



The Princeton Theological Review

EDITORS

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
JAMES OSCAR BOYD
KERR D. MACMILLAN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD
JOHN DE WITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
JOSEPH H. DULLES

HENRY W. SMITH

VOLUME XI

1913

Published Quarterly for
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION
by
THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, N. J.

claimed for Himself by our Lord, Schumacher solidly argues, cannot be properly described otherwise than as metaphysical: Jesus proclaims Himself here as consubstantial with God and as therefore knowing Him as He is known by Him. The knowledge He has of God surpasses all creaturely knowledge: the depths of His being can be plumbed by none but a divine knowledge. As Cellini argues (as quoted, p. 141): "The knowledge with which the Son knows the Father must certainly be like that with which the Father knows the Son, since this twofold knowledge is expressed by the Evangelists in the same terms, with no intimation of a difference. But the knowledge which the Father has of the Son is a specifically divine knowledge. Therefore also the knowledge which the Son has of the Father is also a specifically divine knowledge." Indeed even Harnack allows that if the text be permitted to stand as it is found in our Gospels, recognition can with difficulty be escaped of the fact that we have here "a formal equality of the Father and Son, who are distinguished only by name, and a relation of the Father and Son which has never begun but remains ever the same" (p. 142). We need not go into the details of the exegesis, which would carry us further than would be proper to this brief notice. It must serve simply to say that no detail is neglected and that the conclusions reached are reached in the full light of the whole history of the exegesis of the passage.

The author himself in bringing his discussion to a close (p. 219) sums up for us the conclusions which he considers himself to have established. "The result of our investigation," he says, "is briefly as follows: The logion, Mat. xi. 27 (Lk. x. 22), is from the point of view of textual criticism incontestable in its Biblical wording; the secondary form *ἐγὼ* in Matthew is, as the gnomic aorist, indistinguishable from the present. With respect to its contents this saying of the Lord is the most profound, though mysterious, self-revelation of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels: He is the 'Son', exalted above all creatures, interpenetrating the Divine Being, the physical Son of God, absolutely independent vehicle of revelation and mediation as God Himself ('and he to whomsoever the Son wishes to make revelation'), possessor of the divine nature and might from all eternity as *filius Dei proprius naturalis*, and sharer of the same in time as *filius Dei incarnatus* ('all things have been committed to me by my Father'). This conception of the content of the saying is not strange to the Synoptic gospels, but expresses their sublime background, which only comes forward in an especially striking and illuminating way in Mat. xi. 27 (Lk. x. 22)." We think it must be admitted that this summary of the results of the discussion fairly describes what has actually been attained by it.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus. Von LIC. KURT DEISSNER. Leipzig. 1912. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Pp. iv, 157.

The idea has gained currency of late among expositors of Paulinism

that a development showing several distinct stages can be traced in the Apostle's eschatology and especially in his doctrine of the resurrection and the state after death. The propelling principle in this development is assumed to have been the Pneuma-conception. In the first stage of teaching, represented by 1 Thess., Paul did not yet possess his later peculiar Pneuma-conception or, if he possessed it, did not yet bring it to bear upon his idea of the resurrection. He here expects the raising of a body like unto the body that has died, not a body differently constituted or organized. During the second stage, reflected in 1 Cor., the Apostle gives the Pneuma its full influence upon the form assumed by his resurrection-belief. What is now expected is a body different from the present body, a body deriving its specific character from the Pneuma. Now, inasmuch as the Spirit is a present possession of believers, it is urged that from this point of view, according to which the resurrection is a pneumatic transaction, the result of the indwelling of the Spirit, there was no good reason for postponing the moment when the influence of the Spirit reaches the body and effects its transformation till the parousia. If nevertheless Paul in 1 Cor. makes this pneumatic resurrection coincide with the parousia, this is an inconsistency due to a failure on his part to give full effect to the changed point of view. But this inconsistency could not last. Between the writing of 1 Cor. and 2 Cor. Paul had learned to realize that from his present premises the endowment with the pneumatic body might be just as well put at death and thus an intervening period of nakedness between death and the parousia avoided. This third stage of development, we are told, appears definitely accomplished in 2 Cor. v. where the heavenly body is represented as coming immediately after the laying aside of the earthly body or even in the same moment, what is mortal being swallowed up of life, and where consequently the entrance into full fellowship with the Lord is not postponed, as in 1 Thess., till the parousia, but placed directly after the exit from this life. Some go farther than this, and find in certain passages the extreme view that the resurrection-body is under the influence of the indwelling Spirit already in process of formation underneath the physical body during the present life, so that what takes place hereafter would be strictly speaking not the receiving but only the revelation of the new body which had been up to that point hidden under its earthly envelope.

This view just sketched has with minor variations been advocated by such writers as Pfeiderer, Schmiedel, Teichmann, Sokolowski, Charles and others. Deissner's treatise is in its main intent a criticism, and we believe a successful criticism, of its central principle, viz., that the introduction of the Pneuma-conception has essentially modified the Apostle's view of the resurrection. The author shows how little basis there is for such an assumption. A careful exegesis reveals that on the one hand there is no reason to believe that the eschatological statements of 1 Thess. have any other background than the character-

istically Pauline doctrine of the Spirit, although, owing to the peculiar form which the perplexity of the Thessalonians in regard to the destiny of their dead had assumed, there was no special occasion for Paul to make this background stand out very strongly here. It also shows that on the other hand in 2 Cor. v. there is no real abandonment of the eschatological positions of 1 Thess., nay that on the contrary the phrases and statements in which the endowment with the new body at death is here found by the advocates of the development-view in reality refer to the being-clothed-upon at the moment of the parousia, the attainment of which Paul, in his strong desire to avoid "nakedness", here expresses himself as preferring to a previous death. In other words the Pneuma-conception is an integral element in the structure of Paul's doctrine of the resurrection from the outset and not introduced subsequently as a disrupting factor. All this is shown by a very painstaking and lucid exegesis of the main passages 1 Thess. iv., 1 Cor. xv., and 2 Cor. v. If this exegetical enquiry brings out virtually nothing that is new or original, it at least has the great merit of being conducted with special reference to the point at issue, and so enables the reader to weigh the evidence much more easily than would be possible through the study of the commentaries, where the question appears mixed up with a number of other problems. One distinctly gains the impression in following the author's reasoning, that the whole hypothesis of an eschatological development in the mind of Paul is chiefly due to the present vogue of finding evolution and complications and inconsistencies wherever possible. If the writers advocating this scheme were half as eager to discover and vindicate the unity and harmony of the Apostle's teaching on this fundamental subject from beginning to end, they could have made a far stronger case than they are now able to make for the opposite view. Deissner demonstrates how impregnable the old position, notwithstanding the exegetical difficulties of such passages as 1 Cor. xv and 2 Cor. v, actually is.

In regard to certain issues not directly involved in the main point under discussion, we are not sure that we are able to follow the author. Thus e.g., where he intimates a couple of times that the order of affairs which the Apostle expects to begin at the parousia is conceived by Paul as a kingdom on earth, although nothing distinctively chiliastic is predicated of it, so that we remain in doubt in regard to its precise nature, as also in 1 Cor. xv. we remain in doubt as to the precise chronological relation between the parousia and the delivery of the kingdom by Christ unto the Father. Too much, it seems to us, is staked in this matter on the one word *καταβήσεται* of 1 Thess. iv. 16. Nor can we agree with the author when, after rejecting the development assumed by the other writers in the main substance of the doctrine, he traces a development of his own in regard to a minor point between the standpoint of 1 Thess. and 1 Cor. on the one hand and 2 Cor. and Philipp. on the other hand. This development is held to consist in this that during the earlier period Paul conceived of the

intermediate state as a state of κοιμᾶσθαι "sleeping", whilst during the later period he connected the entrance upon full conscious fellowship with Christ immediately with death, so that in 2 Cor. v where at first the alternative: previous death or survival till the parousia evoked from Paul strong preference for the latter and strong aversion to the former, a few verses later under the realisation of this hope of immediate enjoyment of fellowship with Christ after death, the alternative just described lost for him its acute painful character, and he professes himself contented even in prospect of the less desirable of its two possibilities. We do not believe that the use of the word κοιμᾶσθαι in 1 Thess. and 1 Cor. is able to bear the weight of inference here put upon it. It must have been even in the time of Paul a purely metaphorical designation of the act of dying and the state of death, and the author has not in our opinion succeeded in proving that Paul necessarily associated with it the idea of unconsciousness. On the contrary, the same argument which he urges in favor of the view that the resurrection-idea stood already at the time of writing of 1 Thess. under the influence of the Pneuma-conception, seems to us to weigh equally much in favor of the view that at that time already Paul must have conceived of the state of death as a state of fellowship with Christ. If the resurrection is here virtually described as taking place ἐν Χριστῷ, the same is affirmed of the κοιμᾶσθαι. To be sure the author believes he can escape the force of this argument by observing that in 1 Cor. xv. 18 in οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ the aorist tense is used, so that only the "dying" not the "being dead" is represented as taking place in Christ. But that is certainly a hair-splitting distinction and Deissner besides overlooks that in 1 Thess. iv. 16 the phrase νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ does not allow of such a restriction to the moment of death. If then the fellowship with Christ covers the whole intermediate state, it becomes difficult to conceive of this as a state of unconsciousness and to differentiate it any longer from the state of fellowship looked forward as beginning with death in 2 Cor. v. and Phil. i.

It was perhaps not strictly germane to the author's purpose to give the Pauline conception of the Pneuma its larger eschatological setting. His theme brings it about that he could content himself with considering merely the functional operation of the Spirit in creating the prerequisite state of the resurrection. Still by losing sight of the larger aspect of the matter and not considering the Spirit as the element of the eschatological heavenly life in general and bringing into connection with this the special work of the Spirit concerning the raising of the body, the true perspective of the whole question is somewhat put out of focus and valuable light on it is shut off. The impression even is created, as if the resurrection of the body at the last day were not a specific act of the Pneuma, although this is not explicitly said in so many words. That the author does not quite steer clear of giving this impression is due to his legitimate desire to controvert the modern notion as if the resurrection-body could be in any sense the product

of an immanent development of the Pneuma dwelling in the believer. Over against this it is quite right to emphasize that the endowment with the new body is according to Paul an objective act, by which something is imparted *ab extra*, not something evolved from within. But in emphasizing this Deissner does not state clearly enough that to Paul this objective act is none the less an act which God supernaturally performs through His Spirit, so that there is a true connection and continuity between the immanent Spirit of the present Christian life and the objectively-operating Spirit of the resurrection-act.

At the conclusion of his treatise the author gives a survey of the views of the Stoic and the Epicurean philosophies on the subject of immortality and shows plainly that the nature of these views was not such as to make the assumption of any appreciable influence exerted by them on Paul at all plausible. The Stoics believed only in a temporary survival of the soul till the next world-conflagration, and that not consistently, since some believed in an earlier resurrection of the individual soul into the general pneuma. And the representatives of the Stoa who stood nearest to Paul in point of time, like Seneca, were at heart sceptical on the subject. In regard to Sap. Sol. and 4 Macc., where a greater formal agreement with Paul as to the persistence of conscious life after death exists, it is urged that even here on the point of the Pneuma-conception there are wide-reaching differences, the Spirit being not consistently conceived as "power" after the manner of Paul. In regard to the valuation of the body as an integral part of man there existed even a fundamental antithesis, since in these Hellenizing writings the body is felt to be a burden and a detraction to the state of future blessedness, whereas Paul considers the body absolutely essential to the consummate eschatological life.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes von Lic. F. BÜCHSEL. (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, XV, 3) 1913. Gütersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. Pp. 143.

This monograph enquires into the Johannine conception of "the truth", the prominent occurrence of which is common to both the Gospel and the Epistles. It has long been observed that the usage of this term has peculiar features which differentiate it from that of the Pauline Epistles, where it likewise, especially in the Pastorals, attains to a certain prominence. These peculiar features moreover stand in an obvious connection with the general physiognomy of the Johannine teaching as a whole. They have for their correlate the emphasis laid on knowledge, and most likely bear some relation to the antithesis between the higher and the lower sphere, God and the world, which to so large an extent colors the Gospel. An investigation into the idea of "truth" cannot fail, therefore, to have an important bearing upon the understanding of the Johannine teaching as a whole.