

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

JANUARY 1908

NUMBER I

JOHN KNOX AS STATESMAN.

It was unfortunate that the recent celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Knox should have taken place in the midst of a discussion as to the accuracy of the hitherto accepted date of that event. There is no longer much room for doubt that the challenge of Dr. Hay Fleming was well founded, and that the Reformer was born, not in 1505, but in 1515, and died at the age of fifty-seven. The commemoration, nevertheless, was highly successful, and revived the impression of Knox's great personality and his unique services. It called forth also some excellent additions to the literature of the subject, among which Professor Cowan's contribution to an American series of admirable monographs on the *Heroes of the Reformation* is one of the best. Mr. Andrew Lang's extraordinary outburst has affected no reputation but his own.

We propose in the present paper to consider Knox in one aspect only—that of statesman. That a man, who was simply parish minister of Edinburgh, and who never but for a few months in an emergency undertook any political function, should nevertheless be classed as a statesman, and one of the most capable and successful statesmen of his time, will seem strange to no one who really knows the history of Scotland during Queen Mary's reign.

clear conviction that to our Lord's first followers as a whole, and to Himself as well, He was nothing other than God manifest in the flesh. The starting point of both the exposition and the argument is taken from the Synoptic Gospels; and the material offered by them is dealt with more fully than that supplied by the rest of the New Testament, which is adduced rather as corroborative than as original evidence. The disposition of the matter will be readily understood from the headings of the successive sections: Introductory; the Designations of our Lord in Matthew; Matthew's Conception of our Lord; the Designations of our Lord in Luke and their Implications; the Jesus of the Synoptists; the Jesus of the Synoptists, the Primitive Jesus; the Designations of our Lord in John and their Significance; the Designations of our Lord in Acts and their Significance; the Corroboration of the Epistles of Paul; the Witness of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the Witness of the Apocalypse; the Issue of the Investigation.

Any value the book may have is very greatly increased by the full and accurate index of the passages of Scripture cited, which has been prepared by the Rev. Dr. John H. Kerr, Secretary of the American Tract Society, to whom also is wholly due any accuracy which may have been attained in printing the book. The great pains which Dr. Kerr has taken in verifying the numerous references with his own hands and otherwise watching over the actual printing of the book, have made the printed volume almost as much his as the author's; and the author takes this opportunity of acknowledging them and returning his thanks for them. There are two other indexes, one of which gives a list of the designations our Lord employed in the New Testament, while the other notes the authors cited.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

ST. PAUL The Man and His Work. By H. WEINEL, Professor Extraordinary of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated by the REV. G. A. BIENEMANN, M. A., and edited by the REV. W. D. MORRISON, L.L. D. London: Williams and Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. 8vo. pp. xiv, 399.

Professor Weinel's vivid portrait of Paul, as seen through the spectacles of the modern critical school, has already been before the public for some time in its German form. It appeared first, in large part, in a series of papers which attracted wide attention, printed in successive numbers of the radical journal, the *Christliche Welt*. Then in its completeness, in book form. The English translation now before us reproduces the brilliant German work only in its contents; the charming form of the original has largely evaporated in the process of its transfusion into a new language. Nevertheless, the reader of the volume will obtain from it what it primarily contains—Professor Weinel's portrait of the Apostle Paul.

This portrait is injured somewhat by the narrowness of the founda-

tion on which it is built. For Professor Weinel accepts as from Paul only the four major Epistles—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians—together with Philippians and I. Thessalonians, and knows no other primary source of information concerning the Apostle except the so-called "Travel-document" incorporated in Acts. It is far more injured, however, by certain peculiarities of interpretation, by which Professor Weinel, standing over his victim, forces upon him a series of opinions and points of view, which his language will hardly endure, but which Prof. Weinel thinks must be what he intends to say because he finds them in the Pharisaic literature of late Judaism—and was it not from the circle of the Pharisees that Paul sprung? It is most of all injured, however, by the double purpose which informs Prof. Weinel's sketch. It is not merely to paint as true and vivid a picture of Paul as possible that he writes: but to validate a new view of Paul and his place in the development of "Christianity", and above all to commend a new view of "Christianity" to our generation. "Our task", he says, "is to understand a character of the first century, in and for this our twentieth century, to represent the everlasting questions that assail the human heart in the Apostle's features of human weakness and human greatness, and guided by this, its 'second founder', to obtain some preliminary grasp of the fundamental problems of Christianity" (p. 12). Since his ultimate purpose is, thus, by means of Paul, to commend a new view of Christianity to the world, Prof. Weinel cannot complain if we find his work more useful as an exposition of this new Christianity than as a portrait of the Apostle—full as it may be of useful "broken lights" thrown back on the life of Paul.

The new view of Christianity which Professor Weinel wishes to further by this sketch of one of the early heroes of the Christian religion, is that it consists so utterly in an attitude of soul to God, conceived as Father, that it is entirely independent of all those questions of dogma with which it has been unfortunately identified through the ages. It was Paul above all others who entangled Christianity with conceptions of a Fall, of Original Sin, of an incarnated Heavenly Being, of an Atonement bought in blood, of a Sacramental system, of a limited Ethical outlook. But these things were but the husk of his religion, brought with him from his Pharisaic training; and represent neither the heart of the man nor the essence of the Christian religion. Penetrating beneath this hard shell of Pharisaic dogma, the nineteenth century has discovered the real Paul, and it is time now, as the twentieth century opens, that the whole world should know him, that they may admire and love him as he deserves, instead of being repelled by him as they now are—witness Lagarde and Nietzsche. And so doing it has not only discovered Paul but also saved the Christian religion. For nothing is more certain than that Christianity cannot survive in this our modern world if it is to be weighed down with all these outworn dogmas, which, to speak shortly, no longer correspond with our conception of the universe or of God. While it must be admitted, then, that Paul is fundamentally the author

of this dogmatic "Christianity", it must also be allowed that this dogmatical Christianity was accidental to his religion, and that in its essence it is the simple faith in God as Father, which Jesus taught, which along with Jesus Paul commends to us. "Wherever fire is, there are dross and ashes too," and we are to preserve not the dross and ashes but the pure flame. Paul was, no doubt, the first to develop those ideas by which "the religion of the divine Fatherhood was changed into the faith in the divine nature of the man Jesus" (p. 140). But we are not "to call every man a heretic who cannot accept Paul's mysticism or repeat the Shibboleth of 'the living Christ', because his modern outlook on the universe forbids him to do so" (p. 148): or who refuses to make of the dogma of the atonement, instead of a holy life, the narrow gate which leads to the kingdom of heaven (p. 169). It is not what Paul brought with him from Judaism but what he found in Christianity which concerns us. And in him as in Jesus "the living core and center of all religion is joy in the Divine Sonship": and this abides, though we can no longer find ourselves at home in his doctrinal system. Thus eloquently, Professor Weinel pleads, through his picture of Paul, for an undogmatic Christianity or rather for a Christianity whose dogmas—dogmas of unpropitiated forgiveness of unexpiated sin to all who will look to God for it—are quite different from the dogmas by which Christianity has thus far conquered the world to itself.

It is quite natural that Paul the dogmatist suffers a little at the hands of Prof. Weinel the non-dogmatist. The whole dogmatic system of the great theologian is looked somewhat pityingly upon as a soiled and ragged suit of old clothes not yet put off. The weaknesses of the man are thrown into high lights to explain his failure more purely to realize the high call of the Christian spirit. But the greatness of the man, the thinker, the organizer, the Christian, is seen too clearly to be quite obscured even by this envelope of weaknesses. And it is just here that Prof. Weinel's book becomes valuable. Its lesson is that we may reject the whole mass of Paul's teaching, and yet be forced to discover that Paul was too great a man to be neglected and too noble a man not to be admired and loved. The query is whether so great and so noble and so true a man can be so admired and loved as Prof. Weinel bids us admire and love him, and yet so disregarded or even despised in his teaching and in his testimony to the divine origin and authority and value of that teaching: whether we must not ultimately take our place by Nietzsche and curse him, or else with the whole Christian world and bless him? Is Prof. Weinel's attitude of a somewhat supercilious patronage quite tenable with respect to a man like Paul? And beyond that lies another question of some importance. Can "Christianity" after all be interpreted as consisting of the philosophical faith of the nineteenth century, baptized with the bare name of Christ, or must it not be held to be what has been taught us by Christ and His apostles? When we have "exchanged the thought of a special revelation of God to His people, for that of the great history of

religion throughout all humanity"—what warrant remains for calling this universal, natural religion by the specific name of "Christianity"—a name which, up to to-day, has been reserved not for universal natural religion, but for a very specific form of revealed religion indeed? We used to speak of this universal natural religion as the "higher heathenism". Is its character altered by the modern insistence that it should rather be called "Christianity"? "Christianity as Old as Creation" is the title of an old Deistic volume. "Christianity as broad as the universe"—the affinity is express. Perhaps Christianity is no longer tenable: but we shall gain nothing by calling what we think tenable "Christianity".

Princeton, Midsummer, 1906.

B. B. WARFIELD.

JESUS. By W. BOUSSET, Professor of Theology at the University of Göttingen. Translated by Janet Penrose Trevelyan; edited by Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. Crown 8vo.; pp. vi., 211.

Professor Bousset's *Jesus* and his *Was wissen wir von Jesus* ought, of course, to be read together. The latter booklet stands related to the former something like prolegomena to performance: in it Professor Bousset vindicates his right to attempt a portrait of Jesus and indicates the basis upon which he attempts it. The occasion of this vindication was supplied by two of Kalthoff's astonishing books, the *Das Christusproblem* and the *Die Entstehung des Christentums*. In these Kalthoff contended that modern criticism of the origins of Christianity not only had bankrupted itself, and left itself no materials for forming a residual conception of Jesus—a position which is frankly taken to-day by many highly esteemed critics such, *e. g.*, as Pfeleiderer—but had actually obliterated the figure of Jesus from history and left us without ground for assuming even the existence of such a person,—a position in which he ranges himself with certain Dutch critics of a generation ago (Pierson, Naber, Loman) and is supported only by a free-lance here and there like, for example, our American, W. B. Smith, who, however, while sharing Kalthoff's negative conclusions, vigorously repudiates his "crudities" and especially his positive conception of Jesus as "merely a social-ethical Ideal". It is exceedingly pleasant to a "conservative" or an "apologist", accustomed as such to bear the scorn of the "critics", to see a critic like Professor Bousset sitting in the seat of the "conservative" and standing in the place of the "apologist". And this pleasure is greatly enhanced by the reappearance in Professor Bousset, as "conservative" and "apologist", of all those points of view and methods of argumentation we have been accustomed to see flouted when occupied and employed by other "conservatives" and "apologists". We are greatly inclined to whisper wonderingly to ourselves, Is Professor Bousset also among the prophets? and, sitting at his feet, to learn over again many things we knew perfectly well before, but had no reason to believe Professor Bousset and his fellow-critics had yet learned.