

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 24—October, 1895.

I.

THE ANTISTES OF ZURICH.

THE office of antistes is peculiar to some of the Swiss cantons. He is not a bishop (for the Swiss, with their republican sympathies, are opposed to aristocracy, whether in State or Church), but only the head minister. When Zwingli first came to Zurich, he was called the leut-priester, or chief-priest. This title was dropped in the Reformation for the less objectionable Latin title of antistes (literally, "one who stands before," a master-workman). The antistes is, therefore, the first among equals. He is the preacher at the cathedral, the leading church in the city of Zurich, and also superintendent of the whole cantonal Church. The cantons of Zurich, Basle, Schaffhausen, and we believe also St. Gall and the Grisons have this office. Zurich, the mother Church of the Reformed and the Presbyterian Churches throughout the world, is of peculiar interest to all their adherents. From her as a source and centre the Reformed doctrines radiated through all parts of Europe. But although she once occupied so prominent a position in the days of the Reformation, her history, especially since the Reformation, is unknown to most English readers. This is, perhaps, owing to the fact that very little of it has been published in English. Our space does not permit us to do more than refer to the first two antistes, Zwingli and Bullinger. Nor, as they are well known, is it necessary to describe the genius, eloquence, scholarship, patriotism and bravery of Zwingli, or to dwell at length on the splendid services, the careful thinking and the executive ability that made Henry Bullinger the fit successor of Zwingli. But after Bullinger and Zwingli what? We propose briefly to state the main facts

more apparent. 1 Peter is held to have been written to Gentiles instead of to Jews of the Dispersion, about A. D. 100, and by a pupil of Paul. James is held to have been written between A. D. 125-150, possibly by a man whose name was James; Jude, by an Egyptian between A. D. 100-180; and 2 Peter also by an Egyptian between A. D. 150-175.

The Book of Revelation is held to have been written by a "prophet" John, not the author of the Epistles or Gospel, about A. D. 95. It is a composition in which an earlier Apocalypse or earlier Apocalypses, dating about A. D. 69, were added to, but added to in such a manner that no one can tell what part is the author's and what part is not. The author of 1 John is the same as that of the Gospel, the Epistle having been written, perhaps, five years later than the Gospel, between A. D. 100-130. The apostle John is not the writer, although the heresy opposed seems to be the same as that of Cerinthus. 2 and 3 John are by yet a different author. The incidents of the Gospel are not allegories. The persons are historical, but are introduced merely to set forth an idea, and then dropped. The Gospel of "John is a philosophical fiction, representing the views of Jesus as held by Christians of the third generation."

Prof. Jülicher's theory of the origin of the Synoptics is much the same as that of Prof. Weiss. Mark, written shortly after A. D. 70, is the basis of both Matthew and Luke. In addition, the so-called *Mattheus-schrift* is a common factor. There are other written sources, independent of each other; and probably some oral ones. Mark probably also knew the *Mattheus-schrift*. It is possible that Luke knew Matthew; but if he did, Matthew had little or no influence upon him. The Synoptics are a mixture of truth and fiction; but at the same time give a picture of the essentials of Christ's life and the individual character of his teaching.

The Book of Acts was written about A. D. 100 or 105, but neither by Luke nor by one of the disciples of the apostles. This Prof. Jülicher says, is evident from the contradictions which he finds between the Epistles and the first part of Acts. Luke, or any other disciple, would have known the facts too well to have so contradicted the Epistles. The second part of Acts being derived from the "we" source, is for the most part historical. The first part has oral tradition probably as its basis. "The author has produced in an independent manner the speeches which his heroes utter." Acts gives the history of the early church as a Christian at the beginning of the second century conceived it; in it is much that is historical and much that is not.

One cannot read this *Introduction* without being impressed with the independence with which all critical questions are treated.

Parsons College.

SELBY F. VANCE.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY or Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity According to the New Testament Sources. By DR. WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG, Professor of Theology at Halle. Translated by Rev. Neal Buchanan. Two vols. 4to, pp. 419, 517. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Beyschlag's New Testament Theology is a comparatively recent publication even in the original, the first volume having appeared in 1891, the second in 1892. The promptness with which the book has been translated and offered to English readers is an indication of its high excellence. Among the qualities of the author which have contributed to furnish his work with a special attractiveness should be counted highest of all, an extraordinary lucidity of statement. Except where a subject is inherently obscure or the author pleads a desperate cause, we find him conveying his thought in language which in

point of transparency leaves nothing to be desired. To this is added a remarkable beauty of style not merely from the scientific but even from the æsthetic point of view. It is a delight to read this book. There are passages in it which captivate like poetry. But also in the larger art of handling his subject and grouping his material so as to make a historical movement pass before us as in living reality, the author is scarcely second to any one. In the preface, Beyschlag justifies the publication of his book alongside the much-used work of Weiss, on the ground that the latter cannot be called a historical account in any proper sense. The difference between the two books is certainly very great and it must be admitted that, however high may be the value of Weiss' *New Testament Theology* as a book for study and reference, Beyschlag succeeds better in the description of the historical process as a whole. Owing to this feature his book, while easily read, yet stimulates and invites to study. In almost every case the problems are presented in such a masterful manner that their complicated character ceases to deter the student and evokes new interest even in the more experienced reader. It is to be regretted that here and there the author's great facility of expression and the poetical character of his thought tempt him to substitute indefinite phraseology for a sober solution of the problems. Occasionally also his historical tact forsakes him and he attributes to the Biblical authors forms of thought and opinions, which by their inherent modern character betray their subjective origin. For example, in the exegesis Matt. xviii. 10 the poetic interpretation of words of Jesus is carried to such a length as this: "In every child of man a peculiar thought of God has to be realized, which stands over his history like a genius, or guardian spirit, and which God at all times remembers, so that everything which opposes its realization on earth comes before Him as a complaint."

Beyschlag occupies a middle position between the two camps of advanced criticism and what in Germany is called the conservative school. What he disapproves of in the advanced critics is their lack of sobriety and modesty, and their infatuation with destructive theorizing for no other reason than that it supplants the traditional. On the other hand, while in the main identifying himself with the Mediation Theology, he does not hesitate to pronounce upon it the sharp judgment that "with a few exceptions, instead of applying a bold Biblical criticism to the traditional doctrine, it has half-excused, half-concealed its own deviations from it." There is truth in this charge and the author was fully justified in making it, for he himself takes not the slightest pains to conceal his departures from the consensus of Protestant doctrine. Not only does he everywhere formulate the difference as sharply as possible, but we feel in reading that a certain animus against the church doctrine is never wholly absent. Of course his antipathy to criticism relates only to its most extreme form. Beyschlag rejects the accounts of our Lord's early life in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, and accepts the prevailing theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels from two sources. While one of the most strenuous and successful defenders of the fourth Gospel, he thinks its vindication impossible on any other view than that the Apostle's subjectivity has largely colored and modified his reproduction of the words of Jesus. Of the Pauline writings all but the Pastoral Epistles are held to be genuine. The order in which the various types of doctrine are discussed is the following: The teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic and the Johannine records separately; the views of the first Apostles, James and Peter (the second Epistle being rejected); Paul; the Epistle to the Hebrews; the Apocalypse; Johannine conceptions according to the Epistles and the fourth Gospel; and, under the heading of Post-Apostolic modes of teaching, the Synoptic Gospels, Jude, 2 Peter and the Pastoral Epistles.

As has been remarked, Beyschlag takes occasion in many instances to point out discrepancies between Scriptural teaching and the church doctrine. The Biblical writers knew of no Trinity, of no divine nature of Christ in the metaphysical sense, of no personal Holy Spirit, of no vicarious satisfaction, and consequently of no justification on the ground of imputed righteousness. In most of these and other instances the author's own view shines through his criticism of the church doctrine, so as to give the impression that the agreement between his personal convictions and the Biblical teaching is a tacit assumption. In the case of one who deals with Biblical Theology as a history of revelation, and considers the fact of a view being taught by a Biblical writer sufficient ground for its adoption by himself, this would be entirely natural. But Beyschlag does not occupy this position. He recognises a large element of human imperfection in the Bible. And yet everywhere he uses this imperfect Bible as a basis of attack on the teaching of orthodox theology. We cannot help thinking that, but for this, the author would have found more frequent occasion to profess his own dissent from alleged inadequacies of Biblical teaching. As it is, many will be inclined to suspect that he has, unconsciously of course, made his own views the standard, and striven to approximate the views of the Biblical authors to them as much as possible. The appearance of so many of the distinctive tenets of the Mediation Theology in the garb of views of Christ and Paul and others of the Biblical writers would favor this assumption. In determining what is the view of a Biblical author, Beyschlag further frequently adduces external philosophical or dogmatic considerations. So, *e. g.*, we are told that the juridical doctrine of satisfaction attributed to Paul rests on an insoluble arithmetical problem; that it would be strange if God had made arrangements to purchase those who were in debt to Himself; that it would not be real penal righteousness to let the guilty go free and punish the innocent in his stead; that we cannot entertain the idea of God's treating with infinite love people whom He at the same time hated. It is perfectly clear that, in all these cases, the author has abandoned the historical standpoint and, instead of asking what Paul would have considered an insoluble problem or strange arrangements on the part of God or real penal righteousness or a possible consistency of love and wrath, has simply applied his own judgment in these matters to the words of the Apostle. Such statements, of course, deprive the polemic against the church doctrine of much of the historical force which it might have seemed to possess had the facts been left to speak for themselves. Polemics, if allowed a place in the field of Biblical Theology, should avoid every appearance of animosity and will usually be effective in proportion to their indirectness.

We are inclined to think that the exegetical basis of the book is weakest on those very points which are treated in a more or less controversial spirit. Especially is this true of the treatment of Christ's preëxistence and the Pauline doctrine of the atonement. In regard to the former Beyschlag takes great pains to show that the main body of the fourth Gospel is entirely free from the advanced Christology of the prologue. Of course this cannot be done without some exegetical *tours de force*, by which the notion of an ideal preëxistence is extracted from the well-known passages. In the case of Paul the same notion is made use of to tone down the significance of the Apostle's most explicit utterances on the subject. Paul's idea of preëxistence is represented as a mere development from the pre-Christian Logos-idea, sustaining hardly any vital relation to the rest of his Christological conceptions, so that, when subtracted from the latter, it will leave them unimpaired. From this the author further argues to the radical difference between the later church doctrine and the Pauline Christology, because subtraction of the divine

factor from the church view overthrows the whole scheme. But on the one hand even from Beyschlag's own standpoint, the Pauline Christ assumes such superhuman proportions and has so far outgrown the ordinary conception of a Jewish Messiah, that a thinker like Paul cannot have failed to make his origin commensurate with his subsequent exaltation. Nothing short of a real heavenly preëxistence in the form of God could have appeared to Paul a sufficient basis for supporting the superstructure of his doctrine of the glorified Christ and his cosmical significance. On the other hand it seems to us that there is an element in Beyschlag's representation of the Pauline view which is not merely indifferent to the preëxistence, but inconsistent with it. We refer to his statement that the unity of Christ with God was not complete from the first but subject to a gradual growth. Now, inasmuch as in this unity consisted his divine sonship, there is evidently no place for a perfected sonship in a preëxistent state, for with the Kenotic theories Beyschlag has no sympathy. The modern form of thought underlying this whole construction of the Pauline Christology may be best seen from the statements in vol. ii, p. 88, where the significance of the speculative development of the idea of preëxistence is found in the fact that the union of the divine and human which brings humanity to its ideal perfection, and which from the historical standpoint comes last, as the name "Second Adam" indicates, was from God's point of view the first idea, from which His whole government of the world and even its creation must be understood. The notion of ideal preëxistence serves the same purpose here which is usually served by that of the incarnation in the Mediating Theology.

On the whole the treatment of Paul's teaching, though containing many beautiful and forcible passages, is not equally successful with other parts of the work. It is throughout vitiated by the persistent attempt to ascribe to Paul a moral influence theory of the atonement, and a corresponding view of justification, which makes it consist in mere forgiveness of sins conditioned on incipient sanctification, that is, on the breach with sin effected in principle and guaranteed for the future by identification in faith with Christ. This cuts the nerve of Paulinism in its two most central doctrines. As is customary with defenders of the moral influence theory, the explanation of the manner in which the moral influence which breaks sin and pledges the willingness of God to forgive proceeds from the death of Christ, is vague and obscure in the extreme. The treatment of the classical passages in which Paul has formulated his view of atonement is painful to witness, and the same must be said of the discussion of the passages from 1 Peter in the first volume. Beyschlag conducts his argument chiefly on the following lines. He first establishes the facts that according to Paul Christ's death has not merely a justifying but also a sanctifying effect, and that these two effects proceed from it in organic unity. Further, that the redeeming work of Christ is not a fact accomplished once for all, but a dynamic principle working through the living, exalted Christ. This part of the argument is strong and forcible. Then, however, he assumes that this twofold effect in its organic unity, and this dynamic character of the Saviour's work, are irreconcilable with the church view of vicarious atonement. It may be that theologians have not always sufficiently emphasized these two features of Paul's teaching, but we venture to say that the church view admits of a presentation in which both of these are done equal if not greater justice than in the moral influence theory. In Romans viii. 3, a passage of which Beyschlag makes much, the judgment of sin in the flesh is not simply the killing of sin, but the *judicial* killing of it, and Paul has evidently chosen this very term *κατακρίνειν* to indicate the organic unity of the two sides of Christ's work: the breaking of guilt and the breaking of the power of corruption, in such a

way that the latter proceeds from the former. Beyschlag overlooks the peculiar choice of the term and the judicial element implied in it, limits the sense of the expression to the sanctifying effect of Christ's death, and thus makes it appear as if in Paul's mind justification depended on sanctification. Paul's view in this and other passages evidently is, that the cancelling of our guilt in Christ's death is the objective cause of the subjective breaking of the power of sin within us. In other words, our dying with Christ proceeds logically from Christ's dying for us, and herein lies the organic unity of the two acts of salvation. It goes without saying that the distorted view of Beyschlag entails a modification of the Pauline conception of faith. The principle of *justificatio propter fidem* is defended as Pauline. Faith in itself attracts the divine love and grace.

It was not to be expected that the doctrine of absolute election should have found grace in Beyschlag's sight. He rejects it as un-Pauline, and that because the Apostle's view everywhere recognises the freedom and responsibility of man in the choice of salvation. Nevertheless it is claimed that Paul believed in the ultimate salvation of all. The reconciliation of these two ideas in the Apostle's mind is conceived of after this fashion: that God by providential arrangements so guides the life of individuals and nations as to make in the end the free choice of salvation the only thing possible, or, as the author characteristically puts it, "God's loving wisdom narrows man's choice, and finally, like a victorious chess-player, can shut him up to the one course." This, it seems to us, brings in again the essence of the repudiated doctrine of predestination, inasmuch as the certainty of salvation on this basis rests with God ultimately. With the freedom which others prize so highly, and for the sake of which they reject or distort the Pauline idea of election, this freedom in which man is narrowed down to one choice has very little in common. The only difference between Beyschlag and the church doctrine here, is that the narrowing process is conceived of in a different way. Owing to Beyschlag's views of sin and grace it is carried out by providential arrangements, by indirect means, in a moral way. According to Augustinianism it is accomplished by supernatural, transforming grace. Beyschlag thinks that there attaches a special majesty to this alleged Pauline conception of God narrowing man down to a choice of salvation by indirect means; we believe, on the contrary, that the Augustinian idea of God as *Creator Spiritus* compares favorably with that of God as a victorious chess-player.

There are several other points on which we should like to touch did not space forbid. We are glad to state in conclusion that the translation of the book is excellent. Its best praise consists in saying that it has succeeded in reproducing the great charm and fluency of the author's style. Here and there only has the translator misunderstood the original; although sometimes he has even put into his mouth the very opposite of what he wishes to say. We have observed the following instances: Vol. i, p. 43, where the sentence should read: "they preferred to speak in the abstract religious sense of the Malechut Jahve and Malechut Schamajim *as* (and not '*rather than of*') the kingships of Jehovah." Page 77 where the original means: "his life must be conceived rather as a development from original innocence to completed holiness, as the continuous preservation (not '*than as* the continuous preservation') of a disposition originally at one with God, etc." Page 138 note, where the German *entnimmt* meaning *removes* is rendered by *answers*. Page 233 to "in both of the passages adduced," the words "as if" should be prefixed, which will of course radically change the meaning. Vol. ii, p. 78 "except that He had in addition a divine nature existing alongside of them" should be "and he has not added to these a divine nature existing alongside of them." Page 200 "rather we must give to the communication of the Spirit . . . a

place in the process of becoming a believer which presupposes the ἀπελούσασθε, etc.,” ought to read “which is presupposed by the ἀπελούσασθε, etc.” But these are little blemishes which do not detract from the excellence of the translation as a whole. We note them for the benefit of those English readers who have no access to the original. Perhaps even now the publishers might insert a slip making the necessary corrections.

Princeton.

G. Vos.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY. By ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894. 4to, pp. xiii, 404.

The author of *The Kingdom of God* exhibits anew in this volume both his scholarly grasp on the problems of New Testament theology and his power of placing them before us in a most attractive form. Prof. Bruce has all the restraint and sobriety of the true historical spirit, and keeps entirely clear of the “vigor and rigor” of historical theorizing so well known from a certain class of German writings. With the exception of when he happens to speak of “the scholastic theologian,” he invariably brings to the consideration of each question a fair and well-balanced judgment. To the character of “the scholastic theologian” Prof. Bruce evidently has a deep-rooted antipathy, which, by destroying the calm objective tone of his writing, here and there robs it of one of its greatest charms. The historical spirit hardly does justice to itself when it blinds its follower to the abiding importance of one of the great sister departments in the field of theological study, or to the legitimacy of the methods applied by this department in virtue of the laws inherent in its own nature. Theologians themselves should be the last to foster the vulgar notion that one of the great branches into which with logical and historical necessity their science has developed, is dying and ready to drop off. It is by mutual appreciation only that they can enforce the lesson which Prof. Bruce has so beautifully expressed in the following words:

“There must be differentiation of function: Apostles, prophets, teachers, gifts of healing, talent for administration, the power of speaking with tongues. The diversity need not create disorder. It finds its unity in Christ. . . . But also to carry out the programme, there is wanted a spirit of self-abnegation and magnanimity such as animated the apostle Paul. We are so apt to imagine that our function is the only important or even legitimate one, and to regard men of other gifts as aliens and rebels. It is so hard to realize our own limits, and to see in our brethren the complement of our own defects; and to grasp the thought that it takes all Christians together, with all their diverse talents and graces, to shadow forth, even imperfectly, the fulness of wisdom and goodness that is in Christ.”

One feels throughout the book that in Prof. Bruce the historic and apologetic spirits are both equally developed. Perhaps this is more perceptible in the present case because the author was still fresh from the writing of his *Apologetic*. He seems still to breathe the air of Apologetics. In one or two points this circumstance has materially influenced the treatment of his subject. First the author strikes an apologetic note in speaking of Paul and Paulinism. Once and again we are reminded that we need something to help us assume a sympathetic appreciative attitude towards the Pauline theology, and to overcome the prejudice arising from the fact that the terms of St. Paul present a somewhat artificial appearance, and belong to the region of theology rather than to the region of religious intuition. In such controversial writings as the four great epistles, the rôle of the prophet or seer is replaced by that of the theological doctor. It is interesting to observe what means Prof. Bruce employs to prepare the reader for overcoming this prejudice, and to supply his need of a sympathetic point of view wherefrom to