

of Professors Zoeckler and Strack, occupies a conservative standpoint. The few volumes which have appeared were severely criticised by Professors Schuerer and Harnack, of the Ritschl school, and by Holtzmann, of the Protestant Association. The first two are editors of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, devoted to the review of theological works. It is a journal of much influence, and a most efficient means of promoting the principles of Ritschl's theology. In this journal Schuerer declared that the new commentary ignores the results of Biblical criticism, in order to promote a reactionary theology, and to induce theological students to overlook the recent investigations into the real character of the sacred Scriptures. He affirmed that the commentary places itself on tradition, and in this respect was the Catholic spirit. Making tradition the standard, it does not enter upon the serious scientific inquiries of the modern critical theology, but proceeds as if we still lived in the 17th century, and as if no progress had been made since then.

To these attacks Professor Zoeckler replied in a pamphlet entitled, "Against the Infallible Science," claiming that the charge that he and his colleagues are laboring in a Catholic spirit in the interest of a traditional reaction is false, and asserting that an evangelical conservatism is his standpoint. Holding an impartial view of inspiration, he asserts that he has always treated the problems of higher criticism fairly. He thinks it a matter of course that he should prefer reliable testimony from the patristic age to modern subjectivism. "A science which offers a chaos of supposed hypotheses as established fact, cannot inspire us with great confidence respecting the correctness and fruitfulness of its method."

To this pamphlet Prof. Schuerer replies rather severely in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. He says that the point at issue is nothing less than the entire method of theological inquiry; it pertains to fundamental principles. "Is the kind of science which Zoeckler and his friends pursue justifiable or not at present in the church based on the reformation—that's the question." Schuerer claims that the Lutheran theologians of the day, like the Catholics, are controlled by traditional views, not by scientific research, and that this is true in all departments of dogmatics, church history and biblical criticism. Other theological professors, as well as preachers, are engaging in the controversy. The discussion is not only significant because it affects fundamental views respecting the Scriptures, but also because it intensifies the conflict between the orthodox and the followers of Ritschl.

This controversy has led orthodox minis-

ters to emphasize the need of having theological professors whose teachings are in harmony with the faith of the church. It is claimed that now as appointees of the State, they have the instruction of the future ministers of the church, while the church has no guarantee that they will labor to conserve and develop the faith of that church. There is decided growth in the conviction that the church should have more control in the appointment and continuance of the theological professors, and much is written on the subject. Others claim that in the interest of scientific freedom the matter should be left with the State, as at present. At a recent convention of ministers some severe things were said against professors who teach that Christ was merely human. Prof. Beyschlag, of Halle, who was present, stated that he did not know a professor of theology in Germany who regards Christ as an ordinary man. To this a minister replied: "But I know many who regard Him as only an extraordinary man."

There are so many factions in the Protestant Church of Germany, that it is hard to determine just what persons would be acceptable if the choice were left to the ecclesiastical authorities. Where is the standard according to which the matter shall be settled? In the Catholic church he is a Catholic whom the Pope recognizes; but the Evangelical church has no such authoritative personal standard. Prof. Koestlin, of Halle, recently indicated the difficulties in the way of appointing theological professors by the church. He said: "In the second decade, if a general synod had existed on the basis of our present organization, Tholuck would certainly have been rejected by its board as a pietist, mystic, and fanatic." But the State authorities appointed him in spite of the opposition to him in the ministry, as well as in the university at Halle. There is less difficulty in the appointment of professors than in the supervision after appointment. Whatever theories prevail respecting Church and State, the university is regarded as the place where thought is absolutely free in all departments of science. The Catholic church, which claims entire control over its teachers of theology, cannot remove a professor once appointed to a position in a German university. Prof. Koestlin related a case in point. Dr. Baltzer, of Breslau, Catholic professor of dogmatics, taught a doctrine of the relation existing between body, soul and spirit which the Pope pronounced contrary to the teaching of the church. Yet the State retained him in his position and continued his salary, but of course he had no Catholic hearers. As there was no fund to provide for another professor of dogmatics, the bishop provided the money, and thus secured the appointment of another teacher.