

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 5—January, 1891.

I.

RECENT DOGMATIC THOUGHT AMONG THE PROTESTANTS IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.*

WE are not so fortunate as to be able to avail ourselves of sources lying ready at hand to obtain a correct impression of the dogmatic tendency or tendencies which have prevailed among the Protestants of Austria-Hungary since the middle of this century. Besides some scattered articles in brochures and church papers, as, for example, in Schenkel's *Allgemeine kirchliche Zeitschrift*,† there exists no treatment of the subject of any kind which can be called in any way comprehensive or exhaustive. Moreover, the isolated studies which exist, are written from very diverse standpoints, and therefore make no uniform impression. We shall endeavor to give the American theological public some information concerning the subject indicated in the title, drawn partly from experience and partly from periodicals and brochures of all kinds. If the reader will glance at a map of Austria-Hungary, he will perceive a very extensive tract. From the Russian-Turkish boundary to the Tyrol, from the northernmost part of Bohemia to the Adriatic sea, stretches the territory, and Protestant congregations are found everywhere in it. In some places they stand forth as mere ruins of former greatness and glory, as in the German-Slavic countries; in others they are more compact, as in Hungary, along the Theiss and around Debreczin.

In Hungary the gospel has never had to submit to be entirely

* [For the translation of Dr. Böhl's paper our readers are indebted to the competent hand of the Rev. Charles S. Barrett, M.A., of Baltimore, Md.—
EDITORS.]

† See for the year 1863, 4 Heft.

ment alongside of the latter. The attitude of preëxilian prophets, especially that of Isaiah, towards the cultus presupposes an established order of a well-developed worship. It was not against worship itself that they inveighed; but against the spirit in which it was offered. Nothing could be truer than this and we accept it as a valuable concession over against the exaggerations of the Wellhausen school of critics. It is as well a significant as an interesting fact, also, that this critic dates the principal portions of the Priests' Code as early as the seventh century. He helps to even up the two camps at this point, being associated in this respect with such scholars as Schrader, Nöldeke, Riehm, Dillmann, Bredenkamp, König, Kittel, and, in part, Delitzsch.

Some of the weak points in the author's theory, looking at it from his own point of view, have been indicated. But the weakest thing of all, in our estimation, is the point of view itself. How he can accept and build upon so many Biblical statements while rejecting so many, how he can be so conservative and yet so revolutionary and destructive a critic, is a mystery. No doubt efforts will continue to be made to account for the facts of the Old Testament religion and their influence on mankind past and present on the basis of a natural development. That such efforts have hitherto failed of finding general approval and are likely always to fail, is because no theory starting with such an assumption can ever satisfactorily cover the ground of all the facts; or be made even tolerably consistent with itself while rejecting a part of them.

Hartford, Conn.

EDWIN C. BISSELL.

HISTORISCH-CRITISCH ONDERZOEK NAAR HET ONTSTAAN EN DE VERZAMELING VAN DE BOEKEN DES OUDEN VERBONDS. DOOR A. KUENEN. Tweede geheel omgewerkte Uitgave. Tweede Deel: DE PROFETISCHE BOEKEN DES OUDEN VERBONDS. Leiden: P. Engels en Zonen, 1889.

The difference between the new edition of this second volume of Kuenen's work and the first edition which appeared in 1863 is by no means as great as that between the corresponding issues of the first volume. In the realm of Pentateuchal criticism revolutions have taken place, while the modern theories in regard to the prophetic writings exhibit a steadier and more gradual development. The fact, moreover, that Kuenen is one of the recognized leaders among the advocates of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, lends a special interest to the first volume, which, from the nature of the case, cannot be claimed for his treatment of the present matter. Both volumes resemble each other in this respect that they take account of the most recent discussions and enable the reader by careful study to familiarize himself with the present status and the general trend of rationalistic Old Testament criticism. Though Kuenen does not give a history of the problems in hand, still his work has two characteristics which render it eminently useful for the purpose mentioned. It is throughout genetic in its treatment; by not merely presenting results, but also showing the way in which they were reached, it affords an insight into the author's method of working. It is furthermore polemic, especially in the copious notes accompanying the text, which contain a wealth of historic information, all of present interest. On the whole, the author appears as a calm and unprejudiced critic, to whose conclusions, his principles of criticisms once granted, no one can take serious exception. These principles to be sure are, as Kuenen himself does not conceal, from the outset, incompatible with any form of supernaturalism. Occasionally the critic even drops the chain of his argument to protest against a supernaturalistic inference that might be drawn from his conclusions. After granting the historical character of Jeremiah's prophecy against Hananiah,

chap. xxviii. 15, and of its fulfillment, he adds the remark that a single case of this kind is utterly inadequate to prove the supernaturalistic position, since history offers numerous other examples of similar coincidences. This is certainly overstepping the limits of impartiality.

On the other hand, Kuenen shows some degree of moderation when compared with the ultra-radicalists of the type of Stade. On p. 40 we meet with this highly interesting statement: "He (Stade) asserts that the prophets of the eighth century always have in view a single nation or particular nations, and that even when they speak of homage being paid by the nations to Jahveh, still the idea of their conversion is foreign to them and to the pre-exilic prophets in general. In order to maintain this view, however, he has been compelled to deny the genuineness of a constantly increasing number of pre-exilic texts, and to declare them 'secondary' or interpolated, often on very weak or even trivial grounds . . . It is clear that here the dividing line between criticism and hypercriticism is no longer regarded." Quite in keeping with this are Kuenen's remarks concerning Stade's treatment of chaps. ix-xi of Zechariah. "According to my opinion," he says, "the authenticity of not a single passage of the Old Testament would be able to withstand such criticism."

Of concrete results the following may be noted. Several pieces of Isaiah are assigned to a date somewhat earlier or later than in the first edition. Chaps. xl-lxvi are divided into an exilic and a postexilic part, a division parallel with that into Babylonian and Judean sections. Pre-exilic and Babylonian are chaps. xl-xlix, lii. 1-12, the rest was added chiefly by others in Judea after the exile. The historical pieces of Jeremiah, though not assigned to the prophet himself, are on the main considered reliable. Also the prophecies against the gentiles are for the greater part retained as authentic. Chaps. l and li, on the other hand, are attributed to an author living in Judea about 400 B. C., who wrote *e persona Jeremiæ*. It does not appear how this is to be reconciled with the statement on p. 231, that the people are represented as being in captivity, and that for this reason Jeremiah cannot have written these chapters. Hosea i and iii are founded on facts of the prophet's experience in this sense that they show in what light his married life appeared to him *post factum*. Against Wellhausen, Stade and Cornill those sections in Hosea which treat of Judea are vindicated to the prophet. Joel, according to Kuenen, was written about the middle of the fifth century after the reform of Ezra and Nehemiah. The locusts of chaps. i and ii are taken in a literal sense, but at the same time as a presage of "the day of Jahveh." Of Micah, chaps. vi. 1-vii. 6 were written during the reign of Manasseh, chap. vii. 7-20 during the captivity. Chap. iv and v are largely interpolated. Nahum was composed in the seventh century on occasion of the expedition of Cyaxares against Nineveh. Habakkuk wrote chaps. i-ii. 9 of the book passing under his name either under Jehoiakim or Jehoiachin, but the rest is not authentic and was written after the exile, no more definite date being given. In regard to Zechariah, finally Kuenen defends the pre-exilic origin of chaps. ix-xi against Stade, who wishes to remand the whole second part of the book to postexilic times. According to Kuenen, only chaps. xii-xiv belong to this period, having been written about 400 B. C.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

G. Vos.

DAS VIERTE BUCH ESRA AUF SEINE QUELLEN UNTERSUCHT. Von RICHARD KABISCH, Lizentiat der Theologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1889. Pp. vi, 176, size 9 x 6 inches.

The day is past when the apocrypha, the apocalypses and the pseudepigraphs