

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 39.—July, 1889.

I.

DR. SHEDD'S SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY.

IN the three brief pages of reference to American theology, with which Dorner concludes his *History of Protestant Theology*, that eminent author informs us that, so far as he is able to survey it, theology on this continent "has as yet no connected literary history." We are gravely told that "the numberless parties" existing here, mainly engaged in external labors and conflicts, "have not as yet been able to do much for the advancement of theological science." Yet the hope is expressed that by "the introduction of English and Scotch, and especially of German theology, now abundantly taking place, and transporting into the country many elements of culture," theology may hereafter attain among us not merely a recognizable existence, but also "a new and even an independent form and combination"—a form and combination which somewhere in the future, provided these favorable conditions continue, "may in many respects resemble the theological development of the Church in the first centuries." But at present, in the estimate of Dorner, "America is as yet merely on the threshold of its theological existence."

But what shall be said of a history of Protestant theology written within twenty years which makes no mention whatever of that remarkable anthropological controversy, involving many of the most fundamental principles in evangelical Protestantism, which agitated not only New England but the whole country during the latter half of the eighteenth and the first decades of the present century—a controversy which gave to the Protestant world the treatises of Edwards on Original Sin and the Freedom of the Will, and a large

One of the most admirable paragraphs in the entire volume is that on pp. 351, 352, where the words "flesh" and "spirit" are defined. The English exegetes so often fail to recognize the full scope of "flesh" in the ethical sense, that we may congratulate ourselves upon finding this sentence in the paragraph: "When *spirit* receives its highest signification, denoting the holy Effluence of God, His personal presence in the world, *flesh* sinks to its lowest and represents unrenewed nature, the evil principle oppugnant and alien to God." This is the Reformed interpretation over against the mediæval, semi-ascetic view that High Churchmen often advocate.

The style of the author is clear—usually compact. The "applications" are apt, and the entire work is a hopeful indication of the advance in exegetical method among Englishmen. For such books as these are impossible where there has not been great progress in exegesis. The pietistic exhortations and mystical meditations of the past can only disappear, with the ignorance they too often foster, when popular exposition grows out of exact scholarship.

M. B. RIDDLE.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE ROMANS, with Notes, Comments, Maps, and Illustrations. By Rev. LYMAN ABBOTT, Author of "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," "Jesus of Nazareth," and a series of Commentaries on the New Testament. New York and Chicago: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1888. 8vo, pp. viii., 230.

Dr. Abbott's Commentary on the New Testament had reached the Book of Acts by 1876, but has waited twelve years for the next volume. These have not been idle years; and the author frankly avows that throughout them all his conceptions as to the character and teaching of Paul have been ripening. He puts forth the Commentary on Romans, thus, with all the confidence which naturally arises from long meditation and repeated testing; and he evidently hopes that what is novel in it may be able to make its way to the acceptance of scholars. We are not sure that he does not overestimate its novelty. For example, we cannot admit that the conception of Paul's character which he announces, is new—unless, indeed, the elements in it on which he lays stress be exaggerated to the exclusion of the others, rather than simply emphasized as fundamental. We know no student of Paul's writings who doubts "that he was an evangelist rather than a philosopher, and a poet rather than a scholastic." But neither do any of them doubt that he was unique among evangelists just because he was also very much of a philosopher, or that his peculiarity as a poet lies in the fact that he was also somewhat of a scholastic. We infer that Dr. Abbott would accord with this, as he, too, represents him to have been a profound thinker, filling the words he used with deeper meanings, and "enunciating principles far in advance of the age" (p. 12; yet cf. p. 35). Nor would most students of Paul shrink from speaking of him as "essentially a Christian mystic;" certainly he was much more of a "mystic" than a "scholastic." The fires of God's love burned warmly within his heart; he met God there; and he built his confidence upon the Christ that was within him, the hope of glory. Who would not say that Paul's "religious philosophy was the evolution of a real experience?" Least of all is it novel to find his teaching, "although cast in a different mould, in its spirit that of the Fourth Gospel;" or his doctrine of "righteousness," "precisely that of the Sermon on the Mount." It is, on the contrary, usual to take Paul at his word, and represent him as knowing nothing which Christ did not teach him. He claims to have received his Gospel as a revelation from Jesus Christ; and he claims to be preaching it, not with the interest of a "scholastic" in the logical development of the truth, but with the zeal of a lover of men in saving the souls of his perishing fellows. And most of those who have read

him, have so understood him and so represented him. Dr. Abbott can be novel here, only if he is prepared to be somewhat one-sided in the emphasizing of these obvious facts to the exclusion of others equally obvious (pp. 39, 40).

The theology which he expounds the Apostle as teaching, on the other hand, is new. And it appears that it is this which he has chiefly at heart, as is evidenced by the arrangement of the matter in the volume in such a way as to enable him to bring it three several times to expression. First, we have a long Introduction, in the course of which occasion arises for an orderly exposition of the whole doctrine of the epistle under the caption, "Paul's remedy for sin" (pp. 52-77). Then we have a series of chapters, accompanying the Revised Version, in which this matter is again presented in less compressed form. And finally, we have the exposition itself accompanying the Authorized Version as text. We think it unfortunate that this plan was adopted. Dr. Abbott's continuous and detailed exegesis appears to us far superior in merit to the use to which he has put its results in the Introduction and detached chapters; and we fear that the volume is one of those which, like the Sibylline books, would be stronger, better, and more calculated to advance the reputation of the author, if half of it were withheld. In the purely exegetical portion Dr. Abbott writes carefully, thoughtfully, and with no mean exegetical skill; whereas there is a sermonic flavor of exaggeration suffusing the other chapters which renders them unsuitable companions to the sober exposition. Of course this does not mean that we endorse the teaching of the exegetical portion any more than that of the rest; the same teaching, essentially, is found in both. Nor is Dr. Abbott's exegesis always careful; there are many instances of quite untenable explanations, as, *e.g.*, when the last clause of v. 14 is translated, "who is the figure of the future," and explained as teaching that Adam was the type of all future men: there is "no resemblance between the typical sinner and the typical Saviour;" "Adam is the type not of the Saviour, but of sinful humanity." We may remark in passing that it would be interesting to know why Paul calls Christ the "Second Adam," if "there is no parallel in Paul's mind but a sharp contrast between Adam and Christ." Nevertheless, it seems to be true that Dr. Abbott's theological conceptions are responsible for most of the strain which his exegesis puts upon the text; as, indeed, may be true in the instance just adduced, as the use which is made of this result to discredit Adam's representative sinning (p. 150) may indicate.

The "dealing with" the text which he is expounding, which Dr. Abbott's theology imposes upon him, is so great that it sometimes amounts, not merely to a necessity for explaining away, but actually for reversing Paul's meaning. Let us take an example. "Righteousness" is a key-word in Paul's theology. What does he mean by it? Dr. Abbott rejects the guidance of the previous usage in the classics and LXX., stained by which the word came to Paul, and insists that the meaning that he put upon it must be ascertained solely from his own writings. He appeals to Romans i. 16, 17, and reasons thus (p. 54): Paul says that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, because the righteousness of God is revealed in it; hence, to ascertain what Paul means by "the righteousness of God," we need only "inquire what is it that at the time of Paul's writing was revealed to Jew and Gentile in the Gospel as it then existed?" Now, "the Gospel" at this time was the story of the life of Christ, with his teachings and death; and what is revealed in this story is Christ himself as the manifestation of God; what the Gospel reveals, then, is "the true character of God"—"a character which perpetually comes to seek and save that which is lost." As the result, we are assured that this is Paul's definition of "the righteousness of God," and it is everywhere applied as such. We are, indeed, told that this was not the Jewish idea of "righteousness," but it is added that "with this new idea Paul

endeavors to clothe" the word. If such a method of reversing the meaning of a word needed refutation, it would be enough to refute it, to point to the simple, obvious fact that Paul does not use the term "righteousness" when he desires to express the idea here attributed to it. For Paul, too, thinks often of Christ's work as a manifestation of God—of God's character—and of that character as one which seeks and saves the lost; but when he wishes to express this idea he uses not "righteousness," but "love." Paul never says, as Dr. Abbott says (p. 56), that the "righteousness" of God impels him to come to save sinners; Paul says it was his "love" that thus impelled him. This means, of course, that in Paul's mind, not "righteousness," but "love," expressed this idea; and it is ominous of nothing but error to confuse the two. Thus Dr. Abbott in appealing to Cæsar, does not really go to Cæsar. And this might be made evident by another path. For, beginning again with Romans i. 16, 17, we must ask, What was Paul's own idea of the Gospel which revealed the "righteousness of God?" The life and work of Christ, we may say, but only if we are willing to understand the phrase as Paul understood it; and he himself tells us that his whole Gospel was "Jesus Christ and him as crucified"—*i.e.*, that his Gospel was Christ Jesus conceived of as a propitiation for sins. In a word, according to Paul, Christ, not as the manifestation of God's character, but as the propitiation for sins, is the centre of the Gospel, and as such the power of God to salvation (Rom. iii. 25). But this idea of propitiation has no place in Dr. Abbott's theology. Wherefrom arises the necessity not only to explain away, but to reverse again the teaching of Romans iii. 25. For this he begins afar off. He denies the divine institution of the Old Testament sacrifices; they were only (like *e.g.*, "divorce") permitted, restricted, and restrained by the divine law. In language, for a parallel to which we should have to go back to the false spiritualism of the early gnosticizing heresies (say, for instance, to the Epistle of Barnabas), sacrificial worship is spoken of (p. 66) as a "crude, barbaric, pagan conception of religion, permitted under restraint by the Mosaic law, swept away as puerile and needless by Paul's teaching." Swept away by Paul! Yes; for what Paul means is not that Christ offered himself up really as a propitiatory sacrifice to God. This would be a horrible conception. Paul is speaking figuratively; he means that we are mistaken in thinking we need a propitiation to offer to God—God asks none and never asked any. "As a Protestant preacher to a Roman Catholic penitent, who should ask, What penance shall I suffer for my sins? might reply, Christ is your penance; you need no other, so to Jew and Gentile who asked, bewildered by a teacher who proclaimed the unbought Gospel of God's free love: What, then, shall we do for a sacrifice? Paul replied, Christ is our Passover; set forth to be a Propitiation; henceforth in *his* blood we have access unto God and peace with him." Thus when Paul calls Christ our Propitiation, he not only does not mean that he is such, but actually means that no propitiation was ever needed! On the passage itself (p. 120) Dr. Abbott adopts the translation "mercy seat," but with scarcely any gain to himself; for still we are confronted with "*through faith in his blood*"—language which he is constrained to confess to be sacrificial, and the significance of which, he allows, is to be found in Hebrews ix. 22, but which he sets aside on the ground that "sacrifice" does not imply propitiation or atonement. If forgiveness of sins merely means remission of penalty, he says (p. 131), it perhaps might be achieved without a sacrifice. "Sacrifice" is necessary only because it is not a question of penalty, but of revolution of character, which can be attained only through personal influence; and this in turn depends on sympathy. Thus the idea of sacrifice is weakened to suffering sympathy; and the idea of "blood" to *the out-giving of sympathy!* "There is no possible way by which one can save another," he says (p. 131), "except by pouring something of one's own per-

sonality and experience into the vacant soul, reaching out the real hand that has the tremulousness of sympathy in it to uplift the one that is below." This is his transcript of Paul's "blood theology."

It must be already apparent to the reader that there are few texts which can block Dr. Abbott's way to his desired conclusion. Take another example. The first chapter of Romans, he tells us (p. 86), does not contain Paul's estimate of human nature, but only his picture of the Roman world in its most corrupt period, and is not intended to prove the total depravity of humanity as a foundation for the Gospel. "If we desire," he continues, "to know the object of a writer in any given passage, we naturally look to the conclusion to which it conducts him and his readers. That conclusion in this case is found in ch. 3, v. 20: 'Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be rightened in God's sight,' " etc. But is this passage the formal conclusion of this whole argument? Dr. Abbott does not always think so. For in the detailed exegesis, at p. 118, we are told (and that truly) that we are to read not "therefore" but "because" in iii. 20, which thus becomes not the general conclusion of all that has gone before, but the specific reason for the immediately preceding clause. Again, when we appeal to Cæsar we ought to be willing to go to Cæsar. Why should we pass over iii. 9 where the Apostle professedly states what he intended to prove in the preceding argument? But here he tells us (1) that he is not dealing with Rome and the Jews, as states especially under law, but with Jews and Gentiles as together comprehending all humanity, as the succeeding citations from the Old Testament abundantly prove; and (2) that he has sought to prove of this universal humanity that it is bound hopelessly in the toils of sin. Dr. Abbott's treatment of Chapter ii. is as unsatisfactory as that of Chapter i. Paul obviously teaches here that God will judge according to strict truth and justice; Dr. Abbott makes this mean that he will judge no man according to the principles of justice, but all in mercy: Paul says each will be judged according to what he has done, his key-words being "practice," "works," and the like; Dr. Abbott says, "not by what they have done, but by what they have desired or aimed to do:" Paul, in a word, levels the Jew down to the Gentile; Dr. Abbott levels the world up to the children of God. A similar case is found in the remarks on Chapter ix. (p. 174), where Paul's language as to the sovereignty of God is exactly reversed and made to teach that God claims the right to deal with all men *alike*. So, again, the passage in x. 14 *sq.* is expounded as teaching, not that the Gospel must be preached in order to salvation, but that men may be saved whether they have the Gospel or not (p. 184).

What, then, does Paul, according to Dr. Abbott, teach as to the method of salvation—as to "justification" and "faith?" The idea of a forensic justification is scandalous in his eyes. He is sure that Paul has been only misunderstood to teach it. He admits, indeed, that the word he uses, *δικαίωω*, expresses in the LXX. the idea; but Paul has read a deeper meaning into it, which Dr. Abbott endeavors to express by resurrecting the old word "to righten"—a meaning which makes the word express God's whole work in the rectification of the sinner, both in so far as sin separates from God and in so far as it disorders the soul, *i.e.*, the healing both of its estrangement and of its disease. We are afraid Dr. Abbott has imposed on himself by his method. He pleads that such pivotal words as the derivatives of *δικαίωω* should be uniformly translated in English, and thus provides himself with the series, *righteous, righteousness, to righten*; and then attributes to Paul everywhere, where he uses *δικαίωω*, the obvious meaning of the English word "to righten." But Paul didn't write obsolete English! The only legitimate way to obtain Paul's meaning is to follow patiently the senses which the Greek words bear and to transfer these senses into English, even if this process requires varied renderings of each word. We quite tremble

to think what would have been the result had Dr. Abbott rendered by that other series, *just, justice, justify*, and applied the conceptions of these English words equally mechanically to the exposition of the Apostle's Greek. We turn in vain to such a passage as Romans iii. 4, to see what Dr. Abbott will make of his hard and fast rule that "justify" means always "righten," there. Are we to read, "That thou—God—mightest be rightened in thy sayings," and explain "That thou mightest *be made right*, not acknowledged to be right?" Dr. Abbott makes no comment, but translates "mightest *be seen to be just!*" And what are we to do with "righteousness" in the next verse? Are we to translate it there, too, "character—a character going out to seek and save?" Dr. Abbott translates in his notes "*justice*," and it is evident that this is the only idea which will satisfy the context. Perhaps Dr. Abbott's zeal against the forensic view of justification is partly due to a misunderstanding of it on his part. Certainly, he constantly misrepresents it (*e.g.*, pp. 53, 58, 76, 101, 130), apparently confusing the merely analytical separation of justification from sanctification with a real separation. No Reformed theologian known to us believes that a man may be justified without being sanctified; or separates these two parts of the one saving process in such a sense as that one may be present without implying the other. The real question is whether salvation is a simple or a complex thing, and if it is complex whether it is legitimate to separate in thought between the several elements which enter into it and give them distinguishing names. We know no one, for instance, who would not heartily subscribe to Dr. Abbott's words: "It is clear from Romans viii. 23 and Ephesians i. 14; iv. 30, that the redemption of which Paul speaks is not completed in this life, but is looked forward to by him to be completed in the future; but the deliverance from divine wrath and the reconciliation of the soul to God *is* complete and perfect in this life; we *are* the sons of God (Rom. viii. 16; 1 John v. 2)." Here Dr. Abbott has made the common distinction between justification and sanctification; and it is only to be regretted that he has not conformed his constant teaching to it. This same inconsistency enters into his treatment of faith. He repeatedly speaks (*e.g.*, p. 124) quite in the Arminian sense of faith, as the root of righteousness, being reckoned instead of righteousness; and yet strongly opposes that view in terms (*e.g.*, p. 126). His own special view of faith (see *e.g.*, p. 92), is that it is "spiritual perception." This corresponds to the essential drift of the whole theological conception. If God is of such a character that he needs no propitiation in order to receive sinful man; and salvation is due to the revelation of God's character as one necessarily seeking and saving the lost, in Christ; then the instrument of salvation should not be faith but spiritual apprehension. The difference between the believer and unbeliever, thus, is analogous to the difference between one with and one without a musical ear. A believer is one who lives in the conscious presence of the unseen—who endures as seeing the invisible. And the way in which faith saves is that by this spiritual apprehension man enters into spiritual sympathy with God, and is assimilated to him by his personal influence over him through Christ. This is his "rightening"—"justification." And "faith" is hence indifferently defined as "spiritual perception" and "sympathy," and the phrase becomes a natural one—which Paul never uses, but which Dr. Abbott uses (p. 60)—that we are justified (not "*through faith*" but) "*by a life of faith*."

Thus Dr. Abbott's Commentary is an attempt to deflect the great river of Paul's theology into a new channel. When Paul speaks of righteousness, Dr. Abbott thinks of love; the old phrase, which was intended to supplant the idea of "justice"—"benevolence governed by wisdom"—has given place to the new one, "love looking at the universe," which seems to us much the same. There being no obstacle in the way of God's accepting sinners, the problem of salva-

tion is to get sinners to accept him. To this end God acts by necessity of nature, it being the very nature of God's righteousness to go out from itself "as light and heat go out from the sun, to give righteousness to those who do not possess it." This outgoing is a suffering—"ever and always a suffering"—implying and exhibiting in the suffering Messiah, *sympathy*, which according to its very nature begets sympathy in others. This begotten sympathy is faith, by which man is rightened, *i.e.*, brought into loyal, filial relations to his Father and so, transformed and emancipated from sin. A new channel, indeed! The only difficulty is that no one who takes the trouble to read Paul himself can believe that he teaches the new doctrine. Dr. Abbott's volume, which prints three times over the statement of this theory of salvation, and twice the whole text of the Epistle to the Romans, becomes thus truly a Symposium of the Old and the New Theologies. Paul stands for the one, Dr. Abbott for the other. We are satisfied with our champion. No one who reads both can fail to note their radical divergence; it is only a question of relative authority. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

ALLGEMEINE GESCHICHTE IN EINZELDARSTELLUNGEN. Herausgegeben von WILHELM ONCKEN. Abth. 152, 153, 154, 157 (second half). GESCHICHTE DES VOLKES ISRAEL. Zweiter Theil. Von BERNHARD STADE u. OSKAR HOLTZMANN. I., II., pp. 161-679. Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1888.

HISTOIRE DU PEUPLE D'ISRAËL. Par ERNEST RENAN. Tome Deuxième. Pp. iv., 545. Paris: Calman Levy, 1889; New York: B. Westermann & Co.

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL, FROM THE REIGN OF DAVID UP TO THE CAPTURE OF SAMARIA. By ERNEST RENAN. Pp. xi., 455. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1889.

The earlier parts of these histories were noticed in this REVIEW for January, 1889, pp. 135, sqq. Stade's book is now complete. Renan's second volume brings him only to the fall of Samaria.

For some reason, not given, Stade's work is not carried to its end by his own hand. There are two well-defined parts in the second division, the former ending with the Greek period, and the latter dealing with the later fortunes of the Jewish state, and the beginnings of Christianity. The fall of Jerusalem under the Romans, A.D. 70, is the last event chronicled.

The first hundred pages in the numbers before us bring Stade's own task to a conclusion. They belong intimately with what has been already reviewed, taking up the history in the midst of Ezra's activity, and carrying it on to the close of that activity. The final chapters discuss the literature, religion, and theology of the time. The briefer narrative portion is concerned mainly with the political, social, and topographical matters offered by the story of Nehemiah, and with the religious reform headed by Ezra. Everywhere we find the keen criticism, the bold theorizing, the mastery of details, and the rapid and brilliant combinations to which Stade has accustomed us. The work is full of suggestion—stimulating and of sustained vigor.

The century of Jewish history from Nehemiah to Alexander is wrapped in tantalizing obscurity. It is necessary for the historian, of whatever school, to make large use of the historic imagination and to draw inferences from the ages that precede and follow in order to give any conception of the contents of this period. The trustworthiness of such a conception will, of course, be variously estimated. Not until a far more sustained and candid examination of all known post-exilic facts has been made by scholars of different prepossessions, can we hope for even approximate finality in the results. The beginning of proselytism, the development of the new temple worship, the intense interest maintained in