

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 8—October, 1891.

I.

ETERNAL RETRIBUTION.

THE question of the future and eternal destiny of man will not rest from discussion. One does not wonder at this. The thought that a single man, still more that multitudes of men, because of their deeds in this short life, should be lost eternally, is one which is so awful to contemplate, that it is not strange that not merely rationalistic expositors of Scripture, but also not a few truly devout and spiritual men, have ever protested that it is impossible that this should be the real teaching of Scripture. Accordingly, such have eagerly laid hold of every word here and there which might of itself seem to warrant a larger hope, and have earnestly sought to show that the passages which, to the ordinary reader, seem to declare the doctrine of the eternal doom of many are susceptible of a different interpretation.

By those who contend for the belief in the final universal restoration of all rational beings to holiness and happiness, it is assumed that this is a necessary logical corollary from our affirmation of the infinite perfection of God. For it is insisted that if we believe in a God who is infinite in knowledge and wisdom, power, love and righteousness, then we must logically admit that it is impossible that He should have allowed any creature to come into being, by whom He foreknew that the gift of life would be so abused as to issue in endless sin and misery. Whatever force there may be in this presumption considered in itself, it will be observed, in the first place, that it wholly overlooks the powerful counter-presumption which is furnished by the fact of the uniformly hardening power of habit. For character, to all appearance, tends to fixedness

document JC; those in which He is called Christ Jesus are from CJ; those in which Christ is mentioned but rarely or not at all, and only God is prominently spoken of, belong to G. And as there are two Elohist in the Pentateuch, so G is divisible into G¹ and G². It is then pointed out how a cleavage conducted on this purely arbitrary and superficial basis can set the sundered parts of this closely concatenated epistle at variance with one another. "G¹ portrays Christianity as an ethical institution, a spiritualized Judaism. Salvation according to him is gained by *obedience to the law*. We find here nothing about *faith* of any sort as a condition of salvation. In G², on the contrary, though nothing is said about *faith in Jesus*, salvation is represented as a divine gift and the appropriation of it comes through *faith in God*. In JC the prominent thought is that of justification through *faith in Christ* and particularly in Christ as a *vicarious sacrifice*. In CJ the chief stress is laid on the necessity of spiritual union between the *Christian and Christ*." All this is illustrated at length and in a very striking manner.

The statistics in regard to the diction of these imaginary documents are very remarkable. Of the 928 words in the epistle, 173 are used exclusively by G¹, 171 by G², 98 by JC, 186 by CJ. Numerous instances are given in which the same word is found repeatedly in one document, but never or only rarely in any other; or common words are missing in some one of the documents while used in the others; or different documents use the same word in different senses or express the same sense by different words. And by a comparative computation it is shown that the indications from diction of distinct documents are actually greater in Romans than they are in Genesis.

The different documents in the epistle are also capable of being sharply discriminated in point of style. G¹ is preëminently oratorical, G² argumentative, JC doctrinal, CJ emotional. G¹ is psychological, setting forth the workings of conscience, of sinful passion, of deceitful self-righteousness. G² is historical, illustrating his arguments from historical facts. JC is didactic, laboring to indoctrinate his readers by repetition and amplification. CJ is hortatory, making his practical aim obvious even in his doctrinal part and following this up with an extended series of exhortations.

When to all this is added the care with which the historical testimony to Paul's authorship is set aside and the complacency with which historical facts at variance with the theory are disregarded, the correspondence with the most advanced critical methods becomes complete.

Princeton.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

INTRODUCTION TO THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS. By PATON J. GLOAG, D.D., Minister of Galashiels, author of *An Introduction to the Pauline Epistles*, *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, etc., etc. London: James Nisbet & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891. 8vo, pp. xvii, 440.

THE APOCALYPSE: Its Structure and Primary Predictions. By DAVID BROWN, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1891. 8vo, pp. xi, 224.

DIE OFFENBARUNG JOHANNIS KRITISCH UNTERSUCHT von Lic. KARL ERBES. Gotha: F. A. Perthes; New York: B. Westermann & Co., 1891. 8vo, pp. vi, 184.

These three books, introductory to the study of John's writings, have little in common beyond that fact. Dr. Gloag's valuable volume covers the whole

ground of an introduction to the writings of the apostle; while the others confine themselves to the Apocalypse, and Lic. Erbes, indeed, to the investigation of the single question of the composition of that book.

As the ground covered by Dr. Gloag's book is the most extensive, so it is the most valuable of the three books. Dr. Gloag's learning, sober sense and judiciousness as a writer of introductions to the New Testament books, have already become well known through his previous introductions to the Pauline and the Catholic epistles. He was well advised to add this excellent introduction to the Johannine writings to its fellows. The book is conceived in the same broad spirit, and written in the same excellent style and with the same adequate knowledge that characterized its predecessors. Besides the strictly introductory matter, the author has, as is his wont, included in it certain helpful dissertations on affiliated questions, such as "The Logos," "The Day of our Lord's Death," "The Theology of John," "The Literary Affinities of the Apocalypse," "The Systems of Interpretation of the Apocalypse," "The Millennium," "The Influence of John on Christianity." These discussions add very greatly to the value of the book, and give it a completeness as a *vade mecum* for the study of John which a mere introduction could not have. The information conveyed is up to date, and has been gathered in so sober a spirit that the book may be recommended as perhaps the most trustworthy treatise on its subject.

We need say very little in the way of criticism. The first section is a sketch of forty pages' length, of the life of John; and in it Dr. Gloag permits himself more eloquence than is usual with him, though not at the expense of exactitude of statement. Much of this sketch takes the form of a rapid review of the scenes in our Lord's life in which John participated; and it is interesting to observe how the narrative in these passages assumes the flavor of Mark's gospel, which is perhaps an indication that Mark has done for Peter something similar to what Dr. Gloag is doing for John. The second section gives a judicious compend of the later life of John; but the dissertation on the legends concerning John, while interesting, might with advantage have been made less popular and more scientific in form and matter. No adequate account of these legends is given, and no suggestion of the soil out of which they grew. We find no allusion to Zahn's *Acta Joannis*, and only one mere hint of knowledge of Lipsius' great work on the Apocryphal Acts and Legends, and no indication that either work has been used. It seems unnecessary to reject the tradition of the Levitical ancestry of John so decisively (p. 9): that Mary had priestly connections is certain (p. 22), and the tradition may be a reminiscence of this fact. In the dissertation on the day of our Lord's death, the difficulty of reconciling John and the synoptists is strongly stated, although Dr. Gloag denies that the fact that they are as yet unreconciled proves them to be irreconcilable. He decides, wrongly as we believe, for Nisan 14 as the true day for our Lord's death. It is no wonder, then, that he exaggerates the difficulty of reconciliation; for we believe this date to be irreconcilable with the synoptists. But even on his own statement of the ultimate question at issue—the time of the celebration of the Passover—there is obviously no contradiction. "According to the synoptists," he says, "Christ and His disciples partook of the Passover at one time, whilst according to John, the Jewish rulers partook of it at another" (p. 209). The parties are different. Only, in our view, we should not put the two too far apart. We have all the time from sunset to morning to allow, and it is not difficult to believe that circumstances led to a later hour in the morning being used by the rulers than was intended or even legal. John mentions how early it was when they got Jesus to Pilate (John xviii. 28), and also that it was only six o'clock when sentence was pronounced (John xix. 14),

while Mark tells us that the actual crucifixion took place at nine o'clock (Mark xv. 25). At the most, we should only have to suppose that the Jews hoped to get through before morning, and almost accomplished it; while, perhaps, an even easier solution is within reach. At the opening of the dissertation on the theology of John, we have an interesting discussion of the question whether the discourses of Jesus recorded by John are available as sources of John's theology. Probably a middle course would be the most scientific, viz., to examine the theology of these discourses, in the first instance, separately, as the teaching of Jesus prominently in John's mind; and then to seek through careful comparison to determine how far John understood and built on their teaching in his own. The result justifies their use as data for John's own theology. We think that the first epistle is wrongly denied to be a companion document to the gospel (p. 221); and that the allusion of 3 John 9 is wrongly made to be to a lost epistle instead of to the first letter (p. 264). The remark on the theology of the Apocalypse, on p. 237, is inadequate. Dr. Brown (pp. 13, etc.) much more correctly represents the Apocalypse as presenting "the same truths, which in their ripest stage and fullest development appear in the epistles, lifted up to the third heaven;" in comparison with the Apostolic epistles, he adds as justly as beautifully, "the Apocalypse lifts us to even a higher region, giving forth the same truths in strains so exalted as almost to dim the brightness of them everywhere else. There the veil seems to be lifted, and we are ushered into the midst of things invisible and inaudible, with eyes to see and ears to hear. What is elsewhere simply *announced* is here *enacted*; what elsewhere is *said* is here *sung*, sweeping upon the ear in strains celestial."

Dr. Brown's little book, in which he attempts nothing more than what he calls an A B C of the Apocalypse, falls properly into the category of introduction rather than of exposition, inasmuch as the expository hints that are given are meant to supply nothing further than a clew to the primary predictions of the book and thus belong rather to a discussion of its structure than to its detailed exegesis. We cannot help believing further that the strictly introductory portion of the volume is the most valuable portion. Where could we go, for example, for fresher notes on the date of the book than to Dr. Brown's chapter on that subject? It is gratifying, by the way, to find both Dr. Gloag and Dr. Brown standing for the later date (c. 98), against the trend of a recent criticism, the real basis of which is misunderstanding of the contents of the book. It will go without saying to those who are acquainted with Dr. Brown's writings, that this little book, too, is crowded with the signs of a rare exegetical skill, sound learning and chaste judgment. We may instance remarks on the Greek of the Apocalypse (p. 10 *sq.*), on the meaning of the two books in xx. 11 *sq.* (p. 22), on the true nature of Church unity (p. 19), on what he finely calls the *choral hymns* of the Apocalypse (p. 70 *sq.*), and on that device of the book whereby "when any of the great epochal events is to occur, it is first announced in a burst of song" (p. 73). In a chapter on the design of the Apocalypse, Dr. Brown rejects with decision—as Dr. Gloag also does—that view of its nature best illustrated by Dr. Milligan's writings, which goes under the name of the "spiritual" interpretation; both writers adopting the methods of the continuous historical school. Were we shut up to the alternative as proposed by Dr. Brown, we too would be of his way of thinking. "It is either essentially *predictive*," he says, "or purely *descriptive*." But we decline this dilemma. It is certainly essentially predictive, and yet it is also essentially descriptive. The real question turns not on whether it is predictive but on what it predicts. Only the great outlines of the struggle between Christ and Satan for the possession of this world and its final issue, say we, and not the minute and often minor

details which the historical school find in it. Of course, the descriptive school also may carry their doctrine to extremity, and then the strictures of our two authors are not undeserved. But that the continuous historical interpretation of the book is untenable, we need no better proof than even the sober effort to apply it to the main outlines of the book with which Dr. Brown furnishes us. Dr. Brown exhibits his well-known expository insight, in adopting the method of procedure outlined by Mede (p. 76). This amounts to saying that the structure of the book must first be determined, and the exposition be confined within those lines. But Dr. Brown's exposition runs athwart the obvious lines of construction on which the book is built. This is true even on his own showing. He makes out the structure of the book as follows: (1) the primary vision (i. 1-20); (2) the existing state of the Churches (ii-iii); (3) the strictly prophetic part (iv-xxii). In the prophetic portion he finds a septenary division ruling, in the seven seals, which "cover the whole ground of prophetic disclosure" in the book; the two following septenaries being "but *subdivisions* of this all-comprehensive one." "But besides these," he adds (p. 78), "there is a distinct set of Visions—not arranged in Septenaries, and having a symbolism of their own. These will be found to be of an *Explanatory* nature, designed to *fill up in detail* what in the Septenaries is presented only in dim outline." These Explanatory Visions are made to begin at chapter x, and to extend through chapter xiv, after which the septenary form is resumed in chapters xv and xvi. Not only is this a very artificial and we may add a purely arbitrary arrangement, involving the abandonment of the continuous progress of the book, but it cuts into the obvious structure of the book intolerably, as will be obvious to any one who will only note that the seventh trumpet is sounded only at xi. 15, so that chapters x and xi cannot by any possibility belong to the adjoined explanation of the septenary portion, but are a part of that septenary portion itself. Dr. Brown has in a word misread the structure of the book within the lines of which its action must take place; the exposition is therefore discredited at the outset. Not that he may not have correctly interpreted some scenes, but that he has misapprehended the drift of the matter as a whole. For ourselves, we believe that no exposition is possible which does not begin by recognizing the sevenfold structure of the book (which Dr. Gloag does recognize), and which does not proceed by recognizing that the whole interadventual period is covered by each of these septenaries—the book advancing in a spiral movement. That the Apocalypse gives us a picture of the fortunes of God's kingdom, from the first to the second advent, is true enough; it gives us a sevenfold picture of it; but not a *detailed* history of it.

Lic. Erbes' treatise moves in a very different orbit from the other two which have been classed with it in this notice. Sobriety of judgment is their note; while this is characterized by the faults of an irresponsible and fantastic criticism. Dr. Gloag gives a conspectus of Lic. Erbes' predecessors in speculative reconstruction of the Apocalypse in these judicious words (p. 332): "There is no foundation for any of these opinions. There are no indications of separate authors; a uniform style pervades the whole book. The predictions are symmetrically arranged. 'The threefold visions' [had he said the *sevenfold*, he would have been stronger] " . . . constitute the body of this book; and there is a sameness in the mode of denouncing the judgments which proves the hand of one writer." The unity of the Apocalypse is indeed beyond attack (see *The Presbyterian Review*, 1884, pp. 228 sq.); and Lic. Erbes must fall under the same condemnation with his predecessors in so hopeless a pathway. His special analysis of the book is that it consists of three parts: (1) an early Christian writing—the earliest Christian writing known—of A.D. 40, consisting of chapters xii. 1-13, 18 and xiv. 9^b 12;

(2) the Apocalypse of John, written in A.D. 62, and consisting of chapters i. 4-19, ii. 1-6, 8-10, 12, 16, 18-25, iii. 1-4, 7-11, 14-22, iv. 1-5, 10 (v. 11-14), vi. 1-7, 3, vii. 9-12, viii. 1-11, 19, xiv. 1-7, 13-20, xv. 2-4 (v. 11-14), xix. 5-9^a, xx. 11-15, xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-25; (3) an enlargement of this by a Jewish Christian hand (not John) in about A.D. 80. The main portion of the book is thus left to John. The axis of the theory is the "discovery" that the beast of chapter xiii is the Emperor Gaius, while the beast of chapter xvii is drawn on the theory that the earlier beast is Nero. This reading of the number of the beast seems so important to the author that he feels it worth while to prove that he "discovered" it independently of Spitta.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

DER PROPHET JESAIA für die fünfte Auflage erklärt von Dr. AUGUST DILLMANN, Ordentlichen Professor der Theologie zu Berlin. Leipsic, 1890. [Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Fünfte Lieferung.] 8vo, pp. xxx and 544.

Some recent critic had his joke on a book that reached its second edition before it had a first. The one before us may be said to be in its fifth and yet to be the first. The fact is that the earlier editions have proved inadequate and Prof. Dillmann has nearly rewritten the commentary "for the fifth edition." Similar was his self-denying work on the books of the Hexateuch. Those who know those commentaries and their excellences will know what to expect in this—sound learning, sober judgment, close analysis, accurate interpretation. Nor would we deny to the author sympathy with the elevated theology of the prophet. But of warmth of feeling not to mention enthusiasm there is no trace. They are books of the scholar "seeking for facts" and setting them forth in the dry light of the lecture room. Such books are invaluable for the student—perhaps the best for him. Certainly a considerable part of the doctrinal and homiletical material with which many commentaries are loaded down is worse than useless.

After the method of the *Handbuch* throughout, the author gives a brief Introduction. This discusses (1) "Isaiah's Circumstances and the Chronology of his Time;" (2) "Isaiah's Activity in Connection with the Course of History;" (3) "Isaiah's Prophetic Method;" (4) "Isaiah's Writings;" (5) "The Book Named for Isaiah." A brief Bibliography is appended. Throughout the author takes note of the latest discussions, including the results of Assyriology.

The separate discourses are then taken up in the order of the Biblical text. Each has a brief critical analysis, followed by a commentary, verse by verse. Dillmann's critical conservatism is widely known on account of his defense of the older position concerning the Pentateuch against the school of Graf. It would be a mistake however to call him a conservative in our sense of the term. According to him the book called by Isaiah's name contains a number of pieces not by Isaiah, "and received its form not from him but some centuries after him. Not even the first thirty-five chapters can claim to be a book compiled by Isaiah himself." He supposes two groups of prophecies edited by Isaiah to be contained in chaps. i-xii and xxviii-xxxiii of our present book. Chaps. xiii-xxiii form also a separate collection whose constituents show that it was not put into form until after the captivity. Chaps. xxiv-xxvii are also of postexilic origin.

The details of the argument by which these positions are supported cannot be discussed here.

Cincinnati.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.