

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1922.

No. 1.

## Schopenhauer's Way of Salvation.

REV. H. C. ENGELBRECHT, Oak Park, Ill.

Speaking from the standpoint of philosophy itself, one must say that modern philosophers are for the most part conceiving their task entirely too narrow. Far from embracing the vast field of human thought and desires, hopes and perplexities, they are limiting themselves to a few isolated problems. Thus the movement recently launched known as Critical Realism<sup>1)</sup> has chosen as its sole province epistemology: the problem of knowledge. Prof. J. B. Pratt, who is one of this school, writes:—

“Critical Realism does not pretend to metaphysics. It is perfectly possible to the critical realist to be a pansychist, a metaphysical dualist, a Platonist, or an ontological idealist of some other type. Only so much of the metaphysical problem need critical realists be agreed upon as is required by the epistemological doctrine which they hold in common.”<sup>2)</sup>

Philosophers of other schools and times have seen larger problems. They have dealt with the origin of things, the relation of the finite and the Infinite, the cause and cure of human sorrows and ills, the whence and why and whither of life. The greatness of Christianity lies also in this, that it alone possesses the key to these fundamental human problems. Philosophers of many climes and times have undertaken to find an answer. Among these was also Arthur Schopenhauer. What problems the world presented to Schopenhauer and how he endeavored to solve them shall be the subject of this paper.

---

1) Critical Realism is a very recent movement represented by Profs. D. Drake of Vassar College, A. O. Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins U., J. B. Pratt of Williams College, A. K. Rogers of Yale U., Geo. Santayana of Harvard U., R. W. Sellars of Michigan U., and C. A. Strong of Columbia U. They have joined in publishing a volume which they call *Essays in Critical Realism*. 1920.

2) *Essays in Critical Realism*, p. 109.

## Little Journeys in the Higher Anticriticism.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

### II. The Documentary Hypothesis.

With even more telling effect than in the case of the mythological method, the argumentation used for the support of the document hypothesis has been turned against the literary criticism of the Bible.

The document, or source, hypothesis sets out to prove that many of the Biblical writings are of composite authorship; that one and the same Biblical book may contain elements which originated at intervals of centuries and which were combined into the book as we now have it by some later editor; that by means of the canons of literary (higher) criticism we are able to assign one portion of the book to one author, generally anonymous, and another portion with equal certainty to another author, also anonymous; and that by priestly fraud or for purposes of propaganda the redactors, or editors, altered the texts which they found and freely inserted statements which served their purpose. Thus we have Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah; we have the Ur-Markus; we have documents of various authorship in Acts; and in the Pentateuch fragments of a Jehovist writer, of the Elohist, sections originally part of a Priest-Codex, writings of the Deuteronomian, and many interpolations by editors and redactors, who assigned the entire Pentateuch to a (mythical?) Moses. The complexity of the system can be understood when it is observed that in each "source" or "document" various accretions are distinguished, the layers in each series being designated J1, J2, J3, etc., or P1, P2, P3, etc. Of course, no two solutions of the documentary problem are alike, and in the nature of the case they are largely, if not entirely, pure guesswork. Yet in some form the documentary or source hypothesis is held by all representatives of the negative criticism.

New applications of the document hypothesis belong to the stock-in-trade of the critical fraternity, and there is no recent commentary that fails to record a new crop of conjectures based on the general notion that whoever may be the author of a Biblical book, he is not the author that announces himself as such in the sacred text. We have space only for two examples. A new theory of the authorship of Luke's gospel was recently proposed by an Episcopalian clergyman in a conference paper. The author, Rev. W. W. Holdsworth, first summarized the hypotheses of Harnack, Sanday,

and others with regard to the origin of the "S" portion of St. Luke — that is, of the matter which St. Luke alone records — and then proposed an explanation of his own, "claiming that, while it accounts for all the facts enumerated in great detail by these scholars, it avoids the difficulties which appear as soon as any one of the above explanations is considered." His conclusion, drawn, of course, entirely from "internal" evidence, is that the author of "S" was — Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward! Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania, a few months previous to his death, published a book on Job. Professor Jastrow, who was a liberal Jew and an Ethical Culturist, treats the Book of Job merely as literature and feels free to handle his subject much as a medical student would a cadaver. ("As well," says a reviewer, "might Trotzky explain the Beatitudes.") Jastrow has a new theory about the origin of Job: The book as we have it is composed of layers. The original layer was the story which appears in the prolog and epilog, an archaic non-Hebraic folk-tale in prose. Then was added the philosophic debate or symposium between Job and his friends, a skeptical poem rather awkwardly sandwiched in between parts of the old story. This poem of moral doubt was retouched by meddling orthodox editors to make its features more pleasing to the conservative theology of the day, about 400 B. C., thus changing its original pale doubt to its present religious complexion. But the two, the symposium and the story, are distinct and, to Dr. Jastrow, contradictory. The third layer is then supposed to have been affixed, being the speeches of Elihu, intended as an orthodox corrective; and, finally, the fourth layer, the "nature poems," provides the solution of the problem in the thought of faith in an overwhelming power. The pitiful result, however, we are told, is that the present Book of Job is a "tissue of contradictions, full of abrupt transitions, lacking an orderly arrangement of themes, to an extent that would reflect most seriously on the mentality of those who could produce such a confusing work" —! Thus originated a book which Prof. Moulton of Chicago University, who is not a believing Bible student, holds to be the greatest masterpiece in the world's literature.

In non-Biblical literary criticism, men have learned to speak with caution. It was the fashion a hundred years ago to regard the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as a collection of ballads composed by a "school" of rhapsodists. Now this (Wolffian) theory is regarded as a thing of the past, — since it is known that the art of writing

was practised in Greece 1100 B. C., centuries before the Iliad and Odyssey were composed. "The ballad theory," says John Fiske, "is dead and buried. Were Wolff alive to-day, he would be first to laugh at it." When Canon Dragoni of Cremona in 1840 published a collection of old charters, both Waitz and Wuestenfeld, two "authorities" of the very first order, declared them spurious (1856). Nevertheless, E. Meyer proved in 1905 that nearly all of them are absolutely authentic. The same logic of facts has spoken with an authoritative voice on the theories at various times propounded for the origin of Biblical books. Before the rise of the documentary theory it was asserted with great confidence that the art of writing was unknown in Israel until three or four centuries after the age of Moses and that to associate written books with Moses was as glaring an anachronism as to introduce gunpowder and high explosives into the campaigns of Alexander and Caesar. The finding of the Tel-El-Amarna tablets establishes beyond dispute that the art of writing was known and practised in Canaan long before Moses appeared on the scene of events. Men of high standing in the realm of criticism contended that codes of law were unknown in very early times. To locate the Levitical code in the Mosaic era was to them as absurd as it would be to picture Washington inditing his farewell address on a typewriter. Then the Hammurabi Code was brought to light, and we now know that long before the days of Moses elaborate codes of law were in use among men. Baur and a host of other experts asserted that the traditions assigning our New Testament writings to the times of the apostles were erroneous. They insisted that the gospels and epistles were written in the second and third centuries. How stands the case to-day? The staunchest followers of Baur have had to lower their colors. The force of authoritative evidence has driven them to confess that Paul's epistles were written within thirty years of the crucifixion, that Luke is undoubtedly the author of the Gospel according to Luke and of Acts, and that the New Testament books with hardly an exception belong to the first century. We must take the space to point out at least one typical instance of the manner in which the results of the documentary theory have been controverted. In the prophecy of Balaam, Numbers 24 and 22, there is a reference to the Kenites and Ashur. Fritz Hommel in his *Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung in Inschriftlicher Beleuchtung*, 1897, p. 245 ff., establishes that this reference to the inhabitants of Shur in Southern Palestine is uncontrovertible proof for the Mosaic origin

of the text. "This entire prophecy is comprehensible only if it originated in the Mosaic age." Hommel's entire book is a powerful argument against the new Pentateuchal criticism. But the documentary critics persist in representing their conjectures as the result of collective modern scholarship. McCurdy in his *History, Prophecies, and Monuments*, Vol. 3, p. 43 asserts that even the "oldest stratum" of the prophecies of Balaam "can scarcely have originated long before the time of David."

However, with the many reversals of opinion, involving such important questions as the date and authorship of John's gospel and of Acts, we are not here concerned. While the higher criticism still clings essentially to the canons set up by Wellhausen and his school on the basis of the Hegelian (evolutionistic) view of history, the "traditional" view has in countless matters of detail again obtained recognition, especially due to the incontestable proof derived from the work of excavators and archeologists generally. Limiting our study to the investigation of method, of principles and processes, it appears that regardless of historical and archeological counter-proof, the *Quellenscheidungshypothese*, whether applied to the Pentateuch, Matthew, or Acts, bears within itself the seeds of dissolution. For, if these same principles and processes are applied to books of undeniable integrity and authenticity, it develops that these, too, can be shown to consist of varied source-material more or less, principally less, skilfully welded together into a literary whole by some later redactor!

#### "Romans Dissected."

This is the title of a book by the late Prof. Charles Marsh Mead of Hartford Seminary, published some thirty years ago. By applying the analytical methods current in Pentateuchal research to the Epistle to the Romans, Prof. Mead showed that according to these critical canons this letter must be severed into half a dozen documents from different authors and dates. *Romans Dissected* is a masterpiece of *ad absurdum* criticism equal in some respects to Whately's *Historic Doubts*. But while the British satire asserts an impossible proposition, *viz.*, that Napoleon Bonaparte is a myth, and is simply a dialectic *jeu d'esprit*, Prof. Mead's book announces a thesis which could produce no greater shock than that produced by scores of critics with their pronouncements of source hypotheses applied to other Biblical books. If the Pentateuch, and Isaiah, and the gospels, and Acts, — why not Romans? Moreover,

the methods pursued are in every detail parallel to those of Biblical criticism now in vogue.

"The methods to be pursued," says Mead, "will be that of a critical analysis, which, by showing that the Epistle is a composite work, written by at least four authors, each (or at least three) of them professing to be Paul, destroys the traditional conception root and branch."

Mead first addresses himself to the detection of different types of thought which prevail in various parts of Romans. He finds that the letter is the production of four different authors, which, being unknown, he designates for convenience' sake as G', G'', JC, and CJ, according as they use the terms "God," "Jesus Christ," and "Christ Jesus."

"G' (1, 18—2, 15; 2, 17—29; 12, 9—13, 13; 16, 17—20) portrays Christianity as an ethical institution, a spiritualized Judaism. Salvation, according to him, is gained by obedience to the Law. We find here nothing about faith of any sort as a condition of salvation. In G'' (3, 1—20; 3, 27—4, 24; 7, 7—24; 9, 6—33; 11, 1—36), on the contrary, though nothing is said about faith in Jesus, salvation is emphatically represented as a divine gift, and the appropriation of it comes through faith in God on the part of man. In JC (1, 1—17; 2, 16; 3, 21—26; 4, 25—5, 21; 9, 1—5; 10, 1—21; 15, 8—13; 16, 21—27) the prominent thought is that of justification through faith in Christ, and particularly in Christ as a vicarious sacrifice. In CJ (6, 2—7, 6; 8, 1—39; 12, 1—8; 13, 14—15, 7; 15, 14—23; 16, 1—16) the chief stress is laid on the necessity of spiritual union between the Christian and Christ, through which the life of the flesh is replaced by that of the Spirit."

In addition to these four authors, Mead finds traces of an interpolator, or redactor, R, whom he constantly appeals to, — *à la* Wellhausen, Driver, Cheyne, and Haupt, — when his processes do not "work." The illusion in these sections of Mead's book is perfect. G' is first investigated:—

"From internal evidence we infer that G' wrote not far from 80—90 A. D., when we may suppose the legendary influences had magnified the reputation of Jesus, so that He was idealized and held to be a great authority, though doubtless not yet regarded as superhuman. Probably, therefore, such benedictions as that of 16, 20 could hardly yet have been used; yet since R could have had no sufficient reason for interpolating it here, the most probable supposition is that this benediction had been added by some transcriber

previous to R, in order to give the letter a proper termination, and that R simply left it as he found it."

To G'' are attributed all passages in the book which refer to faith as necessary for justification, but refer this to God, and contain no references to Jesus Christ. Next he takes up JC:—

"This author represents a decidedly different type of thought from G'' or G'. He must have lived at a time when Jesus had gained a unique authority, and was regarded as in a peculiar sense the Mediator between God and man. The influence of the Old Testament is still strong, however, but discloses itself in the representation of Jesus' death as the fulfilment of the Mosaic sacrifices. We may not improbably conjecture that he wrote about 120 to 130 A. D. Like G'', JC emphasizes faith; but it is faith in Christ and His Gospel."

Next comes CJ,—the symbol which stands for the passages containing the term "Christ Jesus." Mead points out that in these parts of the epistle there is a different use of *dikaiosyne*, *dikaioo*, *dikaionoma*, *dikaiosis*, and that CJ stresses sanctification. At some verses this theory goes to pieces, but then we have the Redactor, who "was more skilful here than usual in putting his patchwork together," "why R inserted the passage from G'' just here is mysterious," etc.

The author proceeds to compare the vocabulary of the various authors and also here finds very sharp distinctions:—

"It is instructive to compare this result with a similar analysis of Gen. 1—12, 5, which has been made by Prof. W. R. Harper. He finds the whole number of different words to be 485, of which P uses 239, and J 367. Those used exclusively by P number 118, by J 246. Therefore there are 121 common to the two. Turning now to our Epistle and comparing G' and G'', we find that together they use 613 different words, but that only 110 are common to the two. So far as this indication goes, therefore, it speaks more decidedly for the non-identity of G' and G'' than for that of P and J. . . .

"The foregoing observations respecting the vocabulary of the four writers are borne out when we examine the style of the several parts. G' is preeminently oratorical, G'' argumentative, JC doctrinal, CJ emotional.

"The difference between the four writers in respect of style may be otherwise stated as follows: G' is psychological; G'' is historical; JC is didactic; CJ is hortatory."

Prof. Mead concludes that "an impartial view of the matter must lead us to affirm that not only not the greater part, but no part of the Epistle to the Romans was written by Paul."

Our brief extracts convey to the reader no impression of the exquisite art with which Mead mimics every process and method, every trick and artifice of the higher critics. The seriousness of the discussion is so well sustained, its satire so elusive that Mead's book actually deceived a number of Biblical critics! It was first issued in German and then bore the title "*Der Roemerbrief Beurteilt und Gevierteilt. Von Carl Hesedamm,*" this pseudonym being an anagram on the author's name. It was taken so seriously by German scholars that Prof. Mead was compelled to issue, in self-defense, a second edition in English "in order to prevent himself from becoming a bright and shining light in the galaxy of critical stars." He did so under the name of E. D. McRealsham, "a most appropriate and significant pseudonym since it tallied exactly with the facts." — Prof. Mead died in 1911.

If "Carl Hesedamm" robbed Paul of Romans, Prof. Klostermann proved him the author of the 119th Psalm! The article in question was printed in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Erlangen and Leipzig), 1901, and was cast in the form of a "New Year's Epistle" addressed to Dr. R. Seeberg of Berlin. Its title is: "*Der 119. Psalm ein Gebet des Apostels Paulus.*"

#### Paul the Author of the 119th Psalm.

Prof. Klostermann declares that in these days of wireless telegraphy it is the correct thing to eliminate entirely from the critical process the "wire" of tradition and to apply the purely "wireless" process of Wellhausen and his followers. We must get away from grammar, philology, history, — and "here, too," says Klostermann, with biting sarcasm, "Wellhausen has been our great pioneer, — omitting, in his *Minor Prophets*, the difficult sections." Then commences some ponderous foolery, with Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Persian etymologies scattered over the pages. Open the *Zeitschrift* here, and you will read page after page without sensing the satire; the mimicry of the negative method is perfect: —

"But where shall we seek the origin of Isaac? If only, as in the equation Mizraim = Mestraim, we render Izchaq thus: Ista-chaq, we at once observe the identity with the Median Astyages, *i. e.*, Azhis dahaka = the serpent Dahaqa, — a name which the Arabs and later the Jews interpreted as dahhaq, 'the laugher.' Let me add that the mythical serpent king Dahaq, according to a Per-



sian writer, had a father, Arvendasp, *i. e.*, Abiram with Persian suffix, and a grandfather, Rebigavan, *i. e.*, Reuben, and I beg you to remember also that Abiram (Num. 16), who has an Eranian brother, Dathan, is called a son of Reuben. What immense distances do not here open up to the view of the scholar! May the coming century penetrate to their depths!" — etc., etc. After many pages of this, Klostermann approaches his major task, — that of proving the 119th Psalm a poem of St. Paul.

Let us cut out (ausschalten, — the German term for "cutting out" an electric connection) the wire of tradition and not assume that the Old Testament may contain only pre-Christian documents. Was not (?!) Hebrew the language of the early congregation, and may it not be assumed that it would add to the books of the Old Testament some production of its own spiritual experience? Why, the very arrangement of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet proves its Christian origin! Between Aleph and Tau there are two decades, each consisting of two pentades, of symbols. In the second decade, the first pentad begins with *Lamed*, *i. e.*, the Lunchi = Greek, Logche, the spear of Longinus, which caused water (*Mem*) and blood to flow from the side of the IXTHYS (*Nun* = fish = symbol for Christ); and the second commences with *Pe*, *i. e.*, (S)phoge, with aphairesis of the S, like fungus = Gr. Sphongos, the sponge which the soldier applied to the mouth (*Pe*) of the Crucified. In the first decade it is the conclusion of each pentad that is significant. At the end of the first we have the nails (*Waw*), expressly pointed out to us by the "He!" — See! Be prepared! And at the end of the second pentad the crown, (K)lil — (the following we must add in the original:) "denn der Buchstabe sieht dem nur von vorn gesehenen Kronreifen aehnlicher als der Hand (*Kof*) einer durch falsche Analogie mit der wirklichen Hand des vorhergehenden Jod erzeugten Missdeutung" — !

Now we have obtained the *Gesamtanschauung* that the Old Testament script has been revised and reduced from an earlier form by the hand of Christians. Moreover, we have proof of this in the New Testament — and now Klostermann cites the *stoicheia* of Gal. 4, 3, cf. v. 25, as evidence that the Christian had once been bound to the alphabet of the old world, whereas they now spell according to a new scheme, based on the punctuation (6, 17!!) of 'Jesus Christ! Now as to the 119th Psalm in particular. Here we have the alphabetical division, already recognized as edited by Christians to symbolize the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

“A closer examination of the words of the text themselves in many places shows that it is of Christian origin. It is evident that the words (verse 83), ‘I am become like a bottle in the smoke; yet do I not forget Thy statutes,’ which has been a regular *crux* for the exegetes of all ages, easily yields to the explanation that Paul had fallen into the hands of a Roman centurion, and yet remained faithful (Acts 27, 1). Compare also the conditions described in verses 41—48, and we have a perfect reproduction of the feelings of Paul when, in the presence of his accuser, Tertullus, he spoke to Felix and Agrippa. Still more direct are the applications of the contents of verses 58—67 and 75—79, which depict almost in so many words the experience which Paul had in Philippi. Again, the sentiments expressed in 2 Tim. 4, 6—8 are a reflex of the contents of verses 81, 82, 123, 124 of this psalm. Compare also verse 54 with 2 Cor. 1, 9, 10. There are even verbal agreements between the Pauline epistles and this psalm; compare verse 130 with Col. 1, 9; verse 131 with 2 Cor. 6, 11; verse 136 with Phil. 3, 18.”

“I have,” says Klostermann in conclusion, “engaged to set forth my thesis through detailed proof, although I realize that by means of the much more rapid investigation of antiquity which our new century promises, such laborious methods will soon become antiquated. We suddenly, as it were, gain concepts on the basis of our enlightenment, and we shall not bother much about details, or about correcting the opposite, traditional view. Really, we have only one complaint to make. Modern Biblical science is still too much dependent on the wire of tradition; but in the century just begun, critical scholarship will proceed to the methods of wireless telegraphy, which I have illustrated above.”

We have completed our little peregrinations through the field of higher anticriticism. Disconcerting as the *ad absurdum* argument must be to negative criticism, it affords some amusement to the believer in the integrity and authority of the Scriptural record. But there is a deeper and a very serious purpose underlying all this persiflage. There are vital questions involved, and the situation is serious. Our confidence in the Bible as a source of historical information determines our confidence in most of the teachings which we have come to recognize as the great truths of religion, and with which our spiritual life is indissolubly bound up. Hence there is much more in Whately's *Historic Doubts* and in Mead's “quartering” of Romans than a mere desire to make an opponent look foolish. The object is to destroy the presumption that faith and

reason are antagonistic, if each functions according to its true nature. And if we recognize the government of divine Providence in the discovery, in this age, of Babylonian cylinders and Greek coins which dissipate into thin air certain basic assertions of the negative higher criticism, — the very stones speaking from the ashes of forgotten chiliads to testify to the genuineness of the record, — we may recognize some worth also in the demonstration, along lines of pure dialectic, of the misuse of the critical faculty as employed in the myth- and source-hypotheses. The Sadducean critics, it is very clear, have proved far too much. Their agnosticism is based not on reason, but upon an abuse of reason.