even a part of the basis of his preaching. Of what interest to

1. Ibid., p. 99.

2. Ibid., p. 99.

3. Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 305.

4. Ibid., p. 318.

5. Doehring, op. cit., p. 28.

me, as a member of the congregation, are the experiences of faith of a preacher (if he is not my personal friend)? How could these experiences be laid down as "The history of God with his people"? That would not only be painful and indiscreet and prejudicial to the genuine authority of a pastor, but it would put forth the error that the sermon grows out of the cure of souls, which, quite on the contrary, is correct in only a very limited sense. Were it not so, one could speak of the sermons of only the oldest, most experienced pastoral counsellors as real sermons. This is refuted already by experience, but much more, however, by our understanding of the sermon as a present activity of the exalted Lord through the Spirit, through whom the congregation is called to life by it to service. So the care of souls will follow the sermon, because the word of preaching equips and calls the preacher and the hearers to a fully powerful care of souls. Otherwise the gifts of grace would be here confused or lightly identified with each other and reserved unavoidably for the person of the preacher."

Karl Barth is of the same opinion and states the case rather strongly. He asks if it was any benefit that Anselm's doctrine of reconciliation and the Lutheran doctrine of justification were rediscovered, if the result was the introduction of a preoccupation with man even more than before.¹ Barth felt that it was truly, well done on Tholuck's part when the great objectives of the old dogmatics were put into play, but he notes that these objectives did not hinder

1. Barth, K., "Das Wort in der Theologie von Schleiermacher bis Ritschl," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 2, 1928, p. 99.

his strange concentration upon the object which occupied him the most as a theologian and at the same time doubtless the most impressive thing which he proclaimed to countless others: viz., the pious subject August Tholuck and the "Victory of faith" which one mightily celebrated at the jubilee of his fiftieth year as professor in Halle, his victory of his faith. One of his own friends wrote that he should have drawn a sharp line between faith and reasonable assent. He should have said that faith in Christ is purely and simply a gift of God. Tholuck's friend - and it was Witte¹ - said to his teacher, "You are not quite right on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Barth rejoins that this "Not quite right" was a mild expression for that "sharp line" which Tholuck had so little drawn, and apparently so little seen as had his "unawakened" theological contemporaries. Barth sees the theology of the Awakening as only an apparent protest against Schleiermacher.² Tholuck is to Schleiermacher as a real flower is to a painted one. The "Erregung" of which Schleiermacher spoke became a person in Tholuck. His key words are "feeling", "experience", "heart", "sentiment",

"The theology of the "Awakening" ... thrust into the middle of theology, much more and much more coarsely than Schleiermacher had done, the pious man, with the weight of a real enthusiasm, not just a painted one."³

Not only the "Erweckungs" theologians, but also the "Rechtshegelians" like Marheineke, and the "Biblizisten" like Menken, J.T. Beck, and Hofmann, had their own varieties of subjectivism. It is no wonder that Barth rejoices when those two unrepentant publicans and sinners, Feuerbach and

1. Witte, Das Leben Tholucks, I, p. 328f.

2. Barth, op. cit., "Das Wort", p. 98. Cf. for what follows p. 98f.

3. Ibid., p. 100.

D.F. Strauss, even though speaking out of hate against the Church and theology, appear upon the scene to attempt to halt the rolling wagon of subjectivism. The love of God, he says, uses such Assyrians and Babylonians to call Jerusalem to order.¹

E. The Mood and Spirit of Preaching.

Preaching, says Tholuck, must be done with humility. There is no clearer book than the Bible, and the dark passages are actually dark passages in our hearts; because our blind eyes cannot read the book of our consciences, God has given us the Word of Revelation, which we read with humility and wonder.² It is like a mother reading to her child. The child does not question whether the mother is correct, but whether he understands what is read. The exegete stands under the Word, and in this position he is able to interpret. Drews' suggests that humility is here the gate to life, and here also it applies: to the humble He gives grace and to the upright He grants success.³

In his third sermon on preaching, 1 Corinthians 2:12-14, "The Condition necessary to effectual Preaching," Tholuck complains that for the preacher,

"There are times when the word of God stands before him, as a door that is walled up, and which no force can open; it opens not to the force of care and grief, but only to earnest prayer."⁴

In his first sermon on this subject, 1 Corinthians 2: 1-5, Tholuck expounds verse 3, indicating the "weakness", "the

1. Ibid., p. 105.

2. Doehring, op. cit., p. 21.

3. Drews, op. cit., p. 98.

4. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 43.

242

fear and trembling" with which Paul preached.

"Yes, he trembles, for he is conscious that he is the unworthy messenger of the High King, and of a High message...With fear he knew that his King had committed to his lips a message, in comparison of which, none so rich, so full, could be given unto man, which brought salvation to those who believed, condemnation to those who rejected it...

And here again is the great Apostle the example of us preachers: with slow steps and bended head, you view your pastor step into the pulpit, and truly, if we are not hirelings, that is not merely outward shew, but springs from deep inward feeling. He goes thither, as St. Paul did, with fear and trembling, for he feels himself to be the unworthy messenger of the great King, and of the high message. Look at the cares and difficulties which oppress his heart; whether he shall deliver it pure and clear; whether his actions throughout the week may not give the lie to the word which he preaches on the sabbath, whether he shall speak it with all reverence, with all fervour, with perfect freedom from all fear of man, with perfect freedom from the wish of pleasing men, as he ought to speak; whether his sermon is really the best and most powerful, which his labour and his prayer during the week have been able to produce; these are some of the cares which oppress his heart..."¹

Thereafter, Tholuck makes two necessary qualifications.

First, "that if all the preachers of the Gospel were to become faithless, the fame of the Saviour would still resound, for if those were to be silent the very stones would cry out ..."² Second, "if weakness comes from below, from above come strength and power; if from below comes fear, from above comes perfect confidence; if from below comes trembling, from above comes rejoicing...The majesty of the King whose messengers we are, depresses us, while we direct our glance below, and look upon our own unworthiness; but when we direct our glance above, when we look at Him, at His wisdom, power, and love, how much we are exalted."³

1. Ibid., pp. 13-15.

2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. Ibid., p. 16 f.

The preacher must have the attitude of humility, and he must also have faith. According to Nebe, Tholuck declares that we preachers are impotent in the pulpit because we bring to it all our own doubts and unbelief.¹

"...the first and most pressing question the preacher has to ask himself is this, Have I received the Holy Spirit? Have I **been** born again?"²

In this connection we are again reminded of Tholuck's insistence that the origin of preaching is the Holy Spirit, not only in the act of preaching itself, but in the preparation of the sermon. This is done in the Holy Spirit, and therefore in faith, expectation, and joy. Tholuck suggests that the sermon must be an act of the preacher in his study and again, an act in the pulpit; he must, upon descending from the pulpit, feel the "joy of child-birth -- the joy of the mother who under the blessing of God has given birth to a child."³

The preacher must have the attitude of humility and faith, and also the feeling of constraint and necessity.

"A divine constraint, takes place of a learned eloquence, as St. Paul says, "For though I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!" (1 Cor. ix.16). This was the necessity which urged the Apostle to preach, by land and by water, in health and in sickness, in freedom and in bonds, for even while he lay bound in Rome, with a soldier chained to each arm, he preached to these soldiers; "So that", as he saith, (Phil. i.-13) "my bonds (and together with them also the Gospel) in Christ are manifest in all the palace."⁴

F. Application

John Ker quotes a figure which Tholuck uses:

1. Nebe, op. cit., III, p. 290.

2. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 33.

3. Tholuck, Predigten ueber Hauptstuecke, op. cit., I, p. xxiii.

4. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 28.

"A true sermon," he says, "has the heaven for its father and the earth for its mother. Why is it that so much of our preaching goes coldly over the head and heart? Because earthly affairs are treated only in the light of this world. They have the earth for their mother, but not the heaven for their father. And why do other sermons go over the head and heart altogether? Because, though heavenly things are dealt with, they are not carried into the streets, the homes, the workshops of the earth. They have the heaven for their father, but not the earth for their mother."¹

We have considered the "heavenly" determination of the sermon, now it is our task to discuss the "earthly". It is now the "application" of the sermon which comes to our attention. Tholuck expresses it thus: The sermon should arise from the congregation. There are sermons which have originated from without the congregation and those which have arisen out of the congregation. The first are those which the preacher devises according to the general rules of homiletics, according to Christian preaching generally, of the Church year, etc. So must he miss the way as soon as no living intercourse between preacher and congregation takes place. The other is where the Sunday sermon is the echo of experiences which the visits among the congregation during the whole week have made possible. The more the sermon is from here, the more individual, the more local, the more striking it will be. As it has originated in the life of the congregation, so will it also serve thereto, the more to waken again the life of the congregation. That first consideration should not be excluded from the sermon, but it should include this second one within itself, or in any case bind itself with it.²

1. Quoted in Ker, op. cit., p. 323.

2. Tholuck, Hauptstuecke, op. cit., I, p. xxviiiif.

Not just to any congregation does Tholuck preach, not to human-kind in general, but to his particular congregation. He says that the preacher must know his times and his people, especially his own congregation, from continuous association. There appeared before Tholuck's eyes, he said, in his sermons not merely the general need of the heart of man, but that specifically of his hearers, and that according to the many different classes and levels, directions and standpoints.²

From this Drews draws the principle that the sermon must be appropriate to the congregation.³ Tholuck further delineates this principle, showing how it is to be practiced. Where is the preacher's "standpoint"? Tholuck answers that it is not over the congregation in the pulpit, but among the congregation in the confessional, in the houses and cottages, in the fields and in the small rooms -- there is the proper "standpoint" for the minister. Why otherwise, he asks, do we see many a highly-gifted preacher of our time, year-in and year-out, preach in his Church with all power, yet he lacks a congregation -- a congregation in the genuine Biblical sense of the word -- because he is a preacher before and over the congregation, and not in and among the congregation.⁴

Of his own sermons Tholuck testifies that they have not originated without the congregation but out of the congregation. Almost every time the experiences of the previous week among the members of the congregation have been the birth places which produced the basic idea underlying the sermon.⁵

4. Quoted in Doehring, op. cit., p. 76f.

5. Ibid., p. 77.

2. Drews, op. cit., p. 109.

3. Ibid., p. 109. Cf. Schellbach, op. cit., in his section "Die Bejahung der Gemeinde als Träger und Ziel der Predigt", pp. 86 ff.

The preacher should know his congregation through being with them in their ordinary working life. Doing this will teach him the proper manner of speaking in the pulpit. Tholuck calls this "the eloquence of a healthy understanding of men." He submits that the preacher should pursue his theme in the same manner that healthy common folk would do it, i.e. concretely. This gift is as lacking in our sermons in yet a higher degree as ^{is} the connection onto the life of the people.¹

We look into the language of Tholuck's concrete applications. In his first sermon on John 13:1-17, "Wash ye one another's feet," he calls upon his congregation to "look upon your friends, your relations, your servants, all with whom you have intercourse, in this point of view, viz., -- that you are not here to be ministered unto by them, but to minister to them."² Here not the specific actions, but the concrete recipients of the love we are to show, are named. In the next paragraph he asks, "Do you ask now, what is the expression of this ministering love?" He suggests that it is not confined to alms-giving, or indeed, merely to actions, for ministering love is "akin to compassion, akin to that feeling expressed by Paul, 'Every man should look upon the things of others,' sympathize in all their joys, all their cares, all their gifts, all their wants."³ In his sermon on Matthew 14:1-9, "She hath done what she could," Tholuck enumerates the good works which may be done: not only the giving of money and goods, but

1. Quoted in Witte, Ausgewaehlte Predigten, op. cit., p. 20.
 2. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 65.
 3. Ibid., p. 65.

247

"My brethren, without any outward means of wealth, you are able to give to your neighbour that which is much dearer to him than money; forbearance, sympathy, advice, comfort, example."²

Drews records that Tholuck preached on events in the Life of the congregation.² As university preacher, he referred at the appropriate times to the beginning of the semester. When in 1833 four divinity students committed suicide, Tholuck preached from Ezekiel 33:11 on "The Way of Death and the Way of Life." In 1837, when another student took his own life, Tholuck preached to this. He also treated from the pulpit events such as the Revolution, the Lutheran separation, the cholera epidemic. But not only that. Almost every sermon of Tholuck's grew out of impressions, experiences, conversations, which the daily association of his academic congregation brought him. Therefore his sermons had the "freshness of life" and the "breath of immediacy."³

Tholuck made his character sketches such that an easy identification could be made between the Biblical figures and his hearers. In his series of Passion sermons in which he describes those individuals prominent in the Passion week, etc., the hearer stands with Cai^aphas and Judas, Peter and Thomas, in their sin and unbelief, on basis of a common humanity.⁴

Tholuck's applications were largely concrete in terms of the language he used, illustrations from common life, and events relevant to the congregation. In addition to this, he knew the various levels of intellect and experience, and of

1. Ibid., p. 88.

2. Drews, op. cit., p. 115. Cf. for what follows, p. 115.

3. Doehring, op. cit., p. 86.

4. Tholuck, Light from the Cross, op. cit., p. 38.

whatever other classifications, which comprised his congregation, and sought to speak a language which all of them could understand.¹

But we must also say that Tholuck shared Schleiermacher's early desire to speak especially to "the cultured despisers of religion."² Indeed, Tholuck's "Preface to the second collection" of his Predigten ueber Hauptstuecke has the title "A few words concerning the sermon for the educated classes in our days". In this foreword, Tholuck makes several proposals in an effort to accomplish this "Throwing the bridge across". He complains that the words of the preacher have become difficult for the cultured to understand, due to their separation from the Church's and Bible's language of faith. The preacher should connect onto any thread of tradition held sacred by the cultured from their early memories -- reverence of the Bible, family prayers, a Bach chorale, an impression from a visit to the Cologne Cathedral -- which demonstrate that a religion which produced such results must have an inner kernel of truth.³

1. Doehring, op. cit., p. 86, quotes Tholuck as follows: "Nun halten wir zu denen, die keinen besonderen Himmelsweg machen fuer die Gelehrten und fuer die Ungelehrten, keine eigene Religion fuer die Gebildeten und fuer die Ungebildeten" ist oberster Grundsatz. Darum soll die Predigt "naehrend Brot nicht nur fuer die Gelehrten, sondern fuer alt und jung, fuer Vornehme und Geringe" nach seinen eigenen Worten sein. "Mutterwitz und Logik, die in den Dorfschulen wie in den Hoersaelen verstanden werden" wollen ihrer Sprache die Wuerze geben."

2. Drews says of Tholuck:

"In jener grossen Vorrede des zweiten Bandes stellt er an die Spitze den Satz: 'Wir muessen den 'Veraechtern der Religion unter den Gebildeten' die Haende entgegenstrecken' (S. X.); und in jener Vorrede von 1860 -- wir hoerten es schon -- spricht er vom 'Bruechenschlagen.'"

3. Tholuck, Hauptstuecke, op. cit., II, p. xviif.

"So muss also der Prediger neu aufbauen. Nicht das er selbst aus der hohen, festen Burg seines Glaubens an das Wort der Offenbarung herausgehen und herniedersteigen sollte auf jene weiten, baumlosen Flaechen, wo die Winde des Aufgangs und des Niedergangs ihr Spiel haben. Aber freundlich soll er zu den

3. Umherirrenden sich herabneigen, und lockend mit seinem Finger nach den Pfaden hindeuten, welche in die Burgh fuehren...
 Zu diesem Ende wird denn also zuerst das Verstaendniss der Schrift auf eine zugaengliche und ansprechende Weise aufgeschlo-
 ssen werden."
 "Fuer sie lege der Prediger die heilige Schrift aus, ohne alle andern Voraussetzungen als die eines Herzens, welches fuer rein Menschliches empfaenglich ist."

Then Tholuck praises Herder and Schleiermacher for having done that. In a time, he says, when Shakespeare and Goethe are more revered than Paul, the apostle's words become valid, "All is yours." As an English preacher said, "If I am Christ's so is also Gibbon mine, and a Saatfeld, that likewise bears fruit for Christ."¹

After an admonition for preachers to cease from pedantic and mummified presentations -- "dried up confectionery behind the glass cupboard" -- and an appeal for preaching on the things of life in conjunction with teaching from the pulpit, Tholuck urges this: If we want to bring our educated classes nearer the pulpit, we shall not be able to avoid frequenting the areas in which their lives are rooted, more often than it is the ordinary style to do.²

Paul, says Tholuck, who quoted Aratus and Epimenides in his sermon, will be our umbrella when the homileticians complain against and damn us. Another advantage to be won by this apologetic approach is that trust in the person of the preacher will grow. The preacher, says Tholuck, who has himself passed through the sufferings of a difficult and great

1. Ibid., p. xix.
 2. Ibid., p. xx.

time appears no more as a man of the dedicated caste, who speaks from the school; there speaks to us not merely the preacher, but the man.¹

Then Tholuck recommends, instead of single texts, the homily, and the exposition of Biblical books in a series. This would create a more personal relationship between the preacher and the people. More Church history should be brought into preaching. Finally, the sermon must not be the whole service of worship, but should be balanced with the liturgical forms suited to the taste of the cultured.

It is at once commendable that Tholuck avows his disinclination to step down from the strong fortress of faith in the Word of revelation, abandoning the theological ground, to the arid plains of neutrality, assuming the role of an apologist. It is good that he, like Schleiermacher, clearly saw that the theologian and the apologist do not stand on the same ground. His desire is to build a bridge from faith to the cultured, not by compromising the Scriptures, but by the preacher's kindly humbling himself to point the way to the path of faith. The methods by which this is done take the form of homiletical techniques which derive from the use of illustrations, etc., from the areas of literature and life known to the cultured.

All of this sounds quite modern, and we react in two ways. First, we feel that some preaching today is foolishness and offence -- but in the wrong way, and thus unnecessarily; it is not the foolishness and offence of the Gospel, but

1. Ibid., p. xx.

that of the preacher.¹ Second, there is, on the other hand, the offence and scandal of the Cross which may be threatened by the preacher's desire to preach a reasonable, palatable sermon. We ask if Tholuck's concern in this matter does not rise from the present-day anxiety, "How are we going to communicate the Gospel?" "How are we going to communicate and teach the heavenly truths to earthly (especially cultured) men?" seems to be Tholuck's concern; and this corresponds to the docetic heresy.² To be anxious about the "success" of the Gospel is basic unbelief. It is to fail to understand that preaching is the Word of God; it is to miss the point that Christ Himself is the preacher. Further, it is a denial of the Incarnation and of the unity of the Head and body of the Church to consider as primary the psychological and anthropological determinations of the sermon above the theological determination.³ The relevance of a sermon is the "proprium" of the Holy Spirit.⁴ Dull preaching is still another indication of a different false theology of preaching, but it cannot be corrected by an equally inadequate one. Where Tholuck goes astray is where he seeks a "connecting point" for faith. A glimpse of this theology is contained in Tholuck's belief, e.g., that sanctification, in a certain sense, establishes

1. Ritschl, D., op. cit., p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

"Die Predigt kann aber auch als die Aufgabe verstanden werden, die Herrlichkeit der Gottes Wahrheit in die Tiefe der menschlichen Situation hinunter zu predigen. Dies -- das Ideal der Lehrpredigt und Vertreter der Theorien ueber die Kommunikation -- entspricht der doketischen Haeresie."

3. Ibid., p. 65.

4. Ibid., p. 62.

peace between the children of the world and Christians, because the former are not only of the world, but have "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world". As often as the light of true sanctification begins to lighten in the Christian from without, so also that light begins to bear witness in many children of the world from within, that that light which Christ kindles is truth.¹ Tholuck uses a variety of expressions for this "light" in man, with which he seeks to establish a connecting point. It is the Spirit of God, who makes us hunger for the living bread.

"Thus, the very first condition, under which even the best Christian preaching can be effectual, is hunger; hunger after spiritual bread; for where hunger exists, there exists also the Spirit of God, which receives the Word."²

To the students in the congregation Tholuck asks, "Is your thirst after knowledge a thirst after God?" -- for all knowledge is from God, and we must be seekers after God if we are to be real inquirers; we must feel His truth inwardly.³

In his sermon on John 6:43-45, "The Father draweth Men to the Son," Tholuck proclaims to all faculties of the university that God is the apex of knowledge; all sciences are but satellites of the spiritual sun; and the image of God in us, the works of nature, and our consciences make us long for God, and draw us to him.⁴

1. Quoted in Drews, op. cit., p. 111.

2. Tholuck, University Sermons, op. cit., p. 46.

3. Ibid., pp. 59ff.

4. Ibid., p. 148f.

The first sermon in Tholuck's fourth volume of sermons is "The Thirst of Man to do the Will of God leads to Faith in Christ", John 7:16-17.¹ Jesus spoke to men who did not believe in Him, about faith in God in general. This shows us how to preach and teach the way of faith. We preach to those on the "border" of faith in this way. Another expression for Tholuck's point is -- "We are of the divine race".²

We submit in this place, as we did before, that there is no "Connecting point" in man which the preacher must somehow discover in order to hitch the Gospel on to it. It is the task of the preacher to interpret and preach as obediently and faithfully as he can -- obedient and faithful to the Word of God in Scripture as the prior determination. The congregation is, of course, the other determination of the preaching; but this follows from, and is subordinate to, the prior theological determination. Tholuck must be approved for his active life among the people of his parish; for this life among the people is integral to the preacher's task. But it is quite another thing to be overly concerned about the results and successes of preaching. When we begin to do this, we are sailing in docetic channels with a theology determined by an "anxiety" for "communicating the Gospel," and which is founded upon the alien philosophy that man has a "divine spark" which the preacher must fan into flame. This unnerves us, and, as was the case with Tholuck, we grope

1. Tholuck, Hauptstuecke, op. cit., IV, pp. 1-12.
 2. Quoted in Drews, op. cit., p. 112.

around for techniques by which to make our sermons palatable. And in the process, as again with Tholuck, we loose ourselves from our moorings in the Word of God, become disobedient to our proper task by virtue of seeking to launch out into a sphere in which we have no business. "The making present and the making alive is the 'proprium' of the Holy Spirit."¹ Such anxiety is bad theology, not only for its tempting us away from our proper obedience in preaching, but also because it stems from essential unbelief in the promises of God to preaching. Therefore we must reject and oppose all ideas of a "connecting point", all anxiety about "communication" and all notions that a "divine spark" dwells in man by nature.

G. Summary

In summary, we note that Tholuck began well to define the purpose of preaching -- growth in the service of the Word, strength for the week. But to say that its purpose is the "manifestation of truth to the heart and conscience" is to state a very abstract and subjective principle. Tholuck correctly intimates that preaching is not human, but godly, wisdom, an offence and a stone of stumbling. He properly termed it a sphere in which the Holy Spirit moves, but his formulation of it separates the Spirit from the Word. Quite properly, Tholuck suggests that the content of preaching is Scripture, and therefore Jesus Christ, but his concern therein is hardly more than the subjective appropriation of the reconciliation effected by Christ, a very one-sided emphasis.

1. Ritschl, D., op. cit., p. 62.

He proclaims that there is one revelation in Scripture, Jesus Christ. But in seeking to give a "spiritual" interpretation of a text, he often does not preach what the text says. Tholuck is quite right that the spirit wherein preaching is carried out is that of humility, faith, urgency. Further it was good that he was alive to the importance of concrete application in terms of speaking a language understandable to all, and of knowing the various levels and classifications of the people in his congregation. He taught and practiced the importance of the preacher's life among the people, and from that he learned how to preach to them. His denunciation of sterile, prosaic presentations in the pulpit is well taken. But the forgetfulness of his own affirmations of the scandal and foolishness of preaching, his anxiety over reaching the cultured, the prescription of various homiletical techniques as means thereto, and the theology underlying that -- finding a "connection point" by which to lay hold on the "divine spark" in man --, and thus the apparent failure to remember his own clear perception of the contradiction between the ground of the theologian and that of the apologist -- these we feel are Tholuck's weaknesses. Tholuck was a faithful preacher in his time, and contributed much to good preaching; and it is for this service to the Word that we should remember him.

Part VI, Chapter VIII - The Followers of Tholuck

A. Hermann Cremer (1834-1903)

A student and friend of Tholuck's was Hermann Cremer, who became one of his most famous followers. On one of their walks together, Tholuck put it into the mind of Cremer to write a theological lexicon of the New Testament Greek.¹ Cremer dedicated two editions of his lexicon to Tholuck, and he praised the quality of Tholuck's commentaries.² Tholuck's lectures on Romans were decisive for Cremer, his commentaries were Cremer's models, and he spoke of Tholuck's work as the "re-birth of exegesis".³

We noted that Schleiermacher neglected the Old Testament, but Tholuck and others led the movement to re-instate it in the theology of the nineteenth century. Cremer saw that basic to the theology of the New Testament was its Hebraic background, and he made the Old Testament the starting point for his exegesis of the New.⁴ In this way he carried out Tholuck's scheme of always thinking of the Old and New Testaments in terms of each other.⁵

Cremer's opinion of Tholuck is brought out in his review of Witte's biography of Tholuck's life. Cremer spoke of Tholuck as one of the most significant figures in the theology of the nine-

1. Haussleiter, Johannes, "Cremer", RE³, vol. 23, p. 329. Some critical questions on Cremer's whole procedure in the lexicon are found in James Barr's The Semantics of Biblical Language, pp. 238-244, 259ff.

2. Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon..., 1872, p. vii. "Hardly any even of the commonest NT conceptions has received any adequate investigation, biblical or theological, at the hands of the commentators. The commentaries of Tholuck, my dear Tutor, form, with a few others, a notable yet solitary exception."

3. Duncan, Robert C., "The Contribution of Hermann Cremer to Theological Hermeneutics", unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Edinburgh, 1958, p. 3f.

4. Ibid., p. 47f.

5. Ibid., p. 49.

teenth century, as a man of unwearied love and patience, and as a theologian of great influence upon the lives of his companions.¹ That Cremer was an intimate of Tholuck's may be gathered from the former's statement that only he who has not merely known Tholuck, but who has "experienced" him in close fellowship, will be able to think of him as one of those "who have died and yet live".²

Some of Tholuck's thoughts on the Old Testament re-appear in Cremer. Cremer, as Tholuck before him, speaks of images and types, promise and fulfilment.³ Cremer's view of "Heilsgeschichte" is an advance over Tholuck's process of ideas. In Cremer it is not progressive revelation or evolution of any kind, but the self-manifestation of God in the events of Israel's history.⁴ Prophecy for Cremer does not mean the fore-telling of events, but the prior proclamation of salvation in Jesus Christ.⁵ Like Hengstenberg, Hofmann, Beck, and Tholuck, Cremer believed in an organic unity of the Old and New Testaments.⁶ Like them, he pointed to Jesus Christ as that unity.

Again like Tholuck, Cremer honoured the Reformers and their tradition of Biblical interpretation. From Flacius he learned that the Scriptures are a whole; from Bengel, that Scripture is its own interpreter; and from the Reformers themselves and their followers, that Scripture is perspicuous.⁷ Cremer felt that humanistic concepts had hidden the meaning of the Biblical

1. Cremer, Review of Witte's Das Leben...Tholucks, in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1889, II, p. 399.

2. Ibid., p. 399.

3. Duncan, op. cit., pp. 126ff., 147f., 18, 223-227.

4. Ibid., p. 146.

5. Ibid., p. 148.

6. Ibid., p. 203, 62ff.

7. Ibid., p. 16.

language, making it difficult to understand.¹ The function of exegesis, therefore, is to strip away the alien notions, in order to let the Bible speak for itself.²

But Cremer was also attracted to Schleiermacher's concept of hermeneutics, that theological and philological studies should go together, that thought and speech are different sides of the same coin, and that one elicits meaning from a writer by means of psychological intuition. Robert Duncan points out that Cremer agrees with Schleiermacher at every step, in method but not in evaluation of the results; for Schleiermacher separated the philological from the theological results, and substituted history and the psychology of religion for theology.³ Schleiermacher's great service to hermeneutics was the discovery that the outward form of a word is not always the measure of its content; but he should have gone a step beyond his point, that the word is a sign of a thought, to have seen that behind the thought is an object.⁴

In spite of his great emphasis upon the objective facts of revelation, Cremer, like Schleiermacher and Tholuck before him, was not immune to subjective formulations. This appears in a particularly dangerous way in his Reply to Harnack. "Does that Christ-picture that criticism draws satisfy our wants?" Our moral wants is intended here. "Though the modern Christ may satisfy the current views of the cultured, and of all who absolve them-

1. Torrance, T.F., unpublished lectures on "The History of Dogmatic Theology", Edinburgh, November 25th, 1958.
2. Ibid., same date.
3. Duncan, op. cit., p. 20ff.
4. Ibid., p. 22.

selves, He certainly does not satisfy our wants." "Will the Christ of the New Testament satisfy them?"¹ Cremer has chosen a very disadvantageous position from which to attack the subjectivists. It is the same type of danger to which he exposes himself in Beyond the Grave, when he asserts that "The resurrexion from death is guaranteed to us by the facts of our inner life", by "inward experience"; "Everything agrees with our inner experience, as is ever wont with God's word."²

Schleiermacher could well have said that. But we must say in defense of Cremer, that when he said "inward experience", his meaning differs from Schleiermacher's. For Cremer it was the experience of the living person of Christ, confronting and claiming him, which is the content and object of faith.

"But where this experience comes - it comes not to everyone - it is only the first step of the experience of Christ. This is quite different. We hear of Him, we perceive His Word, we know His deeds, His history - we hear Him! He stands living before our eyes, not as a recollection from childhood, but as One with whom we have to deal, man against man. It is not that He was one who concerns us, He is one - nearer than father and mother and brother and friend. Since He is risen He lives before us, for us, with us, as soon as the Word concerning Him comes to us and demands our faith, our acknowledgment of His truth".³

Cremer was not one to attempt a facile bridging of the chasm which keeps man from being God. Schleiermacher spoke of the "Christian spirit", but Cremer, of the "Spirit of God".⁴ It may have been that for Schleiermacher, the "Christian spirit", man's spirit, really was the only kind of spirit there was. But Cremer speaks of the "Spirit of

1. Cremer, Reply to Harnack, pp. 102-115.
2. Cremer, Beyond the Grave, pp. 65-67.
3. Cremer, Reply to Harnack, p. 256.
4. Duncan, op. cit., p. 22.

God" standing over against him, not at all as something his own, least of all his own spirit.

From Schleiermacher Cremer gained the insight that theology is a scientific discipline. Cremer strove for a scientific method.¹ But as opposed to Schleiermacher, Cremer found that scientific theology must devote itself to its proper Object and Content, Jesus Christ. Cremer's enemies accused him of being unscientific when he brought in "Biblical realism",² eschatology, "Heilsgeschichte", etc. But his reply was that their procedure was unscientific, because they failed to understand the background of the New Testament, and Jesus Christ as the object of faith and content of theology.³ It was unscientific of liberal theologians, said Cremer, to suppose that they were working without presuppositions as impassionate judges of Scripture.⁴ He submitted, e.g., that it was unscientific of Baur and his school to understand the acts of God in the history of Israel as an evolutionary process determined by the Hegelian dialectic.⁵

Against the prevalent note of subjectivism in the theology of the nineteenth century, Cremer pointed the way to objective

1. Ibid., p. 23.
2. By "Biblical realism" we mean that school of theologians, notably Cremer, Kähler, and Schlatter, who emphasized the "given-ness" or objectivity of Christ as the One who confronts us in His Word in grace and judgment. It was a protest against romantic subjectivism which laid stress on inward experience and religious feelings.
3. Torrance, op. cit., November 25th, 1958.
4. Ibid., same date. "Cremer stand bei den Geisteswissenschaftlern seiner Zeit weithin in hoher Achtung." His whole life long he fought against the "Aufklärung". W. Koepf, "Cremer", RGG³, I, p. 1882.
5. Torrance, op. cit., November 25th, 1958.

events. He emphasized that Christ, the historical and present Christ, is the object of faith. Christ is not the subject of faith, as if His own faith were the faith we should copy. He is the object to which our faith is directed. Not the religion which He practiced, but a personal relationship with Him - this is faith.¹ "We have no more to deal with credibility, but only of the actuality."² Therefore, Cremer stressed the resurrection of Jesus. Everything depends on Christ's resurrection, otherwise all is dreams.³ Against Harnack's rejection of miracles, Cremer points out that miracles are recorded in Scripture precisely because they disrupt the natural order.⁴ Jesus Christ makes all things new, and the miracles "become only intelligible in connection with His Gospel and His person"; "we believe not in Jesus for the sake of the miracles, but we believe in the miracles for the sake of Jesus."⁵ Cremer suggests that to acknowledge the miracles of the Incarnation and Resurrection of Jesus is to acknowledge the fact of our own pardon and redemption.⁶ Those great events of Jesus Christ have not just happened out in space, objective and remote from us. For when we can say, "Yes, we believe this", something has in fact happened to us. Thus the subjective condition of our believing is because of the objective reality of Christ. We exist for redemption, i.e., for miracles to happen to us.⁷ For Cremer, the Christian faith is a paradox, a contradiction to all logical and moral sequence, and yet the truth, which

1. Cremer, Reply to Harnack, p. 252.
 2. Ibid., p. 123.
 3. Ibid., p. 143f.
 4. Ibid., p. 202.
 5. Ibid., p. 206f.
 6. Ibid., p. 164.
 7. Duncan, op. cit., p. 148ff.

one can believe only as children also believe.¹ The paradox of believing is the paradox of grace, free grace over against our sin. The mistake of Harnack was that he missed the paradoxical character of the Gospel.² Cremer was one of the few in his time to emphasize the sheer freedom of grace, coming, paradoxically as it does, to sinners in the midst of their sin. For him the doctrine of justification is the key to the whole Scripture.³ Cremer insists that justification requires that judgment come upon us; grace must attack and condemn us if it is to save us. It is the God of judgment whom we recognize again in the God of salvation, and we acknowledge Him as such.⁴

This doctrine of grace leads us to a hermeneutical rule, viz., that we should come to Scripture prepared to be contradicted, judged, called in question by God's word of salvation. This is worlds apart from the thinking of Schleiermacher, e.g., for whom interpretation was such an easy task. Whatever was contradictory in Scripture he took to be a fault of the writer. The romantic, idealistic notion that pious feelings are communications from God, and that all we need to do to interpret the Bible is to do the grammatical work and intuit the mental state of the writer, misleads us. Indeed, the attitude of superiority to Scripture prevents us from really hearing it out. It is said that the Schleiermacher-man has not heard the

1. Cremer, Reply to Harnack, pp. vii, xiii.

2. Ibid., p. 134. Christ is the whole paradox of faith. In God is the last "Urparadox", the whole incomprehensible divine love, the merciful forgiveness of sins in the historical fact of Christ and His Cross unites all paradoxes. That is the simple wonder of God's economy of salvation. Koepf, op. cit., p. 1882.

3. Cremer, Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, p. vii.

4. Cremer, "Dogmatische Prinzipienlehre", Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, III, ed. Otto Zöckler, p. 64f.: "Die christliche Verkündigung als Heilsverkündigung hebt die Wahrh-

Gospel and will not need to do so. Perhaps that is because his ears are closed to words of judgment against him. The words of contradiction are the words which we really understand and remember. When we are prepared to be contradicted by the word of grace and judgment, then we are ready to interpret and understand the Bible. So it was with Cremer.¹

In summary, we have seen that Cremer preserved and in many cases improved upon some of the good insights of Tholuck. Both felt that exegesis of the Scriptures must be carried on by believing theologians, not merely philologists. Cremer shared Tholuck's concern for the Old Testament, and improved upon his "Heilsgeschichte". Cremer's "Biblical Realism" was of great significance - the insistence that Christ is the object of faith and the content of Scripture and, therefore, of theology. To interpret the Bible from this stand-point is the only possible scientific method. But above all, Cremer's understanding of grace in terms of judgment and forgiveness is a real corrective for any high-handed hermeneutics. The words which humble and assault us are really the words which we understand the best. Precisely these words are spoken to us in Scripture, as the Word of God in the Person of Jesus Christ, a Word of judgment and grace.

B. Martin Kähler (1835-1912)

Another student of Tholuck's was Martin Kähler. On the occasion of Tholuck's death, Kähler quoted Rothe to the effect that Tholuck surpassed all men in the service of the Church.²

eit des Gerichtsbewusstseins nicht auf, bestätigt sie vielmehr, und Glaube an Gott in heilsschaffende Gnade in Christo nötigt zu einer so energischen Vollziehung des Gerichtsbewusstseins, dass eine stärkere Bejahung als eben durch diesen Glauben nicht möglich ist."

1. Meyer, A., "Bibelwissenschaft", RGG², I, p. 1080: "Hermann Cremer, die neutestamentliche und dogmatische Wissenschaft eng miteinander verknüpfte in dem Gedanken 'Gericht und Gnade'".

2. Kähler, August Tholuck, Ein Lebensabriss, 1877, p. 1.

From Tholuck, Beck, and Julius Müller, Kähler learned to go to Scriptures as the ground for theology. Tholuck and Müller freed him for Hegelian and theosophical speculations.¹ Kähler found the conviction of faith in Tholuck, and in the personal relationship of the two men Kähler was benefitted greatly.²

As with Cremer, so with Kähler, the direction of Tholuck's work was carried forward by his student. Kähler holds to the objectivity of the Biblical witness. The Person of Jesus Christ Himself confronts us in the Bible. He is not the object of our evaluation, but the self-proclamation of God.³ The Bible is the element from which preaching grows ("Urkunde der Predigt"); it wakens faith in God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ; and thus faith comes from preaching.⁴

Perhaps the most important application of this is in Kähler's Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus, which exposed the weakness of the Life of Jesus Movement.⁵ It is both futile and false to search the New Testament for biographical details of Jesus' life. This misses the whole point. Kähler was well enough acquainted with the historian's method and with the New Testament to know that the latter was no document for such investigations. For

1. Lüttger, D.W., "Martin Kähler, Gedächtnisrede", Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 17/1, 1913, p. 13.

2. Kähler, Zeit und Ewigkeit, p. 3. "Wer hat im Anfange des vorigen Jahrhunderts mehr Sonne durch das Evangelium gezeugt als August Neander und August Tholuck!"

3. Weber, Otto, Grundlage der Dogmatik, p. 166.

4. Kähler, Zur Bibelfrage, p. 40., Zeit und Ewigkeit, p. 27.

5. Robinson, James M., A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 31.

the New Testament was written not as an historically "objective" account of events in the life of Jesus (as if such were possible), but as a faithful witness to Him who was and did the deeds of God, and who Himself by means of this very witness should arouse faith in those who would hear it. We have no sources for a biographical life of Jesus of Nazareth according to the standards of historical science, but we do have a trustworthy picture of the Saviour for the faith of believers.¹ He Himself is author of this picture, and by it - by the faithful witness of the writers of the New Testament - He wins us to faith in Him.² We do not and cannot go behind this picture to find some neutral biographical facts, for the "real" Jesus is the historical (geschichtliche) biblical Christ who meets us in the witness of the apostles.³

Kähler stressed the fact that Jesus Christ is witnessed to not only in the Gospels or the New Testament, but also in the Old Testament. We have to do with "the Christ" of the whole Bible".⁴ The Old Testament is the preparation for the New Testament in

1. Kähler, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus, 1928, p. 49.

2. Ibid., p. 87.

3. But it is important to note that with Kähler we do not overlook the point that the facts of faith occur as real happenings in concrete history, Paul Althaus reminds us that today's emphasis in the theology differs from that of Kähler's day. Kähler had to say that the Gospels are not primarily sources, but they are testimonies; in our day it needs to be said that the Gospels are also narratives. (Paul Althaus, Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today, p. 24.) Kähler held firmly that the Biblical records had to do with "the completest reality" (p. 25). The Biblical picture of Jesus is perfectly real, clear, and consistent, to which everyone who has a sense of reality will agree (p. 26f.) "The revelatory character of the history of Jesus is not known by means of historical reflection or historical reasoning. But...it is not known without these" (p. 34).

4. Kähler, Historischer Jesus, p. 124.

that Jesus' work of salvation is pre-figured in the Old Covenant, in this history of Israel.¹ Kähler points out that Jesus established the Jewish canon as an effective power in the history of mankind; that the Old Testament was Jesus' Bible throughout His entire life on earth; and that we should take note of how He used the Old Testament, in order that we may learn from Him how it should be interpreted.²

It was Kähler who introduced into theological discussion the "three forms" of the Word of God, which Barth has further developed.³ The Bible is the source-book for instruction and proclamation in the Church; it is the document which bears witness to the historical (geschichtlichen) revelation.⁴

Kähler emphasized the scientific nature of the theological task. His main systematical work is entitled Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre. Theology is a scientific endeavour in that Jesus Christ is the object of theology, and therefore all theological statements must proceed from our knowledge of Him.⁵ For this reason, Scripture is normative for Christian doctrine, as well as for witness and confession, because it is the document which tells of the revelation and of the original confession.⁶

1. Kähler, Zur Bibelfrage, p. 124. "Das Heilandswerk Jesu ist in der Geschichte Israels planvoll vorbereitet und durch die der heiligen Schrift Alten Bundes niedergelegte Erkenntnis dieser Vorbereitung in seiner offenbarenden Bedeutung bedingt."

2. Ibid., pp. 126-142. Kähler cautions us, however, against reading into Old Testament passages references to Christ. He suggests that the Holy Spirit, as well as Christ, is the continuity between Old and New Covenants, and a doctrine of Scripture can as well be based upon Him (p. 167).

3. Niemeier, G., Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit, p. 56f.

4. Ibid., p. 44ff.

5. Kähler, Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre, p. 26. "Gegenstand der Theologie ist Gott in Christo d.h. in seiner Offenbarung zum Heile der Menschheit mit ihren Wirkungen innerhalb der letzteren." Niemeier, op. cit., p. 32.: "Alle theologischen Aussagen setzen vielmehr die geschichtliche Gottesoffenbarung in Christus voraus."

6. Kähler, Wissenschaft, p. 33.

This for Kähler excludes "natural theology". One can "discover" God in nature, but only after he has first known Him in Christ.¹ Theology must be carried on in the Church, and not elsewhere, because the Church is where Christian proclamation is heard. An individual apart from the Church cannot have any theology at all, for theology is the affair of the Christian community.²

Another contribution of Kähler's to theology is his doctrine of reconciliation. Ritschl had thought of sin as ignorance ("Unwissenheit"); and of God as love, whose property it is to forgive sin without any cost to Himself or to the sinner. With these presuppositions no serious doctrine of atonement could be had. But Kähler came forward with a Biblical understanding of sin as the irrational, discontinuous, "surd" element, which only God Himself can overcome at great cost. The presupposition of reconciliation is the disruption of fellowship between God and man through man's sin.³ Man sins not because of ignorance, but through self-will - and this is common to every man.⁴ "Reconciliation relates itself to the guilt of sin which calls forth the wrath of God, and thus it (sin) separates us from God."⁵ Unlike Ritschl, Kähler speaks of an historic wrath of God as the divine action against the breaking of fellowship which He has willed to have with man.⁶

1. Niemeier, op. cit., p. 32.

2. Kähler, Zeit und Ewigkeit, p. 2.

3. Gräder, Karl, Die Versöhnungslehre Käblers in ihrem Verhältnis zu Hofmann und Ritschl, 1922, p. 7.

4. Ibid., p. 18.

5. Kähler, Versöhnung durch Christum, 1907, p. 18.

6. Gräder, op. cit., p. 24.

But the possibility of reconciliation is in the saving love of God revealed in Christ, which aims at and accomplishes the reconciliation of the world and the founding of a new covenant of God with man, as a remaining-open door of access through the mediatorship of the crucified and resurrected Christ.¹

God alone is the reconciler. This is important to Kähler, for he considers as not only un-Biblical, but as anti-Biblical, any suggestion that it is God who is reconciled to man, or is in any way appeased or compensated for the sin of man.²

God brings reconciliation through the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. The atonement depends upon the work of Christ. Here Kähler turns to the Biblical witness, and notes that Paul understands reconciliation as the total product of the life-work of Christ, in so far as through it the relation of man to God becomes changed.³ This life's work of Christ Kähler calls Christ's obedience to His call (Berufgehorsam). Kähler, following Hofmann, makes no distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ. But Kähler goes a step farther than Hoffman, and notes that in the call of Jesus lay also the task of representing sinful humanity.⁴

Kähler stresses the point that when we speak of Christ's lifework, we are speaking of events in concrete history. "This reconciliation of the world", he says, "forms first a) as an historic fact the mid-point of the economy of salvation, and

1. Niemeier, op. cit., p. 114.
2. Gräder, op. cit., p. 44.
3. Kähler, Versöhnung, p. 9. In this connection, Kähler refers to κατὰ ἁλλήλοισιν (1 Cor. 7:11) and ἐξιλύκεσθαι. But for a more detailed study of the relevant words, see Kähler's Das Wort Versöhnung im Sprachgebrauche der kirchlichen Lehre, 1898.
4. Gräder, op. cit., p. 60f. Kähler, Wissenschaft, p. 360.

has its historic completion, in the ever widening and becoming-perfect 'Heilsgeschichte'."¹ We are told, however, not to concentrate upon Christ's death, when we think of reconciliation, to the exclusion of the rest of His Life, especially the resurrection and ascension. Neither are we to limit our discussion to the facts of faith in the historic life of Christ, and neglect His present activity of reconciliation as the living Lord.²

When Kähler speaks of reconciliation, he always has in mind the whole world as the object of reconciliation. "The consciousness of the need of salvation is at the same time full consciousness of one's personal belonging to our world...The world's need of salvation corresponds alone to salvation for the world; thus it is appropriate that the plan of salvation becomes manifest as a plan for the world."³ "The God of history, Jehovah, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, cannot reconcile us with Himself, without reconciling the world with Himself..."

"It is a one-sided apprehension of this relationship (reconciliation), when one acknowledges merely the meaning of the work of reconciliation for each individual; for in (Christ) the reconciliation of the world with God is executed, and in this manner, the universal positive religion founded."⁴

We recall that Tholuck wrestled with the problem of universal salvation, and though he decided in favour of the proposition dogmatically, he felt that it could not be supported exegetically. Kähler, on the other hand, considers the universal aspect integral to reconciliation, and this for him has important implications for eschatology, mission, and the Church. He says in Versöhnung durch Christum:

1. Kähler, Wissenschaft, p. 311. He uses "geschichtlich" = historic.

2. Kähler, Versöhnung, p. 29f. "Die Versöhnung ist vornehmlich durch das stellvertretende Strafopfer Christi am Kreuze vollzo-

gen; allein man darf seinen Vollzug nicht auf den Tod Christi ausser Zusammenhang mit seiner Auferstehung beschränken; nicht das einmalige geschichtliche Werk Christi, sondern der erhöhte lebendige Christus vermittelt fortgehend die Versöhnung, weis sich jenes Werk in seinem geschichtlichen Leben vollzogen hat."

3. Kähler, Wissenschaft, p. 307.

4. Kähler, Versöhnung, p. 29, 36.

"The reconciliation of the world is alone that which guarantees to us the perfection of the world through its Creator."¹ It "establishes the right and duty for the outer and inner mission in their manifold forms."² It "gives to Church Christendom its justification over against all rigorous separatism and all sentimental aristocratism of a Christian colouring."³ Thus the preaching of reconciliation "means certainly not the gathering of pious souls...as a special category of men", distinct and separate from others, but rather it means "to offer (to all) the free remission of sins..."⁴

Kähler firmly opposes those who believe that the possibility of faith is not for all.⁵

In conclusion, it is clear from what we have said that Martin Kähler is a very impressive theologian. He learned from Tholuck from a personal relationship with him, and he also carried forward some of Tholuck's main thoughts. But Kähler went beyond Tholuck in understanding the Christological witness of the Bible and in the doctrine of reconciliation. Like Tholuck, he insisted on the importance of the Old Testament witness to Christ, and upon God's action in concrete history. Kähler contributed to theological method by engaging in the scientific theology of "Biblical realism".

1. Ibid., p. 52.

2. Ibid., p. 56.

3. Ibid., p. 60.

4. Ibid., p. 63.

5. Ibid., p. 64f.

C. Adolph Schlatter (1852-1938)

Though Schlatter himself was not a student of Tholuck's, he is a member of the circle of "Biblical realists". Cremer, Kähler, and also Schlatter sat under J.T. Beck in Tübingen. All were kindred spirits to Tholuck.

For Schlatter, the Bible is better and greater than we can ever say, because the living Christ is its unity, and He Himself meets us in its words.¹ Therefore the Bible is not dead letter; it comes from the Holy Spirit and leads us to faith.² The Bible is a human book; men witness to what God does; this is not the weakness, but the glory of Scripture.³ It is God's gift to us all, and it is our duty to read it; it makes us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ.⁴

Schlatter never forgot that he stood under the Word of God in Scripture, and that he must expound it.⁵ He felt that the purpose of the study of the New Testament was "to bring the hearers into contact with the New Testament history."⁶ He understood his work to be the "repetition of the New Testament words", rather than engagement in theological controversies or the formulation of hypotheses.⁷ He refused to put the New Testament into any sort of system, but was content to see and make known the words and events of the New Testament.⁸

1. Schlatter, Einleitung in die Bibel, 1901, p. 543, 548, 8; Das chrisliche Dogma, 1911, p. 403.

2. Schlatter, Einleitung, p. 546, 550.

3. Ibid., p. 546.

4. Ibid., p. 5.

5. Davey, F.N., "Brief Introductory Note " to Schlatter's The Church in the New Testament Period, a translation of Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit, 1926, by Paul P. Levertoff, 1955, p. vii.

6. Luck, Ulrich, Kerygma und Tradition in der Hermeneutik Adolph Schlatters, 1955, p. 39.

7. Ibid., p. 9.

8. Kittel, G., "Gedenkrede", in Adolph Schlatter, Gedächtnisheft der deutschen Theologie, p. 13.

Schlatter saw that the New Testament cannot be understood apart from its Hebraic background. Of this he made a thorough study, as can be seen from an examination of The Church in the New Testament Period,¹ etc. Indeed, his whole work in theology and his commentaries on the New Testament can hardly be thought of apart from his Hebraic studies.² As a student of the New Testament who was also familiar with Judaism, he was qualified to open a new way for investigation of the New Testament.³

Lüttgert refers to Schlatter's exegesis as "pneumatic exegesis", in the tradition of Luther, Calvin, Bengel, and Menken.⁴ By this Lüttgert means "believing" exegesis, and not an arbitrary, subjective kind.⁵ In fact, Schlatter (as well as Luther, Calvin, et al) is a loud spokesman for the objectivity of exegesis. That is, we should come to Scripture prepared to hear, not to question.⁶ The task of the exegete and the dogmatician is to listen to what the text says.⁷

Schlatter takes the content of the proclamation of the New Testament to be God's activity. "In the New Testament there is a great history of God" - what He spoke and did.⁸ In Christ, God reconciles us, gives us fellowship with Himself, reigns over and provides for the congregation and for all humanity. Each text is

1. E.g., pp. 18,20,39,56,64ff., 74, 80ff.
 2. Tebbe, W., "Schlatter", Evangelische Kirchenlexikon, iii, 1959, p. 800.
 3. Traub, Fr., RGG², V, p. 166. Cf. Schlatter's Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit, p. 120.
 4. Lüttgert, Wilhelm, "Adolph Schlatter als Theologe", Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie (henceforth abbreviated BFCT), 37/1, 1932, p. 44.
 5. Cf. on the term "pneumatic exegesis", Otto Piper, Current Trends in Continental Theology, 1934 (1960).
 6. Lüttgert, op. cit., p. 42.
 7. Althaus, Paul, "Adolph Schlatters Gabe an die systematische Theologie" in Gedächtnisheft, p. 33.
 The first question is always: "Was sagt der Text selbst?" Theodore Schrenk, "Adolph Schlatter und das Pfarramt", Gedächtnisheft, p. 42.
 8. Ibid., p. 42.

a piece of this happening, a part of this history.¹ For Schlatter, reality means happening,² and this Hebraic thought comes from his observation that the events of the Bible are those of concrete history. Moreover, history is grounded upon the Incarnation and has its reality in Christ.³ Revelation happens only in history, for history is the sphere in which persons act. God acts thus (as a person) in "Heilsgeschichte". That these salvific events took place in past history does not mean that they are irrelevant for the present. On the contrary,

"The unique characteristic of the Kerygma of the Gospels is the fact that it has to do with an action of God which is completed, but which nevertheless meets (us) in the Kerygma as present history (gegenwärtige Geschichte)."⁴

The Gospel is the proclamation which God Himself accomplishes.⁵ God proclaims this Gospel, Christ proclaims it. The subject of proclamation, God, and the object of proclamation, man, never change. Therefore proclamation is always relevant. It is always in the present. The pastor is the mouth through which Christ Himself proclaims the Gospel. The apostle is one whom Jesus Himself sends.

Theology for Schlatter is observation ("Beobachtung"). The theologian should watch to see God at work in His revelation in Christ, and in the whole "Heilsgeschichte" of the Bible. But

1. Ibid., p. 43.

2. Schrenk, Theodor, "Schlatters Zeugnis vom zweifachen Werk Gottes" in Ein Lehrer der Kirche, p. 38. "Ein theologisches Denken, dass seinen Stoff nicht aus der Geschichte holt, ist rettungslos verloren und wird zur Begriffsdichtung." "Die Wirklichkeit war für Schlatter ein Geschehen. Ihm war auch die Bibel nicht ein Buch, das aus Sprüchen zusammengesetzt ist, sondern sie war ihm Zeugnis von einem Handeln Gottes mit den Menschen und von einem Handeln der Menschen mit Gott. Gott war ihm ein gebender, wirkender Gott, nicht einer, der weit, weit weg sitzt und aus der Ferne sich notiert, was die Theologen Jerusalems Gutes tun."

3. Luck, op. cit., p. 48.

4. Ibid., p. 49.

5. Schrenk, Gedächtnis, p. 43f.

Schlatter does not limit the material which theology uses to the Scriptures. For God speaks and acts in nature and in history. Schlatter felt that, in saying that Christology alone is revelation, there is the danger that we should slight God's creation.¹ Therefore, according to Horst Beintker, Schlatter's theology of observation led him simultaneously ("zugleich") to the word of Jesus and his witnesses, and to the witnesses outside of Jesus, viz., nature and history.² The first function of a theologian is the observation of reality. It is not true, however, that Schlatter advocates "natural theology". He makes it clear that we may speak of the knowledge of God only when He has made Himself known through His actual deeds; we know God through God Himself, i.e., through His revelation.³ This revelation is the object of dogmatics.⁴

Schlatter was no "confessionalist". He made a three-point attack upon the "Confessionalism" of his day: 1. The unity of the Church rests ^{not} upon unity of doctrine, but upon unity of faith. 2. Not the confessing Church, but Jesus Christ Himself is the highest object of faith. 3. Confessional polemics often involve theological arguments which have only a subjective foundation.⁵ Faith in Christ, not theological confessions, determines one's belonging to the Church.⁶ But it may be argued that Schlatter was a child of the Reformation in the best sense. Though he criticizes Calvin, Luther, and their followers on various points,

1. Althaus, Gedächtnis, p. 29.

2. Beintker, Horst, Die Christenheit und das Recht bei Adolph Schlatter, 1957, p. 16.

3. Schlatter, Das christliche Dogma, p. 11f.

4. Ibid., p. 11.

5. Mülhaupt, Erwin, "Das reformierte Erbe in den Händen Adolph Schatters", Gedächtnisheft, p. 40.

6. Ibid., p. 38.

273

Schlatter's theology, like Calvin's, tries to apprehend reality in nature, history, and the Bible;¹ It seeks to be open and unbound to prescribed formulations. Far from being a heretic in the Reformed tradition, Schlatter understood predestination and the Lord's Supper, e.g., in much the same way^{as} Calvin did.² Schlatter's concern, according to Bodelschwingh,³ was that theologians ought to take time to look to Jesus themselves, and not "just sit on the Reformation stool", for God is acting yet!

That Schlatter was original and independent did not mean that he carried on his work outside the Church. Just the opposite is true. His works are written for the Church, with an understanding of the Church.⁴ His chief desire was to proclaim the word of Jesus. On basis of the New Testament, Schlatter spoke of "the character of the Church as a community."⁵ He denied that "we theologians" are the Church, and his concern was the local congregation.⁶ He understood the Church to be created by Jesus Christ, and called into freedom under His authority.⁷

We noted that Schlatter stressed the objective character of revelation in concrete history, as the content of proclamation and as the material of dogmatics. In dogmatics we must "observe" and in exegesis, we must read what is there in the text. There is no mention of feeling or inner experiences. Schlatter was

1. Ibid., p. 38.

2. Ibid., p. 38f.

3. Bodelschwingh, in Ein Lehrer der Kirche, p. 45.

4. Lütgert, op. cit., p. 52. Cf. Rudolph Bretzger in Gedächtnisheft

5. Schrenk, Gedächtnisheft, p. 46.

6. Ibid., p. 46.

7. Schlatter, Dogma, p. 383.

aware that subjectivism had been carried into theology. He prepared an address on the weakness of Cartesian philosophy, in which he observed that the criterion of "clear and distinct ideas" ("Vorstellungen") gives no objective standard of truth.¹ If this is true of Descartes' formulation, it is equally true of that of Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, Schleiermacher - and of all who sought certainty in reason, feeling, intuition, or by any other subjective means. It was no wonder that Schlatter sought to separate theology from philosophy, by grounding theology upon the events of Christ's life, upon God's activity in concrete history - in order that theology may be the "observing of reality".

Thus we have seen how well Adolph Schlatter fits into the circle of "Biblical realists", and how he furthered what Cremer and Kähler worked upon, much of which they received, if only in germinal form, from Tholuck and men of like persuasion. Schlatter's doctrine of Scripture pointed to Christ as the unity and living force of the Bible. His method of New Testament study centred upon God's deeds of salvation in history, and was informed by his Hebraic studies. His hermeneutics was the careful reading of the text and the obedient hearing of it. His theology was grounded upon the Bible and found its object in Christ. He was a Church theologian, doing his work within the Church and for the Church.

1. Schlatter, "Die philosophische Arbeit seit Cartesius", BFCT 10/- 4,5, 1906, p. 20.

Part VII, Chapter IX

An Evaluation of Tholuck's Hermeneutics

"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever" -
so begins Karl Barth's chapter on Tholuck.¹ The main ques-
tion of hermeneutics is "What think ye of Christ?" It is
our understanding of Scriptures that they "testify of" Him,
that the Scriptures are the antiphonal choirs witnessing in
anticipation (Old Testament) and recollection (New Testament)
to Jesus Christ.² Therefore we make our evaluation of Tho-
luck's hermeneutics in terms of Him. We begin by asking what
Tholuck thought of Christ.

From the outset we have called attention to Tholuck's
passion for Christ. We observed that early in life Tholuck
adopted Zinzendorf's motto, "I have but one passion - and
that is He and He alone" (Chapter I). He had hoped to ex-
press this passion in the mission work. But when health
prevented him, his zeal took the form of personal evangelism
among his students, missionary meetings and preaching. If
Christ was the passion of his life, surely it could be expected

-
1. In Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, p.459.
 2. Van Rad, G., "Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments",
Evangelische Theologie, July/August, 1952, Heft 1/2.

that the same would have a large place in his writings on the Scriptures. Such was the case, for in his doctrine of Scripture Tholuck understands that Christ is "the sum and substance of the Old Testament",¹ just as He is that of the New (Chapter III). We noted also (Chapter IV) that religious experiences in many cases became a hermeneutical tool for Tholuck. He laid great stress upon the "inward feelings", and indeed these were a part of his philosophy and life (Chapter I). To be sure, Tholuck's passion for Christ was deeply involved in these subjective feelings and experiences. In addition Tholuck often expressed the unity of the Old and New Testaments in terms of Christ (Chapter V). He noted the various "types" - prophecy, priesthood, sacrificial system, cultic celebrations, etc. - of Christ in the Old Testament. Though a product of the Hegelian dialectic, and though the name of Christ is not integrally bound up with it, a "Heilsgeschichte" is put forth by Tholuck in which there is a movement toward salvation which Tholuck understands as salvation through Christ. Indeed, Tholuck speaks of salvation at some times and Jesus Christ at other times as the unity of the two Testaments. Tholuck regards the content of preaching (Chapter VII) to be the Scriptures and Jesus Christ. His theme is faith in reconciliation, and even though the emphasis falls more upon the person who

1. It is true, of course, that Tholuck becomes so involved in the motifs of the Old Testament that he fails to properly elaborate this point in his work, Die Bibel. Cf. table of contents of it.

has the faith than the One who brings the reconciliation, it is still faith in Christ that is being considered. In the same chapter Tholuck's use of Scripture indicates that he holds to one revelation, and that is in Jesus Christ. These are the chief points in Tholuck's Christology.

The problems which Tholuck places before us are indeed quite modern. One of these is the question of the unity of Scripture, i.e., how are the Old and New Testaments related to each other in terms of a unifying principle. It is put forth in many different ways today. It is one of the issues invariably discussed in our most recent books and articles on hermeneutics. In the symposium edited by A. Richardson and W. Schweitzer, Biblical Authority for Today, e.g., several writers speak to this subject. C.H.Dodd says that the history of the Old Covenant discloses its meaning only in light of the New. Judgment and mercy in the Old Testament are analogous to Christ's death and resurrection (p.159). G. Florovsky suggests that the covenant culminates in the Incarnation, and that revelation is the history of the covenant (p.167). John Marsh finds the hermeneutical principle given in Scripture itself to be the "gracious redeeming activity of God", and that the Old and New Testaments have the same God as subject, offering the same salvation by the same Saviour through the same actions (181-189). James Muilenberg sees the unity of the Testaments in the divine purpose,

the covenant relationship, and the continuity of divine revelation (199-204). These examples serve as illustrations of the fact that the problem of the unity of the Bible, with which Tholuck wrestled, is still alive today. And not only this, but Tholuck's answer is to a large degree the same answer being given by a considerable number of theologians now. Tholuck was, however, careful not to limit his expressions for the unity of the Bible too radically. He spoke for an "organic" view of the relationship of the two Testaments, often without specifying a particular aspect. But the main points where he is in harmony with modern authorities are 1) that he posited a unity of the two Testaments, and that 2) this unity was in terms of Christ.

Now if it is true that Jesus Christ is the unity of Scripture and the object to which the writers of Scripture are pointing and witnessing, then we must be quite sure that we know who this Jesus Christ is. If indeed Christ is the content of Scripture and therefore the key to the understanding of it; if He Himself is the norm by which we are to formulate our hermeneutical rules; then by all means let us inquire into the Person and Work of Christ, in order that we may be sure to what our rules are to conform. Or to put it the other way round, we believe that an investigation of who Jesus Christ is, and what He does and has done, will enable us to understand Him to be the proper norm for all that we say about hermeneutics.

Our first task then is to state who Christ is, i.e., His Person; then, His Work. Then we shall test the hermeneutics of Tholuck by our findings. Finally we shall notice some perversions of the Christological analogy in relation to Tholuck's hermeneutics.

Jesus Christ is "very God" and "very man" - "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary". He is the revelation of God, and in precisely that form, viz., the two natures - His humanity and His divinity. Therefore we want this form, because it is the form of Jesus Christ, to determine all our theology; because our theology should conform to Him if it is to be true. We may state this in a different way. Theology is another word for our knowledge or study of God. We know Him only through Jesus Christ (John 1:18). Therefore Christ must be the object of all our theological investigations. Hermeneutics is such an investigation. Therefore, if we are to be proper, we shall evaluate Tholuck's hermeneutics according to the Christological analogy, i.e., the two natures in hypostatic union, and according to the redemptive and reconciling work of Christ.

We begin by inquiring into Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture. Does he see the Scriptures as having two natures, analogous to the two natures of Christ?¹ It is clear that he does so. He

1. "...Scripture is of a character that it discloses its meaning only to a scholarship that recognizes both the human and the divine and is prepared to deal with both historical and theological realities." James Smart, The Interpretation of Scripture, p. 286f.

understands the Scripture to have a divine nature - it is the Word of God. It is God Himself who gives authority to Scripture for the whole life and faith of the Church. It is the Holy Spirit who has inspired the Biblical writers to record a truthful account of the thoughts and deeds of God among men (Chapter III). Furthermore the Holy Spirit makes plain to believing men the meaning of Scriptures. And the Spirit uses the Scriptures in such a way as to create and increase faith in Christ, which faith leads one to salvation. Because this is true, Scripture can be used to interpret Scripture. The clearer passages enlighten the more difficult ones. This is true also because of the unity of Scriptures in their common witness to Christ who is the object and content of them. Thus we see that Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture firmly emphasises the divine nature of Scripture.

The same is true for the human nature of Scripture. Tholuck strongly denies any kind of mechanical inspiration of Scripture, and insists that the writers of Scripture were very human and subject to error, and that they did in fact make mistakes in their records. The Biblical authors were fully human. In no case was their humanity negated. They were not lifeless tools in the hand of the Spirit, but they were living witnesses. They wrote down what they saw or heard or believed in their own human, fallible words. But, says Tholuck, the Spirit kept them from making any errors which would distort

anything essential in their witness to the truth revealed to them. Thus we see that Tholuck understands Scripture to have two natures -- divine and human.¹

But these vertical and horizontal dimensions must be integrally connected. Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture fails to show such a connection in two important places. First, we noted (in Chapter V) that in his "Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament", Tholuck follows Calvin's example of extolling the virtues of the Old Testament forms of language and thought, even under the supposition that the Old Testament had nothing to do with the New, i.e., with Christ. This view posits a significance to the human words and forms of the Old Testament which is independent of their divine content. The result is an abstraction, form divorced from content. Where the vertical and horizontal do not meet, as here, there is no hinge of meaning.

&

1. We do not claim that Tholuck reasoned according to the Christological analogy. We find it nowhere expressed in his works. He makes no explicit statement that Scripture has two natures because of Christ's two natures, and in analogy to His. We feel that we have shown, however, that in the results of Tholuck's work there is ascribed to the Scriptures two natures; and these form a parallel to the two natures of Christ.

A second place where this error occurs is, as we suggested in Chapter VII, where Tholuck separates the Holy Spirit from the written Word of God. This is a danger in the direction of Montanism in which the Name of the Holy Spirit of God is falsely used to cover all manner of subjective willfulness.

As far as we have gone, we have observed that in Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture there are points which confirm the humanity and divinity of Scripture. We have said that this conforms to the humanity and divinity of Christ. But we found that Tholuck in two important places fails to provide a meeting of the vertical and horizontal dimensions, and this leaves both dimensions suspended in space and without a hinge of meaning.

In Tholuck's day there were challengers to both aspects of the proposal that Scripture was both divine and human. The rationalists pointed out that Tholuck claimed a supernaturalism for the Bible that was wholly unwarranted.¹ The ultra-conservatives accused him of irreverence because of his insistence upon the humanity of the written records.

But today this issue occupies no really central place in discussions on the Bible. The most dominant "schools" of theology are neither ultra-conservative nor ultra-liberal on this

1. D. F. Strauss, e.g., would allow no "supernatural" element in the Gospels. The Life of Jesus for the People, I, 2nd Ed., 1879, p. 41. He did not deny a "divine element" in Jesus, but insisted that it had to be exercised within the laws of nature.

point. The main stream is wider than before which recognizes in the Bible its human and divine natures; though, of course, there is debate over the precise formulation of the proposition. Therefore on the point of the Christological analogy in Scripture, Tholuck's doctrine measures up quite well to what is being said today.

Now we must carry our investigation farther to get into the sphere of hermeneutics. Our question is, Does Tholuck exhibit the Christological analogy in his theory and method of Biblical interpretation? ¹ We believe that he does. We believe that he

1. H.E. Dana, Searching the Scriptures, 1936, suggests that "The Principles of Exegesis" (Chapter XII) are determined by the character of the literature to be interpreted. The New Testament has a two-fold character. It must be interpreted in light of its divine and human relationships. The former implies four things: 1) The New Testament contains a message from God, inspired by His Holy Spirit. 2) This message constitutes the New Testament a coherent revelation. 3) God's purpose in this revelation is to inform humanity of the plan He has devised and executed for their redemption. 4) God was immanent and manifest in the revelation when it was given. There are four resultant principles of interpretation: 1) The interpreter should reverently contemplate the mind of the Spirit as conveyed in the thought of the writer. 2) He should seek in the New Testament a coherent message of redemption, produced by the unifying principle of a common redemptive experience. 3) Passages of a predictive import are to be regarded as reflections of God's future purposes in the plan of redemption, and interpreted in light of the author's mental equipment. 4) Miracles are to be viewed as a means by which the New Testament secured effective contact with its own age, and interpreted in the light of the author's purpose in recording them. -The New Testament must be interpreted in light of its human relationship (p.231). 1) The primary aim in interpretation should be the apprehension of the meaning of the author. 2) Give preference to the clearest and most evident meaning. 3) No statement should be construed as presenting more than one meaning. The Biblical writers said what they meant. 4) Seek to interpret an author in consistency with himself. 5) Due attention should be given to the environmental relations of a passage. 6) A passage should be interpreted in light of its context. 7) Words should be interpreted in harmony with their meaning in the time of the author. 8) In the interpretation of a passage due consideration should be given to its literary quality. 9) Careful consideration should be given to the results of past efforts in the interpretation of the New Testament.

does honour to the two natures of Christ by his concern for a careful handling of the historical context of the Scriptures, which is analogous to Christ's human nature, and by his use of typology, etc., which is a recognition of the divine nature of Scripture, analogous to Christ's divine nature.

We shall first consider how Tholuck's hermeneutics may be said to demonstrate by analogy the divinity of Christ. From what we have said about the high place which Tholuck in his life and writings gave to Christ, and from our notice of the divinity which Tholuck ascribed to Scripture, we expect that his interpretation of the Bible will also bear this theme. A question which was of great concern to Tholuck was the relation of Christ to the Old Testament. He saw in the prophecy and liturgy of the Old Testament references to and types of Christ. His was a view of the two Testaments which saw them in an "organic" unity, connected by the one Messiah, the same divine Spirit. He examined the Old Testament citations in the New and decided that the Spirit of Christ, though concealed in a thick covering, was present in the prophets, and now and then gave signs of its vitality. He saw not only typical words and things, but believed that all Israel, all its institutions and history, was a great prophecy of the coming Christ, because the Spirit of God lived in the very substance of the people (Chapter V). The divine Spirit was the one common soil for the nation and all its institutions. Tholuck thought of the writers of both Testaments as members of the mystical Christ described in history.

It is the Spirit of God, says Tholuck, who penetrates the whole of Biblical history organically.

For this reason Tholuck takes it to be a good rule in interpreting the Bible to compare various passages bearing upon the same point (Comparative Exegesis, Chapters III and VI). This he does with considerable skill. And he considers this a legitimate method in interpretation because all writers of Scripture stand upon the same ground (the Holy Spirit), grow out of the same soil, and are members of the one Christ.

Because the Holy Spirit is alive in the Church, Tholuck listens to his fathers and brothers in the faith when he sits down to interpret Scripture. For the same reason, he understands preaching to be "Godly wisdom" brought forth by the Spirit. For him the content of preaching is Scripture and Jesus Christ. The preacher's attitude must always be humility, faith, and urgency, because he bears upon his lips the message of a great King.

Thus we have seen that by his high opinion of Christ, by his view of the Bible as divine, Tholuck is predisposed to make his interpretations of Scripture in a way which recognizes their divinity. This he does by his method of interpreting the Old Testament and New Testament as organically connected in terms of Christ and the Spirit. For this reason he is quite consistent in his wide use of comparative exegesis; and in carrying on his interpretation within the context of the Church, Tholuck understands that the same Christ and the same Spirit dwell in the Church and make possible a truthful interpretation of the Divine Word.

Therefore we have shown that Tholuck's hermeneutics recognizes the divine nature of Scripture. According to our criterion of evaluation, viz., the Christological analogy, we find Tholuck here in harmony with the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. Our next task is to see if we can discover in Tholuck's hermeneutics an expression of the humanity of Christ.

Our pattern here is the Incarnation. The eternal Word of God became flesh; He entered into flesh most concretely. If we are to be true to this Word, we must follow quite closely what the original witnesses say of Him. And this requires careful scrutiny of the words in their grammatical connections and a reconstruction of the historical situation in its nearer and wider context. We noted that Tholuck was somewhat loose with his handling of the grammar of various texts, and upon this we shall comment later. But what concerns us now is Tholuck's attention to historical detail and the concrete situation. We noted at the beginning (Chapter I) Tholuck's great learning and sparkling erudition. His training as an orientalist and as a scholar of the Old and New Testaments gave him a broad background for an expansive knowledge of Biblical times. He lays special stress upon the interpreter's probing into the period of history in which a particular book or passage was written. He insists upon penetration into the mind of the writer and of the hearers, upon the knowledge of the political circumstances and social customs of

the people among or for whom the book was written (Chapter IV). The introductory sections of Tholuck's commentaries are generally most adequate, and his findings on various questions are quite modern (Chapter VI). He fills in the important points of history which have bearing upon particular texts as he proceeds through the commentary. Sometimes in an appendix Tholuck will deal very fully with a specific problem which presents itself in the book. His insistence upon a thorough analysis of the historical setting of a text has led H.-J. Kraus to suggest that Tholuck contributed to the investigation of the Old Testament by classifying the Psalms into various "Gattungen" (Chapter V). Also Tholuck was adept at comparing texts of similar background or which mutually inform each other (Chapter VI). In Tholuck's preaching, his method was to use very concrete language and illustrations, and to preach upon what was of vital concern to his particular congregation (Chapter VII). Further, his Christological emphasis, which we have mentioned above, makes his exegesis to correspond to the fullest context of Scripture. For the purpose of Scripture is to point to Jesus Christ.

This tendency in Tholuck to draw attention to the concrete actuality of Biblical history by carefully examining the historical details is an appropriate expression in the sphere of hermeneutics of the reality of the Incarnation (John 1:14, Rev. 21:3).

Tholuck's understanding of "Heilsgeschichte", on the other hand, is not an appropriate expression of the Incarnation. It is,

in fact, the very opposite. For Tholuck speaks of the progression of ideas - God, ethics, immortality, etc. - which is entirely abstract, and thus an avoidance of the concreteness which the Incarnation and the mighty acts of God in the Old Testament manifest.¹ But Tholuck was more consistent with the humanity of Christ and of the Old Testament when he argued, however successfully, that the crudities and earthiness of some of the Biblical stories bear on the face of them their factuality.²

We have now observed that Tholuck's hermeneutics indicate an acknowledgment of the divine and human natures of Scripture which, we suggested, is an analogy to the divine and human natures of Christ. Now we must go a step further and ask if in Tholuck's hermeneutics there is some parallel to the hypostatic union. We believe that there is; and to bring this forward we shall investigate Tholuck's answer to D.F. Strauss on "The Credibility of the Evangelical History". We shall endeavour to show that while, on the one hand, Strauss tried to deny the reality of the Evangelical stories about Jesus; Tholuck, on the other hand, affirmed

-
1. This is a serious error on Tholuck's part. Here was a grand opportunity for him to speak of the firm reality and concreteness of God's dealings with His people Israel. But instead he describes the history of the Old Testament people in terms of abstractions. We wish that he had had the insight which his followers, Cremer, Kähler and Schlatter, had on "Heilsgeschichte" (Chapter VIII). For this would have been an even more powerful witness to the Incarnation than the one which he has in fact given.
 2. Cf. J.K.S. Reid, The Authority of Scripture, on the "worldliness" of the Bible, p. 209f.

them. Translated into Christological language, Strauss denied that the human nature of the Christ of the Gospels has its reality within the divine Logos. Indeed, he rejected the Incarnation, and could therefore hardly entertain any ideas of a hypostatic union at all. Tholuck, however, indirectly affirms the hypostatic union by allowing no separation between Christ's divine and human natures in the Gospels. That is, he opposes Strauss' division between eternal truths and "myths" (the miracle stories, etc.), between dogma and history. Tholuck, we shall see, will say that the stories about Jesus in the Gospels have no independent subsistence aside from the Incarnation and apart from the hypostatic union; and that the events of Evangelical history have real and concrete subsistence within the hypostatic union. But first let us look at the particulars of what Strauss and Tholuck say.

Strauss had written that his own fundamental conviction was that everything happens naturally.¹ He wanted to emancipate the people from slavery to the creeds by means of historical inquiry and general philosophical education. The question for Strauss was about the truth of Evangelical history as a

1. Strauss, op. cit., p. xi.

whole and in detail. He was determined that in the Person and actions of Jesus no supernaturalism should remain, and that nothing "shall press upon the souls of men with the leaden weight of arbitrary, inscrutable authority."¹ He felt that no Gospel could claim so much historical reliability. "as to make us debase our reason to believe miracles." He wanted to sift the Bible in order to find the eternal truths, on the one hand, and the temporary, useless and pernicious, on the other.² The eternal truths will be such not because they are supernaturally revealed, but because they are within reason. Transcendence and Incarnation, he said, are Jewish thoughts, and they are to be thrown out. In Christianity man becomes aware of his true nature, just as Jesus did.³ The task in theology is to separate the kernel from the husk, the saving truths from the transient opinion.⁴ There is a strong anti-Church feeling in Strauss. We noticed that he regarded the Creeds as an intolerable weight to free inquiry. He felt that the confessions divided Germany politically and were wrong to do so. He had a high opinion of Renan's book because it was condemned by so many Roman Catholic bishops.⁵ He cited the quotation, "He who would banish priests from the Church must first banish miracles from religion." That is precisely what Strauss set out to do. He felt that the Reformation had stopped short of its goal because it did not tamper with the

-
1. Ibid., p. xii.
 2. Ibid., p. xiii.
 3. Ibid., p. 15.
 4. Ibid., p. 16.
 5. Ibid., p. xvii.

Bible, and that a new Reformation is needed to sift the Bible, to separate the eternal truths from the temporal untruths.

But it is interesting to see what Strauss has to say about the "Lives of Jesus" of the eighteenth century. A biography of Jesus, he suggests, sealed the doom of the Church's doctrine. For the Church's doctrine is composed of dogma and history, which only in the eighteenth century could be united. Dogma and history are an impossible union.¹ And the reason is that the modern age is interested only in humanity. "Our hypothesis," he continues;

"is that the divine element in Christ can have appeared only under the form of a man, acting according to the laws of nature, - but it is not that of the New Testament writers when correctly and naturally interpreted. It is therefore equally perverse to force upon us their conception, as to force ours upon them; it is impossible to reconcile faith with the science of today by any such mode of proceeding."²

But there is a possibility of such a reconciliation if we use the concept of "myth". "Myth" makes an historical view of the life of Jesus possible.³ Then in the second volume Strauss constructs "The Mythical History of Jesus". He concludes that it is the myths (parasites) which have destroyed history (the real tree) in the Bible.⁴ What we need is a greater knowledge of the man Jesus.⁵ Jesus is the improver of the ideal of humanity.

-
1. Ibid., p. 5.
 2. Ibid., p. 25.
 3. Ibid., p. 16.
 4. Ibid., II, p.430.
 5. Ibid., II, p.437.

We have here in Strauss Docetism and Ebionism at the same time. This sometimes happens when the Incarnation is lost sight of. Strauss' interest in the Evangelical history is docetic because he wants to abstract the "eternal truths" from the "bad" history of the Gospels, separate the kernel from the husk. Again, he wanted to remove this entire activity of interpretation from the Church and her cumbersome doctrines. This is "non-contextuality",¹ and opposes the concreteness of the Incarnation. His ebionitic tendencies are also clear. The presupposition that governed everything he did was that there could be no miracle, no supernaturalism, no Incarnation, no Transcendence, no dogma, no authority. Christianity is all about man - man's awareness of his true nature (such as Jesus had), man's autonomous reason (to find "eternal truths"), man's free inquiry (free from the shackles of Church authority), and man's "divine element" (acting within the laws of nature).

What leads Strauss to deny the Incarnation? The interest of the "modern age", he says, is in humanity only. Therefore dogma and history are an impossible union. The Incarnation is the union of dogma and history. It follows that if Strauss conceives of the Incarnation as a Jewish myth, then he must find the union of history and dogma intolerable. Therefore he needs "mythical history".

But Strauss makes an interesting admission: that the New Testament writers when correctly and naturally interpreted believe in miracles, the supernatural, above all the Incarnation.

1. Glen, J.S., The Recovery of the Teaching Ministry, p. 67ff.

It is perverse, he says, for us to force our views upon them, and vice versa. Faith and science cannot be reconciled in this way.

What does Tholuck say in answer to Strauss? He appeals to the fact of the millions of believers in the Evangelical history,¹ and thus puts the issue into the context of the Church in all ages. He attacks Strauss' presumed lack of presuppositions by calling attention to Strauss' determination to allow nothing supernatural in the life of Jesus.² Then he declares that a "myth" is a fable which stands for an idea; it is a contrived superstition and therefore has nothing to do with the down-to-earth happenings which the Biblical writers record.³ Next comes the claim that the Evangelical history is as reliable as any history, and more reliable than most.⁴ He draws evidence for the credibility of Evangelical history from the Evangelists themselves.⁵ Luke, e.g., like Josephus, records his intention of writing genuine history (1:1), and, Tholuck adds, he is capable of doing so.⁶ The Acts of the Apostles, he continues, has countless historical references

-
1. Tholuck, Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte, p.40.
 2. Ibid., p. 41.
 3. Ibid., p. 54.
 4. Ibid., p. 64.
 5. Ibid., p. 114.
 6. Ibid., p. 140. Luke 1:1 tells us, says Tholuck, that 1) Luke is concerned to write an accurate account. 2) Already many have undertaken to write. 3) The account comes from eye-witnesses. 4) Luke believes it to be exact (p.143). 5) Luke strives for certainty of faith.

which can be checked by other sources.¹ Then from his vast knowledge of other literatures, Tholuck compares the Evangelical history with other circles of sayings - the apocryphal, Roman Catholic,² and Mohammedan - and finds it superior to them as history.² Then he notes some contradictions in the Evangelists and their causes, and discusses the relation of error in detail to the truth in the whole.³

Here we see that Tholuck, in contrast to Strauss, indirectly affirms by his argument the Christological analogy. He sees Strauss' myth as an abstraction which the concreteness of the Evangelical witness will not allow. He places the record in the context of the Church's faith and witness. Tholuck demonstrates the reliability of Evangelical history by listening to the writers themselves and to what they themselves say of their witness, as well as from comparison with secular literature. He faces frankly the contradictions and errors in the accounts, and calls them that. This too is true to the humanity of Christ. Humanity, we have seen, must be understood from the humanity of Christ. And that humanity, when applied to Scripture, does not mean infallibility of historical detail. But Tholuck again affirms the essential truthfulness of the Evangelical history as a whole, and

-
1. Ibid., p. 154.
 2. Ibid., p. 395.
 3. Ibid., pp. 429, 440, 457.

this he must do because it is a witness to Christ, who is the truth. This is a recognition of the divinity of the Scriptures, its conformity to the truth.

To put this in other words, though Tholuck never says it explicitly in this way, the divinity and humanity of Christ are two natures in one Person, in one "hypostasis". Therefore in the Evangelical accounts of Christ it is quite wrong to try to separate what is "eternal truths" and what is "myths" posing as history, as Strauss does. In analogy to the hypostatic union, where divine and human natures are inseparably joined in one person, so in the accounts which witness to Jesus Christ, it is hopeless and perverse to try to divide dogma from history, the divine from the human.¹

This brings us right into the problem of the "historical Jesus", and our first consideration will be a review of our earlier discussion of Martin Kähler's position on this question (Chapter VIII). Kähler holds that details for a biography of Jesus cannot be found in the New Testament. But Christian faith does not in any case depend upon our having such details as the nineteenth-century historicism wanted to find. This would make faith

1. An evidence of Tholuck's insistence upon the inseparability of the divine and human natures of the Evangelical accounts is the following statement of his: "One thing it is important to remember, namely, that having duly established the historical character and credibility even of one Gospel, we have done all that is absolutely essential to vindicate the claim of Christianity to a supernatural origin, - to vindicate the claim of Jesus to a mission from on high." In "The Credibility of the Evangelical History" in Voices of the Church, edited by J.R. Beard, p. 47. Italics mine.

depend upon what the historian can uncover - a faith dependent upon the experts and their scientific tools. This must be wrong, for what of all believers in past ages and all simple Christians who have not had the benefit of modern historical methods? No. The New Testament was not written as an historically "objective" account of events in the life of Jesus (nor is such possible), but as a faithful witness to Him, in order that the witness, by its very association with Him, may compel faith in the hearer. In the Gospel we have a trustworthy picture of the Saviour, not by neutral observers (such there could not be), but by believing men anxious for others to believe through their witness - from faith to faith. Christ Himself is author of this picture, and by it He wins us to faith in Himself. It is hopeless to try to go beyond this picture to pick up neutral biographical facts. Such an undertaking would be disobedient as well. For the real Jesus is the historical (geschichtlich) Biblical Christ who meets us in the witness of the apostles.

It is useful also to repeat Paul Althaus' point that for Kähler the facts of faith in Jesus's life are real happenings in concrete history. The Biblical records have to do with the "completest reality". In answer to the nineteenth century quest of the historical Jesus, Kähler would say that "the revelatory character of the history of Jesus is not known by means of historical reflection or historical reasoning" (Chapter VIII, p.10). But in answer to the twentieth century quest (as in James Robinson,

Kümmel et al.) he would say that Christ is not known apart from
the historical records of Scripture.¹

Professor Cairns has suggested that Bultmann has stood Kähler's
doctrine on its head.² Though using Kähler's distinction of "his-
torisch" and "geschichtlich", Bultmann understands by "historisch"
not Kähler's sense of biographical detail, but the minimum of agreed-
upon concrete happenings in the life of Jesus (which is Kähler's
"geschichtlich" in so far as the complete historical reality of the
records is concerned). The "geschichtlich" for Bultmann indicates
the existential meaning, the meaning for me, the meaning for faith.
It is to be noted that "geschichtlich" for Kähler also denotes the
meaning of Christ for faith, or the actual Christ as He is presented
in the New Testament for faith and known by faith. But with Kähler
the actual "geschichtlich" Biblical Christ of faith is the Christ
of concrete history, of completest historical reality. For Bultmann,
however, this aspect of the word does not enter into his usage of it
at all - that aspect is relegated to the realm of the "historisch".
For to him events of the past, however "factual", are dead, over,
and finished. They can have no meaning for me. The "cross of
Jesus Christ", however, is the source of our salvation. But this
is a cross and a Christ not rooted in first-century history - for

-
1. For this reason James Smart, op. cit., pp. 279, 299, is quite wrong to lump Strauss, Kähler, and Bultmann together, without qualification, as those who "relinquished all hope of recovering from the New Testament documents a historical figure of Jesus." This is true as far as it goes, but it should be added ~~that~~ they did so for quite different reasons.
 2. David Cairns, A Gospel Without Myth?, p. 145ff.

such would have no interest for me in the twentieth century - for they are "existential". Professor Cairns generously defends Bultmann against the charge of Docetism on grounds that Bultmann does not exclude the possibility of something having happened in the first century. But we maintain that his indifference to the historical realities of Christ's life and death clearly indicates a "docetic" tendency.

There are several interesting parallels of Bultmann to Strauss. Like Strauss, Bultmann will not allow miracles or the supernatural in history. Both men are embarrassed by the crude history of the Bible and therefore flee from it by abstracting "eternal truths" (Strauss) or "the Kerygma" (Bultmann).¹ Both want to separate the kernel from the husk. Why should they want to do this? Because "the modern age" (Strauss) and the "modern man" (Bultmann) will not accept the Biblical accounts. Both men rebel against the Church's way of doing things - the Church's creeds and authority

-
1. However impassionately Bultmann pleads for concreteness in terms of the existential nature of his theology, his "Kerygma" is still an abstraction - abstracted from the concrete world of the history in which the revelational events in fact occurred. James Smart, op. cit., p. 174, is right to suggest a return to Jesus' word "the Gospel", because of the fact that "Kerygma" has become abstract and weighted down with existentialist philosophy. Principal Glen, op. cit., p. 83, is correct in his observation that "the bare word cannot be extracted" from the historical deed. "We cannot separate the sermonic material out of the historical interpretation without losing something in the process. For what happened in the life and work of the Church as the subject matter of interpretation is really an indirect form of the kerygma. The historical interpretation is not unlike the flesh of the incarnate Christ in which the Word is found." It is a "rather erroneous idea that the gospel can be preached by a recital of the bare elements of the kerygma without the historical matrix integral to it, which is the old noncontextual positivism again with its self-contained units of truth." Ibid., p. 83.

(Strauss) or the Church's vocabulary (Bultmann), and thus they immediately put themselves out of the context of real Biblical interpretation. This too demonstrates Bultmann's "Docetism". But as with Strauss, so with Bultmann, the ebionitic strain is also there. Christianity, he would say, is all about man - "man's awareness of his true nature" (Strauss), or "man's self-understanding" (Bultmann). Like Strauss, Bultmann makes his own presuppositions quite clear, and they are absolutely foreign to the Biblical witness - Heidegger's existentialist philosophy. His procedure, like Strauss', denies the possibility of the union of dogma ("Kerygma") and history. This by analogy calls in question the hypostatic union. It is obvious that neither of the two men have understood or accepted the Christological analogy, otherwise they would not be so scandalized at the sheer humanity of the Biblical records. Both of them contrive a "mythical history" which has nothing in common with the real world of the Bible or the reality of the Incarnation.

Tholuck's answer to Strauss is still timely enough to be given to Bultmann. What of the millions of believers in the "communion of saints" who have not found the historical accounts in the Bible

-
1. Bultmann says that we must understand "being" and "self" through philosophy. One particular philosophy is meant: understanding is existential (Heidegger). Essays, op. cit., Chapters IV, V, pp. 240ff.
 2. Bultmann seeks to overcome the offence of the Cross. He says in "Prophecy and Fulfilment", Essays, op. cit., "Can the offence of the Cross be overcome by saying that it was long prophesied and planned by God?"

irrelevant for life?¹ May their witness not outweigh the unbelief of the so-called "modern man" (whoever that may be)? Then Tholuck could turn to Bultmann's presuppositions and demonstrate how Bultmann has begged the question of the actuality of the Biblical events by uttering the simple statement that the "modern man" will never believe it.² Tholuck's suggestion that a "myth" is only a fable that stands for an idea, and therefore has nothing to do with the concreteness of Evangelical history, could well be heard by Bultmann.³ Tholuck could call Bultmann's attention to what the Biblical writers say of their own witness - that they are written that men may believe in Christ through their words, not in spite of them.

-
1. It seems that for Bultmann living by faith excludes living by sight. And for him, that means that we must take away all historical "crutches", in order that our faith may be pure. Or at least, he would perhaps say, the fewer the historical facts we cling to, the stronger the faith. So growth in faith demands the casting away of our crutches. But what Bultmann takes for crutches or extra baggage is really quite integral to faith. Faith is faith in Jesus Christ who became man in history and who remains man and whose Spirit is active among men in history. Therefore He and His flesh and historicity cannot be cast away, for they are the very objects of faith. If we insist upon throwing out the historical as having nothing to do with us "modern man", we will have to resort to believing in abstractions and fantasies - "myths". Not even in heaven can we get away from historical facts - for Christ has taken His body up into heaven, and at the last, heaven will be peopled with embodied souls. Furthermore, the once-for-all Incarnation of Jesus Christ has efficacy for time and eternity, heaven and earth.
 2. Bultmann in Essays, op. cit., "Prophecy and Fulfilment", says that the kind of prophecy and fulfilment which considers the Old Testament as a whole as prophecy is impossible in this age of historical science.
 3. James Muilenberg, op.cit., p. 21²¹, says that the danger of Bultmann's existential approach is that we may lose the concrete reality of the original event and introduce alien nuances and psychologisms into the text.

The problems of theology and history, and of the "historical Jesus" in particular, are still with us. But the position which Tholuck holds measures up quite well in the current discussions. His student Kähler, going beyond Tholuck, has made a very important distinction between "historisch" and "geschichtlich" which is still used today, and its misuse by Bultmann should not make us abandon it.

We have applied the analogy of the two natures in hypostatic union to Tholuck's hermeneutics and to some modern problems in Biblical interpretation. Now we should look at the work of Christ in order to see if it may be a useful norm by which to evaluate other points in Tholuck's hermeneutics and in modern theology. It is the work of Christ to reconcile men to God. This He does by revealing God to men, and this revelation is their salvation. Revelation, reconciliation, and interpretation are all bound up together. Jesus Christ reveals God (John 1:18, or "exegetes", interprets Him to us). He declares the truth about Him. This truth which He declares is saving truth, active and concrete, not abstract truth; because the God whom Jesus Christ reveals is He who comes to save men, to reconcile them to Himself. Jesus Christ Himself is the Reconciler by this very action and because of His own Person. He is true to his name - Saviour, Messiah. The Bible bears witness to this revealing and reconciling Christ. The Bible's purpose is not to teach men wisdom. For as it bears witness to the revelation

of God in Christ, it is in fact the actual offer of His grace, and not merely the record of His offer.¹ The Bible is not merely a record of God's revelation in the past, but above all a divine act by means of which God directly offers salvation in Christ to every reader.² It is for this reason that John Marsh suggests that the key to the interpretation of Scripture rises out of the Bible itself, and is the gracious redeeming activity of God and man's response to this activity.³

When we speak of the salvific work of Christ we mean that He delivers us from sin, that He makes reconciliation in the place where our sins had made alienation. We brought out the fact that Tholuck had a deep consciousness of sin. It was this which qualified his tendencies toward the positing of a continuity between God and man, after the fashion of the Hegelians (Chapter I). His awareness of his own offences made up a great part of Tholuck's piety. Furthermore, he felt that the doctrine of sin was a cardinal doctrine. For it was his awareness of sin that led him to seek a Saviour, he said. Our question then is, Does Tholuck's doctrine of sin have any bearing upon his hermeneutics? If it is true that his sins weighed so heavily upon him, does this attitude carry over into his interpretation of Scripture?

-
1. Piper, Otto, "Modern Problems of New Testament Exegesis", The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, 36/1, August, 1942, p.10.
 2. Ibid., p. 10.
 3. Marsh, John, in Biblical Authority for Today, op. cit., p.182.

But first we should investigate the connection between interpretation and the doctrine of sin. The Scriptures point to Jesus Christ who reveals God for our salvation. This revelation, or Jesus Christ, coming as He does to help and save us, makes us immediately aware of our sin and need for the salvation which He offers. His judgment upon our sin and His offer of grace come simultaneously and inseparably. The implication for hermeneutics is that when we interpret the Scripture we shall find not comfortable words only, but also words which are unpleasant because they expose our guilt to the bright light of the eternal Word. Therefore we should go to Scripture expecting to be called in question, to have our pretences exposed, to be contradicted. Cremer, Kähler, and Schlatter (Chapter VIII) had such an understanding of Scripture. Piper is right when he says,

"If the Bible simply confirms what you thought you knew already, if it does not change your outlook and constantly overthrow your favourite theories, you may be quite certain that you have not yet apprehended its revelatory character."¹

It is because we resist losing our favourite theories and pet ideas, and because we resent being questioned, that we have difficulty in interpreting the Scriptures properly. Our hard hearts produce more resistance to the Bible than any hermeneutical rules can overcome.² Like Israel, we are not open to the God who roots up and destroys.

1. Piper, op. cit., p. 7.
2. Smart, op. cit., p. 307.

J. S. Glen has developed this emphasis under the chapter heading, "Relational Hermeneutics".¹ The truth of the Bible comes to us only in conflict against our own ideology (idolatry), our peculiar confidence in the flesh. There is a difference between God and man - God is transcendent, man is sinful. But by virtue of the Incarnation, there is similarity between ourselves and God. The difference is to the similarity as the hook imbedded in the bait is to the bait. The flesh of Christ is the similarity, the Word is the difference. As we feed on His flesh we are caught by the Word. The honest interpreter must confess the offence. This involves risk and suffering.

Now how does Tholuck's hermeneutics measure up to this formulation of the work of Christ as judgment upon sin? Or again, to the understanding of the Scriptures as the Word which contradicts us? It is clear that Tholuck sees himself contradicted by God's judgment upon sin. When the text speaks of sin, he does not hesitate to include himself among the sinners.² And yet there is another force at work upon Tholuck, the spirit of the times. We noted that Tholuck's idea of the continuity between man and God and his consciousness of sin mutually limited each other. He could not hold a form of Hegelian "pantheism" with a doctrine of radical sin and evil. We feel that this idea of continuity so diluted Tholuck's doctrine of sin that it may never have occurred to him to bring

1. Glen, *op. cit.*, Chapter IV.

2. We noted (Chapters III, VII) that Tholuck suggested that we apply all offensive things in Scripture to ourselves, and rather look for the offence in ourselves. He is here quite close to the position that we should interpret the text against ourselves.

the doctrine of sin radically into the sphere of hermeneutics. Therefore what we find in Tholuck is Schleiermacher's ideal of an interpreter: a man with talent for language and the skill of penetrating into the inner recesses of the minds of the Biblical writers. But we fail to find in him the man who is at every turn ready to be contradicted by Scripture. Yes, it is true that Tholuck insisted that preachers should do their work in a humble spirit, conscious that they bear the message of a heavenly king (Chapter VII); but for Tholuck it is a message palatable to Schleiermacher's cultured man, or to any man, that he should direct his pious feelings to God. It is this dreadful combination of forces which Tholuck inherited from Hegel - that of continuity between man and God - and from Schleiermacher - the Romantic notion of interpretation by divination of the writer's inner soul - which saw to it that his doctrine of sin could never have ultimate seriousness. The reason is that the positing of such a continuity contradicts the exclusive Mediatorial Office of Christ. For if there is continuity between God and man, there is no gap for a Mediator to bridge, and therefore no need for a Mediator. To find a "connecting point" in man to join religion on to, such as Schleiermacher and Tholuck sought, could only end in the confirmation of everything already known to the "cultured despisers", except that the religion which they unknowingly despised was really what they already felt within themselves. This was a hopeless and false undertaking, because the followers of Schleiermacher were only being confirmed in their error, and they

were not at all questioned to the depths of their being by the Scripture, which always stands opposed to sin and sham. The contradiction between man and God was thus removed, and so inevitably the doctrine of sin was diluted. Therefore nineteenth century man had no need for a Mediator, for he was already continuous with God, and no need for a Saviour, for from what should he be saved?

It is on these grounds that we must say that Tholuck did not measure up well in understanding the contradicting power of Scripture. The doctrine of the work of Christ as Reconciler and Saviour, which Tholuck formally asserted, unavoidably makes its way into Scripture to confront and contradict its readers. But Tholuck did not see the transition from doctrine to interpretation, because his spirit followed the devious paths charted by Hegel and Schleiermacher. This is no inconsiderable error on his part. For Tholuck's failure to carry through on the doctrine of sin exposes him to the charge of a lack of thoroughness and of an inadequate doctrine of the atonement. Interpreting the Bible is for Tholuck, as it was for Schleiermacher, no great problem. He can just read off the meaning of Scripture with no difficulty, because he is a believer to whom Scriptures are perspicuous (Chapter III), and of course he has the requisite literary talents and the knowledge of men. But in all this the work of Christ as Mediator has no structural place.

The redemptive work of Christ in the world takes place through the Church. The Church is His "new creation" and has a place in His

work of reconciling the world unto Himself. In fact He, the revelation of God, is understood only within the Church, only within the actual setting of His people Israel.

This aspect of the work of Christ Tholuck well understands. We described him as a man of the Church who did his interpretation within the Church and for the Church (Chapter I). When he spoke of the Scriptures he understood them to be the authority and norm for the whole life of the Church (Chapter III). He did not separate the work of interpretation from the Church as if it were an activity for philologists only. In his own work in interpretation Tholuck understood himself to be standing in the tradition of his fathers in the Church of every age, and following after them, learning from them, building upon them (Chapter VI). And his motive was to be of service in this way to the Church of his own generation and of succeeding generations. His preaching was for the Church (Chapter VII), and he drew his inspiration and material for sermons from his own particular congregation, taking special pains to see that the words, illustrations, and all details of his sermons were appropriate to them and easily understood by them. Tholuck's emphasis upon the Church was taken up by Cremer, Kühler, and Schlatter (Chapter VIII).

Tholuck was quite right in this regard. For the Bible and the Church are inseparably united. "Heilsgeschichte" is constituted and re-lived within the fellowship of the Church.¹

1. C.H. Dodd, Biblical Authority, p. 160ff.

God's perpetual Word of judgment and renewal falls upon the Church. The Holy Spirit is the gift of Christ to the whole Church. That is why the whole Church has responsibility for interpretation. The Holy Spirit is the interpreter of Scripture. He is the giver of life to interpretation and to the Church. It is the Church therefore which can hold the subjective elements of the exegete in check. The interpreter does satisfactory work only when he knows that he is conditioned by and responsible to the life of the Church.¹ This is another way in which we may draw the hermeneutical circle. It moves "from faith to faith", from part to whole, from Church member to the body of the Church. We listen to each other and learn from each other, for the Holy Spirit is in our midst speaking in His own way to each of us. It is this community which stands in continuity with the people of God to whom He has revealed Himself. In light of this the "hermeneutical circle" is the activity of God: He shows Himself in Christ to His people, He takes up their witness to this revelation and speaks it forth anew to each generation, and He comes into their midst by His Spirit to open their ears to hear this Word, and to open their minds to understand it. Therefore obedient interpretation must be carried on within the context of the Church, for that is the only place in which it can be done. This is a firm rule for Tholuck which appears explicitly in his hermeneutics and implicitly in his exegesis and preaching.

1. Piper, op. cit., p. 13.

This is a far healthier view of the relation of the Bible to the Church than is often held by some who advocate a "Gemeindetheologie" which they equate with the Bible. According to these, all we can know from the Scriptures is what ideas the early Church held. Some of these ideas are very crude notions representative of a false cosmology. We can learn from the early Church all about the Christian faith, but nothing about Christ. We can accept the fact of what they felt and we can try to imagine what ideas these feelings were supposed to express, but we cannot accept what the writers of the Bible said that they saw or heard - after all, they were primitive humans and were likely mistaken. This way of thinking is quite false for several reasons. First, it is a form of unbelief to contend that the Biblical words do not point to realities in fact. This is refuted by the whole of Biblical thought. In the Bible, e.g., the name of a person or thing is what he or it really is. The names for God describe what He really is and does for His people. So with the names of the Biblical characters and places. So with Jesus Christ - His name is what He is. So with the Biblical accounts - the revelation of God to men is as the writers describe it, just as they have seen it and heard it - yes, within the context of the "Gemeinde" - but the "Gemeinde" is only the context in which something happens and not the whole of it minus the happening. The event plus the interpretation of it Christ takes up and quickens, and He uses

it to arouse faith in each succeeding generation. He directs the events and the interpretation of them. He is both the Lord of history and the interpreter of His own actions. (Amos 3:7).¹ But to strike out the events and to dwell upon the life of the "Gemeinde" really misses the point. It is to throw out the "hermeneutical circle" of the activity of God in His Church. There is no more revelation of God Himself or the witness to revelation which God Himself uses. There is no longer a need for a Holy Spirit to interpret the revelation -- for there is only the Church left to itself with its ideas and fantasies. Thus we see that on this point Tholuck is far sounder than many of our contemporaries.

There remains to us the task of examining in Tholuck's hermeneutics two perversions of the Christological analogy. The first is parallel to the Eutychean heresy of confusing the two natures of Christ. What is Tholuck's error in this regard?

1. Dodd, op. cit., p. 159.

It is Tholuck's tendency to blur the line between God and man by his extreme subjectivism. From the outset we saw Tholuck as a man of deep piety (Chapter I). He revelled in the good and warm feelings which came to him from a personal relationship to Christ. He was on fire with the message of salvation, and his one passion was Christ - to live for Him and to tell others about Him. To him feeling and religious experience were two main ways by which one came to know God. In Tholuck's hands religious experience becomes a real hermeneutical tool. The outward events in the Scripture do not seem to be nearly as important as the inward appropriation of them (Chapter III). For it is the religion of the heart which is "a foundation for the holy Science of Exegesis" (Chapter III), and it is man's criterion for verifying religious truth. Scriptures, that is, must find their verification in the inner experience. Religious feeling, furthermore, is something which men have within them and the Gospel must only connect to this for its easy acceptance. It is the Holy Spirit who plants this seed in the hearts of all men, it is a divine seed. Sometimes Tholuck forgets and in some places he confuses the Holy Spirit with the human spirit. We objected that the facts of faith are not inner feelings and holy experiences, but they are rather what God did in Jesus Christ - the events of redemption in concrete history. The important events in our lives are these - what God did and does, not what we feel or experience. We further objected that if we ourselves (from our inner

experience) pass judgment on the Scriptures, then we shall be hearing only what we want to hear, only what we already know and can tell ourselves. Then it will be no Word of God that we hear, for it is His Word which contradicts us and brings death to our cherished opinions. Again, we argued that there is nothing in man which can serve him as a "connecting point", that he may the more easily believe. Jesus Christ alone is where God and man meet. He is the only "connecting point". The vertical meets the horizontal and forms a cross, and it is a scandal and offence to us all.

Tholuck's emphasis is analogous to both "docetic" and "ebionitic" heresies. We suggested that it is like "Docetism" because it abstracts the response of faith from the objective facts of faith in the life of Israel.¹ It is the ideal of the preacher who preaches only for conversion. It is in its own way a flight from history and objectivity. Therefore it cannot be a valid rule of interpretation to measure everything in light of the religion of the heart. The stress upon the feelings is, on the other hand, parallel to the "ebionitic" heresy. For it has to do with man alone - man's feeling, man's experience, man's spirit which even somehow absorbs the Holy Spirit of God. It is sheer humanism. It is the kind of thing Schleiermacher's cultured despisers could have easily agreed to; for, as he showed in his Speeches, their humanism was really religion "incognito".

1. D. Ritschl, op. cit., p.11.

We also mentioned that this preoccupation with the subjective was the characteristic error of the nineteenth century (Chapter II). Schleiermacher set the pace and the others, after their own fashion, followed along. For this reason they found it difficult to really cope with Nietzsche, Feuerbach, and D.F. Strauss, who pricked the theology of the time in its most sensitive spot, its inner-direction and subjectivity.

But the old subjectivity has by no means left us. For Bultmann tells us that understanding is existential (Heidegger). He is pre-occupied with an awareness of himself, his "life" and "relationships-in-life". He is on fire with the message of salvation by self-understanding. One knows God by learning to understand oneself. Existential experience becomes in Bultmann's hands a real hermeneutical tool, indeed it is the only way anyone can understand anything (understanding is existential). Scriptures must find their verification in my own existence. It is the same with Tholuck. The outward events in the Bible are not in themselves interesting to Bultmann, for past history is dead and buried. Yet the Spirit of Jesus lingers on, and it must be preached that He has meaning for man's existence today.

It is the Church's duty to find a "point of contact" in the "modern man" to make him "understand" the "Kerygma", Bultmann may say. The Church must so respect modern cosmology that it "demythologizes" the Bible's cosmology; and with it must go all other things unpalatable to the modern man, for these are not really

essential to the "Kerygma" (i.e., the essence of the Biblical message as Bultmann understands it). Bultmann wants to do away with the unnecessary scandals and offences in the Bible, that the "modern man" may not be frightened away. Schleiermacher, Tholuck, and Bultmann want to find some "connecting point" in the man to make an easier acceptance of the Gospel.

Our answer to Bultmann is the same as our reply to Schleiermacher and Tholuck. The facts of faith are not "existential" experiences, but objective events outside us which, because they are for us, do catch us up into them. And thus by a miracle of grace they are our own "existential" events made present (vergegenwärtigt) and relevant to us. The important events in our lives are what God did and does, not what we feel or experience. If our existence (or we ourselves) determines our understanding (or what we will understand), then it is fair to say that we probably will not choose to understand anything that contradicts us. If we like to play "modern man", then we can become judge of Scripture. We can ourselves determine the "relevant" parts by what we are willing to understand. But it may just be that we are willing to understand only the most palatable things. But after a while we "modern men" will get tired of reading from the Scripture what we already know and what we can tell ourselves (since we already understand it), and we shall become quite bored with the Bible and put it aside, as most of our fellow "modern men" have done. But we can be sure that

this word which we already understand or can so easily understand is not the Word of God for that very reason. Jesus Christ Himself is the "connecting point" between God and man. The vertical and horizontal form a cross, and that cross is a scandal and offence which can not at all be overcome, but which must be confessed and received against ourselves.

Therefore in Bultmann too appear "Docetism" and "Ebionism". His abstraction of the "Kerygma" from history, and of personal existence from the redemptive events of the Bible - this is docetic, a flight from history and objectivity. Therefore it is invalid in hermeneutics. But on the other hand, Bultmann's emphasis on "existence" is "ebionitic". It is all about man - man's existence, man's understanding determines everything. It is a humanism which "modern man" can easily grasp because it so nicely agrees with what he already knows; it is in fact his religion "incognito".

The point is that the quest for a "point of contact" is a sign of dissatisfaction with Jesus Christ who in His divinity and humanity in one person is the only possible point of contact between God and man. This quest is a facile attempt to bridge the gap between God and man by using the proper words, the proper cosmologies, the proper methods. This is serious unbelief, for it obviates the Incarnation and the work of Christ.

This perversion of the Christological analogy in Tholuck's hermeneutics is that of his positing a continuity between God and man, so that, in this case, no real gap exists between them. This

is parallel to the "Eutychian" heresy, the confusion of the two natures of Christ. We mentioned this earlier in this chapter, but we have come to the place to dwell more upon it. We noted (Chapter I) the philosophical influences upon Tholuck. He was drawn to accept a kind of "pantheism" in terms of a correspondence of being between man and God, an "analogia entis". It is this philosophy which lies behind any attempt to seek out a "point of contact" between God and man; for the "point of contact" in man will be something kin to a "divine spark". This search is absolutely destroyed and forbidden by the Incarnation which declares not a "divine spark" in man, but a humanity taken up into God in Jesus Christ.

We called attention (Chapter VII) to Tholuck's idea of the "Light which lightens every man," as a light which all men possess, and which makes the worldly not fully worldly, for they have this heavenly light. We noticed (Chapter I) Tholuck's attempt to posit a continuity between Christ as Logos and the reason of this world, a harmony of revelation and reason. He believes that the reason of man can easily embrace the Logos of God, because they are of the same substance.¹ Here again, Tholuck believes man to have a heart capable of meeting God, an "inner disposition for Christian truth,² which consists in the original in man."

-
1. Tholuck overlooks the fact that when the Word became flesh, "the world knew Him not ... His own received Him not." (John 1:10f.)
 2. Barth, Die prot. Theol., op. cit., p. 463.

The Person and Work of Christ will not allow this, however. The sole Mediatorship of Christ, His prophetic voice against sin, destroy any notions we may have of an "analogia entis". Yet, despite this clear rule, theologians continue to posit one. The controversy over "natural theology" rises anew in every generation because we always seem to seek a way to God which circumvents Jesus Christ, who is the only way to God. We cannot bear the thought of His judgment and reproach, so we conveniently avoid Him if we can.

Another form of circumventing Christ is that which Bultmann has adopted, viz., that of retaining the words "Jesus Christ" in his system, emptying them of historical reality (or importance),¹ and using them as names for the demands of existential decision. Bultmann seeks to dispose of Christ, it seems, by abstracting Him from history, just as he has done with the "Kerygma". Thus Bultmann achieves the opposite of what he set out to do, viz., to make the "Kerygma" of "Jesus Christ" quite "existential". He has succeeded,² however, in making preaching abstract and remote from life. Well might Tholuck point to Bultmann's theology and preaching and say: "stale jelly behind the glass door of the cabinet!" All such efforts to circumvent Christ's redemptive work are necessarily stale, for they deny the action of God upon the scene of history, and posit a continuity in which somehow man grows up to be God.

-
1. G. Wingren, Theology in Conflict, p. 134, believes that the retention of the name "Jesus Christ" shows how wrong Bultmann's whole system is.
 2. Ibid., p. 148. "That the sermon is abstract, without contact with the actual life of the hearers, is an error which escapes (Bultmann's) analysis. (His) program contributes rather toward making modern preaching even more abstract, separated from actual life and devoted to the spiritualized conception of the law. The program of spiritualization affects the whole system."

Now we shall summarise what we have said in this chapter. We decided at the outset that we must make our evaluation of Tholuck's hermeneutics in terms of Christ. We saw what Tholuck thought of Christ: Christ was his one passion and he lived to serve Him. He held Christ to be the content and unity of the Bible, the goal of "Heilsgeschichte", the centre of religious experience, and the one revelation of God. These views appear to be still quite valid today. The unity of Scripture is still found to be in terms of Christ and salvation. Tholuck measures up very well on this point.

We further suggested that if Christ is the norm for theology and hermeneutics, then we must examine the person and work of Christ in relation to the hermeneutics of Tholuck and of modern times. We saw that the Person of Christ -- His divine and human natures in one Person -- finds a parallel in Tholuck's doctrine of Scripture. For Tholuck ascribes divinity to the Bible in so far as it is for him the Word of God, the authority for the Church, inspired by the Holy Spirit, made plain by the Spirit, and used by the Spirit to create and increase faith in Christ. Tholuck holds to the humanity of the Bible in that he affirms that the writers were human; there was no mechanical inspiration. This position is widely held by theologians today, and very few seriously deny the uniqueness of the Bible as divine Word or affirm a mechanical dictation theory. On this doctrine Tholuck's theology is quite agreeable to current Biblical thought. But we found that Tholuck failed to connect the horizontal and vertical dimensions in that he separated content and form in the Old Testament and in some places divided the Spirit from the written Word.

We then applied the analogies of the two natures of Christ to the hermeneutics of Tholuck. We found that there is in his method a parallel to the divine nature of Christ because he interprets the Old and New Testaments as documents organically connected to each other by Christ and the Holy Spirit, who also dwell within the Church to make interpretation possible. We saw that Tholuck's use of the historical context and the concrete situation was parallel to the human nature of Christ. His knowledge of Biblical times, his penetration into the minds of the writers and original hearers and readers - these things are appropriate to the humanity of Christ and by analogy affirm it. Tholuck does the same by establishing a text in its nearer and wider context - by unfolding its historical background, its place in the chapter, book, and canon by comparative exegesis, and in relation to Christ and the Church. His use of concrete language is also an indirect testimony to the analogy of Christ's humanity. Though his version of "Heilsgeschichte" is weak in this regard, his insistence upon the full actuality of the Biblical accounts has a parallel in the humanity of Christ. In connection with the hypostatic union we gave special attention to Tholuck's controversy with D.F. Strauss on the credibility of Evangelical history, and found that Tholuck showed Strauss' "myth" to be an abstraction disallowed by the concreteness of the Evangelical narratives. Tholuck placed the records in the context of Christian faith and witness, he listened to the writers themselves, he compared the accounts with secular histories, he faced the contradictions in the Gospels. All of this is an affirmation of the humanity and divinity of the Scriptures, analogous to

the two natures of Christ in one Person. Then we considered the modern problem of the "historical Jesus" and found that Tholuck's answer to Strauss could well be given to Bultmann et al., viz., that the Church's belief in the factuality of the Evangelical accounts more than outweighs the unbelief of "modern man". Further, "myth" has nothing to do with the concreteness of the Evangelical records. We feel that Tholuck's position stands up quite well in the modern discussion of this problem.

Next we discussed the Work of Christ under two heads. First, "Reconciliation, Revelation, and Interpretation" we found to be three things integrally connected in Jesus Christ. We noted the connection between interpretation and the doctrine of sin. The exposing of sin and the offer of salvation come together. The Bible presents both of these, and is therefore a word of comfort and a word of offence. As for Tholuck, we found that in practice his doctrine of sin was softened by his adoption of Hegel's position of continuity between God and man and of Schleiermacher's Romantic desire to make the Gospel a palatable message to the cultured. He posited a "connecting point" in man which circumvents Christ in His office of sole Mediator. We find therefore that here Tholuck's weaknesses do not enable him to measure up well to the theology of today.

The second heading under the Work of Christ was "Redemption in the Church". Here we saw that Tholuck well understood that

the interpreter must do his job in and for the Church. This is what Tholuck clearly did. We found that the Bible and the Church are united, and that the "hermeneutical circle" is "from faith to faith" by virtue of the activity of the Holy Spirit. We noted that Tholuck believed this, and this gave him a far better understanding of the Bible and the Church than is often held today among adherents of a "Gemeinde-theologie". For everything in the Bible is a witness to the fact that Biblical words correspond to realities and events.

The final point was a consideration of a perversion of the Christological analogy similar to the "Eutychian" heresy. This was Tholuck's tendency to blur the line between God and man by his extreme subjectivism. This is the theological side of it. His religion of the heart he used as a hermeneutical tool. The Scriptures were verified by his inner experience as a divine seed which recognizes the truth. This, we said, undervalues the objective events in Scripture, it lets us hear only what we want to hear, it establishes a connecting point from God to man outside of Christ. Both "Docetism" and "Ebionism" therefore appear here. "Docetism"; because the response of faith is abstracted from the objective facts of faith. "Ebionism"; because it is all about man, mere humanism. We still have this kind of subjectivism today, complete with a new vocabulary, from Bultmann et al. Our answer to Bultmann was the same as that which we gave to Schleiermacher and Tholuck. This is a sign of dissatisfaction with Christ as sole Mediator.

The philosophical side of the Eutychian perversion of the Christological analogy is the positing of a continuity between God and man. This, we said, and all its modern counterparts are destroyed by the sole mediatorship of Christ.

Thus we have come upon many solid and valuable points which Tholuck contributed to the field of hermeneutics. His best points are held widely today, and his weak points, unfortunately, are also with us. And many forceful arguments which he used against wrong tendencies in his day can be applied with equal strength to some contemporary errors. All things considered, Tholuck well served the Church of his day as an interpreter of the Holy Scriptures.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BFCT Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, ed. H. Cremer, A. Schlatter, W. Lütgert, Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann.
- EGT The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W. R. Nicoll, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1897-1910.
- ET Evangelische Theologie, ed. E. Wolf, Munich, Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- ICC The International Critical Commentary..., ed. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, C. A. Briggs, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
- JBL The Journal of Biblical Literature, ed. M. S. Emslin, Philadelphia.
- RE³ Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3rd Ed., ed. A. Hauck, Leipzig, J. C. Henrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- RGG² Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2nd Ed., ed. H. Gunkel, L. Zscharnack, Tübingen, Mohr, 1927-1932.
- RGG³ ----- 3rd Ed., ed. Kurt Galling, Tübingen, Mohr, 1957-
- Schaff-Herzog The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge..., ed. S. M. Jackson, London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1908-1912.
- SJT The Scottish Journal of Theology, ed. T. F. Torrance, J. K. S. Reid, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.
- Th L Z Theologische Literaturzeitung, ed. E. Sommerlath, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- TS Theologische Studien, ed. K. Barth, M. Geiger, Zürich.
- TT Theology Today, ed. H. T. Kerr, Princeton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works of Tholuck

"Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament" in Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, 5th Ed., Hamburg, Perthes, 1860.

Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer..., Berlin, F. Dümler, 1824. 2nd. Ed. 1828. 4th Ed., Halle, Anton, 1842.

Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des Neuen Testaments, zugleich eine Würdigung des Rezensions meines Kommentars zum Briefe an die Römer von Dr. Fritzsche, Halle, Anton, 1832.

Die Bibel, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1851, in Unterhaltenden Belehrungen für Förderung allgemeiner Bildung.

Einige apologetischen Winke für das Studium des Alten Testaments, Berlin, Maurer, 1821.

Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs im Verlaufe des 17. Jahrhunderts..., Hamburg and Gotha, Perthes, 1852.

Geschichte des Rationalismus, 1. Abteilung: Geschichte des Pietismus u. des 1. Stadiums der Aufklärung, Berlin, Wiegandt and Grieben, 1865.

Gespräche über die vornehmsten Glaubensfragen der Zeit..., Halle, Mühlmann, 1846. 2nd Ed., Perthes, 1865.

Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte, zugleich eine Kritik des Lebens Jesu von Strauss..., Hamburg, Perthes, 2nd Ed., 1838.

Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, Hamburg, Perthes, 1836, 3rd. Ed., 1850.

Kommentar zu dem Evangelio Johannis, Hamburg, Perthes, 1827. 5th Ed. 1837. 6th Ed. 1845.

Die Konsequenz der Reden Christi über seine Zukunft und sein Gericht, Halle, Anton, 1871.

Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers. Hamburg, Perthes and Besser, 1823. 3rd Ed. 1830. 8th Ed. 1862.

Literarische Anzeiger für christliche Theologie und Wissenschaft überhaupt. ed. A. Tholuck, 20 vols., 1830-1849, Halle, Anton and Gelbke.

Philologisch-theologische Auslegung der Bergpredigt Christi nach Matthäus..., Hamburg, Perthes, 1833. 3rd Ed. 1845. 4th Ed. 1856. 5th Ed. 1872.

Predigten über Hauptstücke der christlichen Glaubens und Lebens, Hamburg, Perthes, 1838-1845 (5 vols.).

(4) Predigten über die neusten Zeitbewegungen, Halle, Mühlmann, 1848.

Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen. Eine apologetische hermeneutische Studie. Gotha, Perthes, 1860, 1861, 1867.

Der sittliche Charakter des Heidentums, 3rd Ed., Gotha, Perthes, 1867.

A. Tholuck's Ausgewählte Predigten, ed. L. Witte, 2nd Ed., Gotha, Perthes, 1888.

Stunden christlicher Andacht. Ein Erbauungsbuch. Hamburg, Perthes, 1839-1840. 3rd. Ed. 1842. 4th Ed., 1847.

Übersetzung und Auslegung der Psalmen..., Halle, Anton, 1843. 2nd Ed. Perthes, 1873.

Umschreibende Übersetzung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer..., Berlin, Dümmler, 1825.

Vermischte Schriften grössenteils apologetischen Inhalts. Hamburg, Perthes, 1839. 2nd Ed. 1867.

Vorgeschichte des Rationalismus. 1. Teil: Das akademische Leben des 17. Jahrhunderts mit besondere Beziehung auf die protestantischen-theologischen Fakultäten Deutschlands... 1. Abteilung: Die akademischen Zustände, Halle, Anton, 1853. 2. Abteilung: Die Geschichte der deutschen, skandinavischen, niederländischen, schweizerischen Hohen Schulen. Halle, Anton, 1854. 2. Teil: Das kirchliche Leben des 17. Jahrhunderts bis in die Anfänge der Aufklärung. 1. Abteilung: Die 1. Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts bis zum westfälischen Frieden. Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben, 1861. 2. Abteilung: Die 2. Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben, 1862.

Translations

"Calvin as an Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures", in Calvin's Commentary on Joshua, Beveridge edition, Edinburgh, T. Constable, 1854.

A Commentary on the Gospel of John, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1860.

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, The Biblical Cabinet, vols. 38, 39, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1842.

A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1860.

"The Credibility of the Evangelical History" in Voices of the Church, ed. J. R. Beard, London, Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., 1845.

"Evangelical Theology in Germany - A Survey of my Life as a Teacher of Theology", The History, Essays, Orations and other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, 1873. New York, Harper & Bros., 1874.

Exposition...of Christ's Sermon on the Mount...I, II, The Biblical Cabinet, vol. vi, xx, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1834, 1837.

An Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1833-1836. Philadelphia, Sorin and Ball, 1844.

"Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament", The Biblical Cabinet, vol. i, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1833.

Hours of Christian Devotion, London, 1853, Edinburgh, 1870.

"Inspiration", The Journal of Sacred Literature, July, 1863.

Light from the Cross, Sermons on the Passion of our Lord, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1857.

"Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul", The Biblical Cabinet, vol. 28, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1840.

A Selection of University Sermons of Dr. A. Tholuck, London, Seely, 1844.

Sermons on Various Occasions, The Biblical Cabinet, vol. 8, T. Clark, 1840.

"Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology", Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844, no. 1.

A Translation and Commentary of the Book of Psalms, London, J. Nisbet, 1856.

The Two Students Guido and Julius; or the True Consecration of the Doubter, London, J. E. Shaw, 1855.

II. Works on Tholuck

Bonwetsch, G. N., "Aus A. Tholucks Anfängen", BFCT, 2/4.

Brastow, L. O., Modern Pulpit, London, Macmillan, 1906.

Doehring, Johannes, Die Predigtweise Tholucks, II, Berlin, 1939. A dissertation for the University of Königsberg.

Drews, Paul, "Die Bedeutung Tholucks für die Predigt der Gegenwart", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1912, Heft 1.

Fritzsche, C. F. A., Die Verdienste des Herrn...Tholucks um die Schrifterklärung, Halle, Anst. n., 1831.

Hodge, A. A., The Life of Charles Hodge, New York, Scribner's, 1880.

Kähler, Martin, August Tholuck. Ein Lebensabriss, Halle, Fricke, 1877.

Ker, John, The History of Preaching, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1888.

Nebe, A., Geschichte der Predigt, III, Wiesbaden, Nieder, 1879.

Otto, Rudolph, The Philosophy of Religion, London, Williams & Norgate, 1931.

Park, E. A., "A Sketch of the Life and Character of Professor Tholuck", The Biblical Cabinet, vol. 28, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1840.

Schaff, Philip, Germany, its Universities, Theology, and Religion, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1857.

Schellbach, Martin, Tholucks Predigt, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1956.

Stalker, James, "Studies in Conversion. VII. Tholuck", The Expositor, IV, 1912.

Witte, Leopold, Das Leben D. Friedr. Aug. Gotttreau Tholucks, Bielefeld and Leipzig, Velhagen und Klasing, 1884. (2 vols.)

III. Works on Nineteenth Century Theology

Barth, Karl, Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, Zürich, Zollikon, 1947.

- From Rousseau to Ritschl, a translation of eleven chapters of Die prot. Theol., London, SCM, 1959.
- "Das Wort in der Theologie von Schleiermacher bis Ritschl", Zwischen den Zeiten, 1928, Heft 2.
- Briggs, C. A., The Study of Holy Scripture, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1899.
- Dargan, E. C., A History of Preaching, II, New York, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912.
- Davidson, Samuel, Sacred Hermeneutics, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1843.
- Drummond, A. L., German Protestantism since Luther, London, Epworth, 1951.
- Farrar, F. W., A History of Interpretation, London, Macmillan, 1886.
- Hirsch, Emanuel, Geschichte der neuern Evangelischen Theologie, Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1949-1954.
- Kraus, H.-J., Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments, Neukirchen, Erziehungsvereins Verlag, 1956.
- Lichtenberger, F., A History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1889.
- Mackintosh, H. R., Types of Modern Theology, London, Nisbet, 1937.
- Moffatt, James, The Approach to the New Testament, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1921.
- Torrance, T. F., "The History of Dogmatic Theology", unpublished lectures at New College, Edinburgh, 1958-1959.
- Wach, Joachim, Das Verstehen, Grundzüge einer Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie im 19. Jahrhundert, Tübingen, Mohr, 1926.
- Weber, Otto, Grundlagen der Dogmatik, Neukirchen, Erziehungsvereins Verlag, 1955.

IV. Works of and on Contemporaries and Followers of Tholuck

Schleiermacher

Schleiermacher, F. D., Hermeneutik, ed. Heinz Kimmerle, Heidelberg, Carl Winter - Universitätsverlag, 1959.

----- Hermeneutik und Kritik, ed. F. Lücke, Sämtliche Werke, VII, Berlin, Reimer, 1838.

----- On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers, New York, Harper Torch, 1958.

Niebuhr, Richard R., "Schleiermacher on Language and Feeling", TT, July, 1960.

Schlatter, A., "Die philosophische Arbeit seit Cartesius", BFCT 10, 1906.

F. C. Baur

Baur, F. C., Die kanonischen Evangelien, Tübingen, Fues, 1847.

----- Die Tübinger Schule, 2nd Ed., Tübingen, Fues, 1860.

----- Vorlesungen Über neutestamentliche Theologie, ed. F. F. Baur, Leipzig, Fues, 1864.

----- The Church History of the First Three Centuries, 3rd Ed., London, Williams & Norgate, 1878-1879.

----- Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his life and work, his Epistles and teachings. London, Williams & Norgate, 1875.

Bauer, R., "F. C. Baur und die Tübinger Schule", RGG², I.

Mackay, R. W., The Tübingen School and its Antecedents, Edinburgh, Williams & Norgate, 1863.

Schneider, Ernst, F. C. Baur in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie, Munich, Lehmann, 1909.

Hengstenberg

Hengstenberg, E. W., The Christology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1854.

----- A Commentary on Ecclesiastes, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1860.

----- A Commentary on the Gospel of John, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1865.

----- A Commentary on the Psalms, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1846.

----- A Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1869.

----- Documents on the Genuineness of Daniel..., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1848.

----- Egypt and the Books of Moses, Edinburgh, T. Clark, 1845.

----- The History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1871.

Pältz, E. H., "Hengstenberg", RGG³, III.

Pope, W. B., "An Essay on the Life and Writings of Hengstenberg", in The History of the Kingdom...II.

Hofmann

Hofmann, J. C. K. von, Schriftbeweis, Nördlingen, Beck, 1857-60.

----- Interpreting the Bible, Minneapolis, Augsburg, 1959.

Bestmann, H. J., ed., Encyklopädie der Theologie von J. Ch. K. von Hofmann, Nördlingen, Beck, 1879.

Hauck, A., "Hofmann", Schaff-Herzog.

Haussleiter, Johannes, Grundlinien der Theologie Joh. Christ. von Hofmanns, Leipzig, Deichert, 1910.

Hübner, E., "Hofmann", RGG³, III.

Mays, James, "A Classic on Hermeneutics", Review of Hofmann's Interpreting the Bible, Interpretation, April, 1960.

Lücke

Lücke, F., Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes, Bonn, Weber, 1834.

----- Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Hermeneutik und ihrer Geschichte, Göttingen, 1817.

----- "Übersicht der zur Hermeneutik, Grammatik, Lexico und Auslegung des neutestamentlichen gehörigen Literatur vom Anfang 1828 bis Mitte 1829", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1830.

----- "Reminiscences of Schleiermacher", in A Brief Outline of the Study of Theology by Schleiermacher, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1850.

Dilthey

Dilthey, W., Entstehung der Hermeneutik, Gesammelte Schriften, I, Leipzig and Berlin, Teubner, 1921.

----- "The Rise of Hermeneutics", in Hodges' Dilthey, translated from Gesammelte Schriften V.

Bollnow, O. F., "Dilthey", RGG³, III.

Bultmann, R., "The Problem of Hermeneutics", Essays, Philosophical and Theological, London, SCM, 1955.

Hodges, H. A., Wilhelm Dilthey, An Introduction, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1949.

Mulert, "Dilthey", RGG², I.

Cremer

Cremer, Hermann, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Mt. 24, 25., Stuttgart, Steinkopf, 1860.

----- "Der germanische Satisfaktionsbegriff in der Versöhnungslehre", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1893, Heft 2.

----- Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1899.

----- Review of Witte's Das Leben...Tholucks, Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1889, II.

----- Beyond the Grave, New York, Harper, 1886.

----- A Reply to Harnack on the Essence of Christianity, London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1903.

Duncan, Robert C., "The Contribution of Hermann Cremer to Theological Hermeneutics", unpublished thesis for the University of Edinburgh, June, 1958.

Hausleiter, Johannes, "Cremer", RE³, vol. 23.

Koepp, W., "Cremer", RGG³, I.

Meyer, A., "Bibelwissenschaft", RGG², I.

Kähler

Kähler, Martin, Dogmatische Zeitfragen. 2nd Ed. Leipzig, G. Böhme, 1908-1913. I. Zur Bibelfrage, 1907, III. Zeit und Ewigkeit, 1913.

----- Der so-genannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus, Leipzig, Scholl, 1928.

----- Versöhnung durch Christum, 2nd Ed. Leipzig, Deichert, 1907.

----- Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre, 2nd Ed. Leipzig, Deichert, 1893.

Gräber, Karl, Die Versöhnungslehre Käblers, 1922.

Hutten, K., "Kähler", RGG³, III.

Kattenbusch, F., Review of Kähler's Wissenschaft..., ThLZ, 1894.

Klaas, W., "Kähler", Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon, 2.

Lütgert, D. W., Martin Kähler, Gedächtnisrede, BFCT 17/1, 1913.

Niemeier, G., Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit in der Theologie Martin Käblers.

Schulze, Martin, "Kähler Renaissance", ThLZ, 65, 1/2, 1940.

Schmidt-Japing, "Kähler", RGG², III.

Schlatter

Schlatter, A., "Briefe über das christliche Dogma", BFCT, 1912/3.

----- Das christliche Dogma, Calw and Stuttgart, Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1911.

----- Einleitung in die Bibel, 3rd Ed. Calw and Stuttgart, Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1901.

----- "Die Entstehung der Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie...", BFCT, vol. 25, 1920.

----- "Die philosophische Arbeit seit Cartesius", BFCT, 1906.

----- Adolph Schlatters Rückblick auf seine Lebensarbeit, Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1952.

----- The Church in the New Testament Period, London, SPCK, 1955.

Beintker, Horst, Die Christenheit und das Recht bei Adolph Schlatter, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957.

Adolph Schlatter, Gedächtnisheft der deutschen Theologen. Contributors: G. Kittel, W. Gutbrod, P. Althaus, E. Mülhaupt, T. Schrenk, W. Geisser, R. Bretzger, H. Fritsch, W. Metzger.

Ein Lehrer der Kirche. Contributors: T. Schrenk, Liebendörfer, Bodelschwingh, Graeber, Hupfeld, Fezer.

Luck, Ulrich, Kerygma und Tradition in der Hermeneutik Adolph Schlatters, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

Lütgert, W., "Adolph Schlatter als Theologe," BFCT 37/1, 1932.

Tebbe, W., "Schlatter", Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon, III.

Traub, F., "Schlatter", RGG², V.

Strauss

Strauss, D. F., The Life of Jesus for the People, 2nd Ed., Edinburgh, Williams & Norgate, 1879.

V. Works on Hermeneutics and Exegesis and on particular problems thereof

Althaus, Paul, Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today (American Ed.), The So-called Kerygma and the Historical Jesus, Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1959.

Barr, James, The Semantics of Biblical Language, London, Oxford University Press, 1961.

Barth, Karl, Church Dogmatics, I/2, Edinburgh, T. & T., Clark, 1956.

----- A Shorter Commentary on Romans, London, SCM, 1959.

Blackmann, E. C., Biblical Interpretation, London, Independent Press, 1957.

Briggs, C. A., A General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1899.

Brown, James, Subject and Object in Modern Theology, London, SCM, 1955.

- Bultmann, R., Essays, Philosophical and Theological, London, SCM, 1955.
- Cairns, David, A Gospel Without Myth?, London, SCM, 1960.
- Colwell, E. C., The Study of the Bible, Chicago, University Press, 1942.
- Craig, A. C., Preaching in a Scientific Age, London, SCM, 1954.
- Cullmann, O., Christ and Time, London, SCM, 1951.
- Dana, H. E., and Glaze, R. E., Interpreting the New Testament, 1961.
- Dana, H. E., Searching the Scriptures, New Orleans, 1936.
- Denney, James, The Epistle to the Romans, EGT.
- Diem, Hermann, Dogmatics, Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- Dodd, C. H., The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Moffatt Series, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1933.
- Dods, Marcus, The Epistle to the Hebrews, EGT.
- Ebeling, G., "Hermeneutik", RGG³, III.
- "Wort Gottes und Hermeneutik", Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1959, Heft 2.
- Fullerton, K., Prophecy and Authority, New York, Macmillan, 1919.
- Glen, J. S., The Recovery of the Teaching Ministry, Philadelphia, Westminster, 1960.
- Hunter, A. M., Design for Life, An Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, London, SCM, 1953.
- Jeremias, Joachim, The Parables of Jesus, London, SCM, 1954.
- Kenyon, F. G., Recent Developments in Textual Criticism, London, University Press, 1933.
- Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London, Macmillan, 1926.
- Kümmel, W. G., Das Neue Testament, Munich, Verlag Karl Alber Freiburg, 1958.

- Lampe, G. W. H., and Woolcombe, K. J., Essays on Typology, London, SCM, 1957.
- Löwith, Karl, Meaning in History, Chicago, University Press, 1955.
- McIntyre, John, The Christian Doctrine of History, Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Miskotte, K. H., Zur biblischen Hermeneutik, TS, 1959, Heft 55.
- Moffatt, James, The Epistle to the Hebrews, ICC, 1924.
- Muilenburg, James, "Preface to Hermeneutics", JBL, LXXVII, March, 1958, Part I.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, London, Williams and Norgate, 1901.
- Noth, Martin, "Die Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments in der Verkündigung", ET, Juli/August, 1952, Heft 1/2.
- Ott, Heinrich, "Heilsgeschichte", RGG³, III.
- Piper, Otto, "Modern Problems of New Testament Exegesis", The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, 36/1, August, 1942.
- Reid, J. K. S., The Authority of Scripture, London, Methuen, 1957.
- Richardson, A., and Schweitzer, W., eds., Biblical Authority for Today, London, SCM, 1951.
- Ritschl, Dietrich, Die homiletische Funktion der Gemeinde, TS, 1959, Heft 59.
- A Theology of Proclamation, Richmond, Virginia, John Knox Press, 1959.
- Robinson, James M., A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, SCM, 1959.
- Rylaarsdam, J. C., "The Problem of Faith and History in Biblical Interpretation", JBL, LXXVII, Part I, March, 1958.
- Sanday, W., and Headlam, C., A Critical...Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, ICC, 1945.
- Smart, James, The Interpretation of Scripture, London, SCM, 1961.
- Snaith, N. H., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, Epworth, 1944.

- Steck, K. G., Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte, TS, 1959, Heft 56.
- Stendahl, Krister, "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation", JBL, LXXVII, 1958.
- Torrance, T. F., "Hermeneutics", unpublished lectures at New College, Edinburgh, 1962.
- "The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, ed. T. H. L. Parker, London, Lutterworth, 1956.
- Tregelles, S. P., An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament..., London, Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854.
- Van Ruler, A. A., Die christliche Kirche und das Alte Testament, 1955.
- Vogel, Heinrich, Grundfragen des Studiums der Theologie, 1957.
- Von Rad, G., "Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments", ET, Juli/August, 1952, Heft 1/2.
- Westcott, B. F., The Epistle to the Hebrews, London, Macmillan, 1889.
- Wingren, Gustav, The Living Word, London, SCM, 1960.
- Theology in Conflict, Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1958.
- Wright, G. E., "Interpreting the Old Testament", TT, July, 1946.
- Zimmerli, W., "Verheissung und Erfüllung", ET, Juli/August, 1952.