

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 3—July, 1904.

I.

THOMAS CROMWELL.*

(*Conclusion.*)

THE Bull of deprivation, long threatened against Henry, was now (August 30, 1535) prepared but not issued. It forbade his subjects to obey the King or his officials or magistrates. It absolved all Princes from every oath to him and commanded them to break every treaty with him. All Princes were commanded to rise in arms against him and all who obeyed him; all Christians were to seize wherever found the money, ships, credits and goods of any one who acknowledged his authority. And by the fullness of power given to the Pope, these became the absolute property of whoever seized them. All who refused to enforce this sentence became subject to the same penalties. Every clergyman in the world was to proclaim this curse before the largest possible concourse, and a lighted candle was to be cast down and extinguished, even as the souls of Henry and his supporters were condemned to hell.† But the publication of the Bull was suspended.

Such a sentence would readily suggest to Cromwell, even if there were no other motive in his mind, that the defense of his policy required the suppression of the monasteries. This act earned Cromwell's familiar name, "The Hammer of the Monks," and the worst traits of his character, traits common to most men of the day, show so plainly in the transaction that the solid reasons for it which appealed to a man of his type have been obscured. The monastic orders were corrupt. Cromwell sent commissioners to investigate the condition of the monasteries. Their sweeping denunciations

* *Vide* No. 2, April, 1904.

† Wilkins' *Concilia*, III, 792

sors of the school. A valuable list of the professors and students of that period closes the volume. It is a splendid tribute to the past work of that University and in its author a tribute to its present scholarship.

THE MINUTES AND LETTERS OF THE COETUS OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CONGREGATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1747-1792. Published by the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. Philadelphia, 1903.

This is a very important work on the early Church history of the churches in the United States. The German Reformed Church never knew its early history exactly, as most of its early records seemed lost. They were discovered in Holland and made known to the Church by the writer, assisted by Rev. Prof. W. J. Hinke, of Ursinus Theological Seminary. This volume is the publication of that part of the Holland documents that contain the minutes of what was a sort of a synod and was called a coetus. It occupied a place [medium] between a classis and a committee, not having the rights of a classis, yet having more rights than a committee. This volume throws a great flood of light on the early history of the Church. It completes the set of synod's minutes back to the very beginning. Incidentally it sheds some interesting light on the early relations between the Presbyterians and the Reformed. In addition to the Minutes of the Coetus, it contains also the annual letters sent to Holland, explaining the coetus' acts and containing a good deal of independent matter. The minutes are prefaced by three important letters of Rev. John Philip Boehm, the founder of the Church, written to Holland before the coetus was organized in 1747, containing valuable information. The volume was published by a Committee of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church, and edited by Rev. Prof. W. J. Hinke and Rev. James I. Good, D.D. The volume is well printed, and has for its frontispiece a *fac-simile* of the title-page of the first coetus' minutes. It is an honor to its committee of publication and to the Church whose origin it reveals.

HISTORY OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE. By JOSEPH HENRY DUBBS, D.D., LL.D. Lancaster, 1903.

This volume is due to the semi-centennial celebration of the union of Marshall College, of Mercersburg, Pa., with Franklin College, of Lancaster, in 1853. The author, however, goes back of that date and traces its history to the beginning of Franklin College in 1787. He throws a great deal of light on this very early history, and on the intimate relations of Benjamin Franklin with the institution in his efforts to elevate the Pennsylvania Germans. He proves that Franklin was present at the opening of the institution in 1787, a fact somewhat doubtful before. The most interesting part to us is the brief sketch of the early religious history of Marshall College, and of the later development of what was known as Mercersburg Theology. The book is full of new and interesting facts connected with the college. A bibliography of works by graduates of the institution closes this excellent tribute to the institution the author represents.

Reading.

JAMES I. GOOD.

GESCHICHTE DER JÜDISCHEN APOLOGETIK ALS VORGESCHICHTE DES CHRISTENTHUMS. Von M. FRIEDLÄNDER. Zürich: Verlag von Cäsar Schmidt, 1903. 8vo; pp. xv, 499.

The author of this volume has made himself favorably known by a series of interesting studies all dealing more or less directly with the connection between the Judaism of the diaspora and Christianity. The first of these, *Patristische und Talmudische Studien*, appeared as far back as 1878, and

then, after a considerable interval, the same line of investigation was further pursued in *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums, ein Excurs von der Septuaginta zum Evangelium*, 1894; *Das Judenthum in der vorchristlichen griechischen Welt, ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums*, 1897; *Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*, 1898; *Der Antichrist in den vorchristlichen jüdischen Quellen*, 1901. The two fundamental views running through all these publications are, on the one hand, that Christianity was not only formally but materially indebted to the Judaism of the diaspora, inasmuch as some of its characteristic formative ideas were anticipated by the latter, such as that of freedom from the ceremonial law; and, on the other hand, that gnosticism existed in a well-developed form within the fold of Judaism considerable time before the rise of Christianity, indeed as far back as the time of writing of some of the Canonical Psalms, the Zedim mentioned in which are none other than gnostics. These two positions are reaffirmed with considerable emphasis in the present volume, though here they are formulated more cautiously than in the previous treatises, no doubt owing to the criticism brought against them in their original less guarded form. But these views appear here in a larger setting, since the author attempts nothing less than to give a history of Jewish Apologetics in the widest sense of the word. The apologetic attitude is according to him the very essence of the mind of the Judaism of the diaspora, since this branch of Judaism had awakened to the consciousness of the uniqueness and absoluteness and universalistic destiny of its religion, and was in the entire range of its literary production controlled by the intent to assert and defend its claims as such. To write the history of this Apologetics is to the author's view practically equivalent to writing the spiritual history of this branch of Judaism itself, since the struggle for life, as it is biologically and evolutionistically put, is the secret of the life's development. We own to having felt a certain disappointment in reading the book, because the execution hardly comes up to this magnificently, if somewhat one-sidedly, conceived programme. Friedländer's presentation of things moves too much along the line of an analysis and discussion of the single writings, and has too little of detachment on the author's part from the sources to satisfy the claims of a truly historical treatment even in a subject where so much of the historic life runs in literary channels. A further objection that may be made to the book is that it forces into the category of Apologetics practically the whole extra-canonical literature of Judaism belonging to the period dealt with. While in a case like that of the Sibylline writings and the works of Josephus and the older quasi-historical productions this is the true point of view, it is hardly correct to apply this to the Apocalyptic literature, as the author attempts to do. Here certainly the apologetic motive was entirely secondary, and to place it in the foreground necessarily results in giving a distorted view of the character and aims of this class of writings. With reference to the influence of the freer tendencies of the diaspora-Judaism upon the Christian religion, two things might be said. On the one hand, Friedländer still overestimates the extent to which emancipation from the literal observance of the Mosaic law had been carried among the Jews in Egypt and elsewhere. Though it cannot be denied that an antinomian party existed, there is no ground to believe that it was in any sense influential. It has been correctly observed that even a man like Philo, who goes so far in his allegorizing, spiritualizing evaporation of the intent of the Mosaic law, still firmly insists upon the observance of the letter as of coördinate importance with the apprehension of the spirit. On the other hand, the author does not make clear how he conceives in the concrete of the channel through which this law-free spirit affected the origin of Christianity. Some

of his statements read as if he considered the latter a direct product of the former. But he has not shown that Jesus was or could have been subject to any influence from this quarter. After all that has been said, it still is true that Christianity is the creation of Christ, so that, unless Christ can be brought into vital connection with the ideas or spirit of the diaspora, this hypothesis lacks all support. If on the other hand, the influence of this factor is found at a later stage of the history of primitive Christianity, say in Stephen or Paul, then this involves the admission that at the utmost it can come under consideration as a secondary factor, since at any rate the main impulse toward emancipation from the law must have come to them from Jesus, if the history of early Christianity is to possess any true continuity at all. Apart from this, the author seems to us to overlook the immense difference between the most enlightened and emancipated diaspora-Judaism and Christianity from a soteriological point of view. The soteriological principle is almost entirely absent from this type of Judaism. In Christianity it is central from the beginning, as may be seen from this that the standpoint of freedom from the law is, most clearly in Paul, reached through a soteriological process. Not in the negative feature which they have in common, but in the positive principle which in each case underlies and explains the negation consists the essence of Judaism and Christianity respectively.

It is a decided merit of the author that he has once more called attention to the presence of a gnosticizing element in præ-Christian Judaism. Undoubtedly he goes too far in interpreting everything said about the Minim of these Jewish gnostics, in finding them everywhere, where any radical form of opposition to orthodox Judaism is spoken of, as, *e.g.*, in the Zedim of the Psalms, and in explaining from this gnostic movement in Judaism the development of the idea of the antichrist. Nevertheless, even in the reduced sense in which Friedländer's theory will have to be taken in order to stand, it is of far-reaching importance for the problem of the gnostic views attacked in some of the New Testament writings, especially certain Pauline Epistles. If the author's theory can be substantiated in any degree at all, the polemic against gnosticizing views can no longer be considered a mark of post-Apostolic origin.

The entire question of explaining Christianity as a specific form of the development undergone by Judaism in the diaspora has been moved one stage farther back by the most recent Babylonian mythologizing hypothesis as applied to important New Testament ideas and institutions by Bousset, Gunkel and others. According to their view, it is the Judaism of the diaspora itself which requires an explanation, and which, the more it is investigated, the more assumes the character of a syncretistic religion not capable of direct derivation from the religion of the Old Testament. Nay, on this most recent view it would seem as plausible to say that Christianity did receive the elements in question directly from the Oriental systems as that it received them mediately through its descent from Judaism.

In regard to the chronology of the literature involved, it is interesting to compare the views of Friedländer with those of Schürer on the one hand and of Bousset on the other hand. Friedländer puts Aristeas 200 B.C. "at the latest;" Bousset, his pseudo-Aristeas between 40 B.C. and 30 A.D. Similarly Aristobulus is assigned by our author to the early time of 170-150 B.C., by Bousset to the Roman period. The Sapiientia Salomonis is dated from the middle of the second century B.C., whereas Bousset brings this also down to the time shortly before or after Christ. Baruch is believed to have been written "soon after the destruction of the temple," and IV Ezra is made dependent on it, to both of which positions Bousset takes exception. Only

with reference to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Bousset stands for the earlier date in making the *Grundschrift* Maccabean in its time of composition. In most of these points Friedländer adheres to the older views as represented by Schürer, and refuses to accept the newer chronology of the Judaistic literature advocated by Willrich and others.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

BAPTISM AND CHRISTIAN ARCHEOLOGY. By CLEMENT F. ROGERS, M.A. An Offprint of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* (Vol. V, part IV, pp. 239-361). With 64 illustrations. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1903. 8vo, pp. 122. 5 shillings, net.

In this careful investigation Mr. Rogers has done a delicate and much-needed piece of work, and he has done it well. The precise subject he has investigated is the mode of baptism practiced in the early Church, as it has left traces of itself upon the monuments. This subject, of course, has not lain up to now wholly unstudied. The somewhat cognate subject of the baptism of Christ as depicted in the monuments has been, indeed, repeatedly studied,—most authoritatively, perhaps, for a portion of the field, by A. de Waal, in a paper in the *Römische Quartalschrift* for 1896; most comprehensively in a treatise by Dr. Josef Strzygowski, published in 1885. And Mr. Rogers' precise subject has been recently dealt with, among others, by Dr. Philip Schaff in a section of his *Oldest Church Manual*, and by Dr. C. W. Bennett in his *Christian Archæology*, as well as, perhaps most fully of all, by the writer of this notice, in a paper published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1896. It is naturally a great pleasure to us to note that in the matter of chief concern—the determination of the mode of baptism actually practiced in the early Church—Mr. Rogers announces conclusions not essentially different from those which we ourselves reached: and, we may add, these conclusions are supported also by the great names of De Rossi and Duchesne, and, most recently, Wilpert. And it is a matter of no less pleasure to us to see these conclusions based by Mr. Rogers on a more complete survey of the material than it was open to us to make.

The characteristic feature of Mr. Rogers' book is that it brings together and places before the reader the entire series of monuments, preserved from the early Church, which depict the act of baptism. These monuments have, moreover, been studied by Mr. Rogers critically, and are reproduced by him from the best sources. Although, we must confess, they are not very artistically reproduced, they come before us in his pages, nevertheless, in their most authoritative presentation. As the reader turns over these pages, there passes in survey before him the entire testimony as to the usage of the early Church which is at the moment accessible, and he can form his own conclusions from it. Mr. Rogers accompanies the presentation of the evidence with a running comment: and sums up his conclusions from it from time to time with clearness and force. But this is done in a manner which seems rather to offer the reader aid in estimating the bearing of the evidence than to obtrude another's opinions upon him. The book is distinctly an investigation and its conclusions stand out merely as the suggested results of the investigation.

We are not going so far to forego the prerogatives of a critic as to find no fault with Mr. Rogers at all. We think it a pity that Mr. Rogers does not separate the monuments which deal with the historical scene of our Lord's baptism from those which depict the customary rite of Christians. The conclusion ultimately attained would, it is true, have been the same: but the pathway over which we travel to reach it would have been a trifle more clearly blazed out. We think further that Mr. Rogers errs in setting