

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 2—April, 1904.

I.

THOMAS AQUINAS AND LEO XIII.

AS an ecclesiastical diplomat, Leo XIII will no doubt take high rank among the popes of modern times. He had no power to marshal armies and to set in motion crusades against refractory dissenters, as did Innocent III, nor did he exercise the function of fulmination against princes. And yet his moral influence throughout the bounds of all western Christendom has been notably great. He has elevated the papacy to a position of world-wide influence such as it has not had since the Reformation. Not before in their history have the different portions of Protestantism had so kindly a feeling toward a pope. For the moment room has been made even for a feeling of toleration for the papacy itself. Both feelings are due to the impression made by the virtues of Leo's private character. This impression was enhanced by the exceptional mental vigor Leo displayed into a high age and the youthful interest he manifested to the very end in current events, and which has seldom, if ever, been equaled in recent times. This personal sympathy of Protestants, strange to say, has been accorded to Leo in spite of his sweeping condemnations of Protestantism. His encyclicals* have denounced the Reformation, with its novel doctrines, as having produced "sudden tumults and most audacious revolts, especially in Germany." Its so-called philosophy is made the mother of unnumbered pests, such as communism, socialism and nihilism. The ultimate fruit of the Lutheran revolt is the ruin of morals.† In one of his very first encyclicals the evan-

* June 29, 1881; August 1, 1897, etc.

† *Ruinam morum ultimam maturavit*, *Encyclical*, August 1, 1897.

tion to the belief in the near approaching parousia. II ii. 1ff., after the doubts already suggested, clearly contradicts I v. 1-4. II ii. 2, on the assumption of its Paulinity, can only refer to a forged letter, and this last would be incomprehensible.

A brief chapter is devoted to the language and style; but in harmony with more recent criticism it is admitted at the start that little that is certain and unassailable can be obtained from this argument.

A positive *terminus a quo* for the date of the Epistle is not obtainable. The references to persecutions are too indefinite and colorless to be fixed in the last of Trajan's reign (as Hilgenfeld). The author seems, however, to have a collection of Paul's letters. As *terminus ad quem* we have Marcion's Apostolicon and the date of composition of the Epistle of Polycarp. In conclusion a chapter is added to show that the *vabcs* of ii. 4 (i.e., at Jerusalem) was appropriated bodily from some older Jewish tradition, and therefore not inconsistent with the late date assigned.

Such, in brief, is Dr. Wrede's solution of the problem. Is it the only one? Spitta's (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, I (1893), S. 109ff.), that the Epistle is by Timothy, has impossibilities of its own. Zahn's (*Einl.*, I (1897), S. 175, 178; cf. also McGiffert, *Encyc. Bib.*, IV, 5045), that Paul kept a draft of his letters and read over I Thessalonians before composing II, though attractive and abstractly possible, in the absence of other evidence, seems more to resemble a cutting than an untying of the knot. In our opinion, the explanation of Jülicher (*Einl.* (1894), S. 40f.) comes nearer to the truth: that the resemblance is due to the similarity of the situation, in which Paul had learned little that was new of Thessalonica, and that little showed the necessity of repetition and explanation, obliging him, therefore, to recall and partly reiterate his former letter. It may well be, too, that the psychological conditions under which Paul wrote I Thessalonians, as suggested by Bornemann (*Thessalonicherbriefe*, S. 484f.), contributed somewhat to the result we have observed.

In the light of these considerations, is it necessary, with Dr. Wrede, to suppose that II Thessalonians is a forgery? Frankly, we do not feel so. The difficulties are not inexplicable. On the contrary, we are inclined to believe that the facts he emphasizes are easier of explanation on the supposition that the letter is by Paul, than to account for the epistle as a whole upon the contrary hypothesis.

Chicago.

SAMUEL DICKEY.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH. By GEERHARDUS VOS, Ph.D., D.D. New York: American Tract Society. 12mo, pp. 203. 75 cents.

This little book is the second published in a series of volumes being issued on the Teachings of Jesus by the American Tract Society, under the editorship of its Publishing Secretary, Dr. John H. Kerr. The aim of the series is to furnish a popular and untechnical yet not too elementary discussion of the principal aspects of our Lord's teaching. In view of the numerous recent attempts to popularize the results of the so-called liberal interpretation of Jesus' life and teaching, this is surely a timely and laudable undertaking for which the Society deserves the thanks of all conservative Christians. In the present volume our Lord's doctrine of the kingdom is presented from a biblico-theological point of view, so as to define its place in the larger field of revelation as well as in the field of Jesus' teaching historically considered. The attempt is made throughout to reproduce our Lord's own point of view and keep the discussion in close touch with this. After

an introductory chapter pointing out the prominence of the conception of the kingdom in the discourses of Jesus, its relation to the Old Testament is discussed. Next, the meaning of the distinction between "kingship" and "kingdom," and between "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven," is set forth in chapter III. The fourth chapter deals with the view which has been recently gaining vogue, that Jesus held a purely eschatological conception of the kingdom, and did not look upon the spiritual results of his labor on earth as in any sense a realization of the same. The author here seeks to show that the idea of an internal, spiritual kingdom realized gradually cannot, without doing critical or exegetical violence to the record, be eliminated from our Lord's teaching. In the next chapter certain current misconceptions regarding the present and future kingdom are corrected. Chapters VI, VII and VIII deal with the essence of the kingdom as consisting in the supremacy of God in the sphere of saving power and of righteousness, and in the state of human blessedness resulting from this. A separate chapter is devoted to the delicate and eminently practical question of the relation between the church and the kingdom, and the modern tendency to separate the two is shown to find only a very partial and qualified warrant in the utterances of Jesus. The tenth chapter treats of the entrance into the kingdom through repentance and faith. A concluding chapter recapitulates the important doctrinal principles embodied in our Lord's kingdom teaching. An index of subjects and one of texts are appended. The book is printed from large type, and this, as well as its general make-up, gives it an attractive external appearance.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

IV.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

LES AFRICAINS. Étude sur la littérature latine d'Afrique. Par PAUL MONCEAUX. *Les Païens* Paris : Lecène, Oudin et Cie, 1894. 12mo, pp. v, 500.

HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE DE L'AFRIQUE CHRÉTIENNE depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion Arabe. Par PAUL MONCEAUX, Docteur ès lettres. Tome Premier : *Tertullien et les Origines*. Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1901. 8vo, pp. vii, 512. Tome Deuxième : *Saint Cyprien et son Temps*. Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1902. 8vo, pp. 390.

The volumes here brought together form in effect parts of a single comprehensive work which has for its object a survey of the entire Latin literature of North African provenience. The first of them, in which the Pagan writers are studied, was, indeed, published several years before those which treat the Christian literature. It was also issued by a different publishing house, in a different *format*, and as a member of a different series of handbooks. It is even written on a different scale—a scale much less elaborate than that on which the Christian writers are dealt with. Nevertheless, it was written consciously as the first part of a larger undertaking, and it was given a title which implied as much. No reader could have been deceived, except in so far as he might have supposed that M. Monceaux's subject was the Latin literature of Africa, and that he was giving in this volume the first main division of it—the Pagan literature; whereas the truth is that M. Monceaux's subject is the Christian Latin literature of Africa, and he has only begun very properly by prefixing by way of introduction a sketch of the Pagan literature, alongside of which the Christian literature developed itself. When so conceived, not only is the unity of