

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 1.—January, 1880.

I.

THE IDEA AND AIMS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.

THERE has been for some time a conviction, constantly widening and deepening, that a Review is needed that will adequately represent the theology and life of the Presbyterian Church. This need has been felt all the more that in former years our Church derived so much strength and advantage from the Reviews so ably conducted by Drs. Charles Hodge, Albert Barnes, Henry B. Smith, and others. Two years ago, the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, which had gathered up into itself the various older Presbyterian Quarterlies, was sold out by the proprietors and editors, and the *Princeton Review* appeared in its place, devoting itself chiefly to Philosophy, Science, and Belles-Lettres, and presenting an array of scholarship and talent unprecedented in the history of periodical literature. Yet this very fact called the more attention to its defects in those very respects that made the older Reviews so important to the Presbyterian Church; consequently the desire for a representative Presbyterian Review grew to be so strong and irrepressible, that several efforts have been made during the past year, in various parts of the land, culminating in the present enterprise, which seeks to combine all the varied interests and sections of our Presbyterian Church in order to secure a Review that will truly represent it by a strong, hearty, steady, and thorough advocacy of Presbyterian principles. The managing and associate editors have been requested by a large number of theologians,

fore, as the seed had not come—*could not set aside* the promissory covenant. The conclusion is, that the law in the nature of the case and by the direct implication of the method chosen for its publication, could not do away with the promise. It was not an ἐπιδιασθήκη, therefore not inconsistent with v. 15; but a simple declaratory document set forth by one party as an exhibit of his covenant rights.

Looking back on the whole argument the apostle asks, v. 21, if the law could, then, be against the promises, and answers, μὴ γένοιτο. No law had ever been given, meant to set aside the promise and offer salvation on other conditions. The law included in the Scriptures was designed, rather, to shut up all under sin—to define and make plain what was a violation of the covenant—and thus to bring all to Christ, the σπερμὰ to come, to be according to promise justified through faith in Him. Thus, the law, so far from being κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν (v. 21), is seen to be rather παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν (v. 24). And its service is over when the σπερμὰ has come (v. 25).

B. B. W.

ROMANS II. 22.—Ἱεροσυλέω.

COMMENTATORS have been divided into three marked classes in the explanation of this word. Following Chrysostom, Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi, Alford, Sanday, etc., understand it of robbing heathen temples, Pelagius, Pareus, Grotius, and among the moderns, Michaelis, Ewald, Reiche, Van Hengel, Hofmann, etc., understand it of robbing the Jewish Temple (by withholding tithes, etc.; Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 3, 6, sq.) On the other hand, taking a broader and higher view, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, Flatt, Köllner, Umbreit, Cremer, Hodge, etc., understand it of any irreverence towards God, or profanation of His name—in a word, of “committing sacrilege.” Dr. Shedd is undecided between the second and third.

Meyer declares that the third view is an unjustifiable deviation from the literal sense which would never have been thought of if proper attention had been directed to the climax, “*theft, adultery, robbery of idols’ temples.*” It may well be asked, however, in what way the climax suffers on the rendering, “*theft, ADULTERY, SACRILEGE.*” Surely, with Paul, sacrilege was a surpassingly horrible transgression, while the robbery of idols’ temples was simple theft and that only. Surely, then, Cremer (2d Ed., p. 295) is right in calling the explanation lame, and referring rather to the progress from the commandments of the first table of the decalogue to those of the second. With the analogy of the substantive in Acts xix. 37 before us, where ἱεροσύλοι are paralleled with those who blasphemed the goddess, we ought to have been kept straight as to the rendering of the verb here. The use of the abstract in 2 Macc. xiii. 6 (cf. verse 8), also seems broader than simple robbery of the temple, although the well-known robberies of Menelaus were doubtless meant to be included in the reference. Considerable light has been thrown on the meaning of this word lately by a passage in one of Mr. Wood’s Ephesian inscriptions (*Ins.* vi. 1, p. 14). There we find the words ἵστῶ ἱεροσυλία καὶ ἀσέβεια, although, unfortunately, the condition of the stone prevents us from reading what is thus to be accounted “as sacrilege and impiety.” Certainly we seem justified, however, in coming to this conclusion:

that if those who performed the action of the verb in Acts xix. 37 are paralleled with blasphemers, and the action itself in Mr. Wood's inscription is paralleled with ἀσέβεια, we cannot go wrong in translating the verb itself broadly "to commit sacrilege." Compare in confirmation, Cremer, *sub voce*, and the passages there quoted

B. B. W.

The General Synod of the Evangelical Church of Prussia assembled for the first time in the city of Berlin, on Thursday, Oct. 9, at 10 A.M., and was opened with an address by the President of the Supreme Consistory, Hermes. At last the tendencies to a Presbyterian form of government, which have been at work since the Reformation, have reached their culmination, and this first synod is a happy indication of the blessing that will result therefrom to entire Germany in the future. The Rationalistic element was in a feeble minority. Even the middle party, that has played such an important part for the last fifty years, were only respectable in numbers and names. The control was decidedly in the hands of positive, evangelical men. Count Arnim Boitzenburg was chosen President and Superintendent Rübeseben, Vice-President, and five Secretaries; six Committees were appointed, of twenty-one each, on Marriage, an Emeritus Fund, Choice of Pastors, Church Discipline, Petitions, and Finances. The chief business was of a practical character :

(1). It was resolved to take up a special collection every two years for city missions in Berlin. On the last day of the session a collection for this purpose was made in the synod, and 2,762 marks were raised on the spot. In our land the metropolis raises money for the country, but in Germany the metropolitan city is the most destitute of religious privileges of all Germany.

(2). The Sabbath question received much attention, resulting in several resolutions for the abolition of military general reviews on the Sabbath, the limitation of service on railroads, and so on.

(3). Intemperance was treated in a common-sense way, and it was resolved that drunkenness should not be regarded as lessening the guilt of a crime, that those intoxicated in public places should be punished, as well as keepers of restaurants and hotels who tolerate or sell to such persons, and that habitual drunkards should be shut up in asylums.

(4). Provision was made for worn-out ministers in the establishment of an Emeritus Fund.

(5). A resolution was passed, that the common schools should have a confessional character, and that the reading books should include the chief points in the history of the Evangelical Church, and that no restrictions should be put upon the use of Luther's smaller Catechism.

(6). The laws of marriage were discussed, and two forms of marriage were adopted to suit various circumstances and cases.

(7). The greatest difficulty was in the matter of discipline and exclusion from the sacrament. Cases arise in which the pastor and his elders do not agree in this difficult matter of discipline. It was resolved, that then the pastor's decision should stand until the appeal to the Presbytery should be decided, which must be made within fourteen days.

(8). A resolution was adopted that the Supreme Consistory should consult