

NOV 17 1913
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION

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.

scintilla of historical evidence that he ever existed and there is not the smallest necessity for his assumption discoverable in the religious development of the race or the religious life of the individual. The reason why the Divine-human Jesus does not "go" with him is that His existence is historically testified to by evidence which is overwhelming, that He is historically necessary to account for the religious life of the world for two thousand years and indeed for the whole course of historical development since His life on earth, and that His real existence is historically verified in the experience of thousands of men living in every region of the earth to-day. The possibility of the denial of the existence of Jesus is dependent upon the obscuration of the Divine-human Jesus by the merely human Jesus of modern "Liberalism": Drews and his compeers are the legitimate offspring of the "Liberal theology." Without the discrediting in wide-circles of the evidence for the existence of the Divine-human Jesus for whom alone is there historical evidence this new radicalism could never have arisen; and the "Liberal theology" must not be permitted to repudiate the fruit of its own loins. It is a great evil that this obscuration has taken place and men have been led to imagine that a merely human Jesus is the only Jesus whose actual existence in the world it is worth while to consider. But it is a good work that Drews and his compeers have wrought when they have called men's minds sharply back to the realization that there is no evidence that such a merely human Jesus ever existed. That therefore no Jesus ever really existed is a violent *non sequitur*, which may safely be left to take care of itself. Why should the Jesus whose existence is certain be discarded, because the Jesus whose non-existence is certain is freshly perceived to be impossible?

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Historicity of Jesus. A criticism of the contention that Jesus never lived, a statement of the evidence for his existence, an estimate of his relation to Christianity. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, of the Department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press. 1912. 12mo; pp. vii, 352. \$1.50 net; \$1.62 postpaid.

The descriptive sub-title sets forth the purpose of this volume as threefold. It is "a criticism of the contention that Jesus never lived, a statement of the evidence for his existence, an estimate of his relation to Christianity." We learn from the Preface that the emphasis is to be thrown upon the second item: "The main purpose of the present volume is to set forth the evidence for believing in the historical reality of Jesus' existence upon earth" (p. v). The first item is included only "by way of approach" to this; the third only in order briefly to indicate "the practical bearing of the discussion." The book thus finds its occasion in the contention that Jesus never lived to which considerable vogue has been given during the last decade, and undertakes to refute it. We must confess to some surprise

that this contention has been thought worthy of a formal and extended refutation. It certainly demands our attention and study. But we should as little have thought of undertaking a serious refutation of it as we should of Pastor Russell's "Millennial Dawn" vagaries, or of Mrs. Eddy's Christian Science or of the Book of Mormon. The interest of such movements lies in the revelation they bring us of the currents of feeling which are flowing up and down in the obscurer regions of modern life: their study belongs to the pathology of modern culture. We cannot afford to neglect them; they attract our most intense curiosity; for they make known to us as nothing else does with the same poignancy the seamy-side of our boasted modern enlightenment. He who would know our times must know these things too; and he will find his profit in knowing them intimately and in not minimizing their significance. But to approach them as if they were possible or even plausible accounts of reality, with claims to consideration sufficient to require serious refutation, is a very different matter. We might indeed imagine circumstances in which mere charity might impose on us the objectively superfluous task, we will not say of disproving, but of exposing their claims. Chance might throw us temporarily into contact with a circle in Brooklyn, or Boston, or Salt Lake City, for whose sake we might be compelled patiently to go through the weary task of pointing out in detail after detail the monstrosity of the obviously monstrous. Is there a circle in the neighborhood of Chicago University which requires to have it proved to it that Jesus really lived, to which the "conclusion" that Jesus never lived seems an entertainable contingency, and for which the so-called "arguments" by which this "conclusion" has been commended to us need to be analyzed that their true character may be perceived? Professor Case writes as if such might be the case, and, to tell the whole truth, as if even he himself might be a member of it. The hypothesis that Jesus may never have lived, in other words, although decisively rejected by him is treated as a debatable suggestion. And herein lies the significance of his book. Our interest in it centers therefore not in the point on which he throws the emphasis, but in the closing chapters in which he outlines positively his own opinions. We wish above everything else to know the point of view to which a serious argument against so impossible a contention seems natural.

Having said this much, let us add at once that Professor Case, from his own point of view, has done the work he set before himself very well. His book contains ten chapters. The first two of these lay the basis for the discussion by giving some account of the critical movements out of which the denial of the historicity of Jesus has emerged. The next two criticise the grounds on which the denial has been based. Then follow five chapters in which the positive argument for the historicity of Jesus is presented. The last two chapters outline Professor Case's own views as to the historical place of Jesus and His significance for religion to-day.

The first two chapters, as we have said, are occupied with a very

lucid historical account of the critical movements the results attained by which have raised the question of the historicity of Jesus. The substitution by the so-called "Liberal" theology of its so-called "historical Jesus" for the Jesus of the New Testament records is first explained, and it is very fairly pointed out that this reduction of Jesus both in His person, to purely human measures, perhaps to something less than normal humanity, and in His significance to the religious movement we know as Christianity, to at most its first teacher, more probably only its first exemplar (and possibly not very purely that), perhaps even nothing more than its accidental actual starting-point in history, leaves the way open to question whether any Jesus need be recognized at all. If the only Jesus whose portrait has been transmitted to us by historical tradition is fictitious, why may not the whole figure of Jesus be a work of fancy? If the only Jesus which can be plausibly unearthed as lying possibly behind this creation of fancy, is psychologically impossible, exhibiting if not supernatural, then infranatural traits in an inextricable intermixture with normal ones,—why not simply admit that such a being never really lived? If the rôle played by this Jesus was so insignificant why not frankly recognize that he has no significance and therefore no reality in the actual course of things? Thus it cannot be thought strange that in the moment of the greatest diffusion of the "Liberal" criticism with its "historical Jesus," a movement should arise which proposes that we should simply "wipe this historical Jesus entirely off the slate." To understand the movement it must be clearly recognized that it is directed precisely against the "historical Jesus" of the "Liberal" theology (pp. 3, 31), and the problem is therefore posited in this form: Can the existence of Jesus be defended from the position of the "Liberal" theology? When the question is so posited, it must be allowed to be a very debatable one. In the second chapter a good running account is given of the various attempts which have been made to sublimate the historical Jesus into a myth. The chief exponents of this general view are named and the peculiarity of the method of each is explained.

The way having been thus prepared the argument against the denial of the existence of Jesus is taken up with the third chapter. Chapters three and four are negative and are devoted to a searching criticism of the argument which has been developed against the historicity of Jesus. It has been the misfortune of the radical movement that its leaders, though often men of learning in other departments, have been unwonted to historical research and have unfortunately sought their guidance from untrustworthy sources. Their attempts whether to break the force of the traditional evidence of the historicity of Jesus or to construct a plausible account of the origin of Christianity without Jesus, have been therefore no less than pitiable in their weakness, and offer a shining mark for telling criticism—if indeed the exposure of their open nakedness can be dignified by the name of criticism. This part of Professor Case's task is ac-

cordingly very easy, and he performs it thoroughly. Now and then, his own standpoint no doubt blunts the edge of his criticism, and sometimes we find ourselves even compelled to disallow it entirely. Thus, for example, when he adduces against Drews' assumption that the idea of a suffering deity is genetically vital to Paul's thought his own construction of the development of the doctrine of the deity of Christ and raises the alternative, "Is it the God-man Jesus or the Man-god Jesus that stands as corner-stone of the Pauline gospel?" (p. 126)—we can only reply, in accordance with Drew's contention,—that it certainly was the God-man Jesus and not the Man-god Jesus, of which latter indeed Paul knows nothing. To Paul undoubtedly the center of his thought of Jesus was that He was God become man for our salvation, and we do not even understand what Professor Case means when he says (p. 127): "The point of supreme importance for his gospel, that which he makes the central item of his preaching, is the transition from . . . 'Jesus' to 'Christ and him crucified.'" To Paul it was undoubtedly "Jesus Christ" who was crucified, and this "Jesus Christ" was the "Lord of Glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8), and He was the "Lord of Glory" already when He was crucified and did not wait to become such until He had been exalted to the right hand of God. One would think a mere glance at such a passage as Phil. ii. 8 would suffice to indicate what was Paul's movement of thought with respect to Jesus and what was the center of his conception of Him. Like Paul, like his pupils Luke and Mark. It really is undeniable, as Drews asserts, that "in the gospels we have to do not with a deified man but rather with an anthropomorphized God" (p. 128). The "deified man" is a pure invention of the "Liberal" reconstruction of the historical development in the interests of its mythical "historical Jesus." We are grateful to Professor Case, however, for a very true remark he lets fall in the course of his discussion. Quite unintentionally on his part no doubt, it suggests the key to certain modes of speech characterizing the early chapters of Acts on which the "Liberals" have laid hold to supply the much needed Biblical basis of their reconstruction of the historical development. "What troubled the first missionaries of the new religion," he says (p. 128), "was not the reluctance of their hearers to believe that God had become a man, but their hesitation about believing that a man, especially an obscure Jew who had been ignominiously put to death, was really the Son of God." That was it. It was not the "missionaries" themselves in whose thought Christ was a deified man; this was the false appearance of things, which they had to overcome.

In his second four chapters (Chs. v.-viii.), Professor Case develops his positive argument for the historicity of Jesus. In the first of these, which he designates "Pragmatic phases of primitive tradition" he works out a purely speculative scheme of the development of early Christology on the assumption that Jesus was a mere man, recognized as such by His followers at first, and only gradually transmuted in their thought into a Divine being under the pressure of

their apologetic needs; and pleads what he apparently looks upon as the verisimilitude of this construction as a proof that therefore this "historical Jesus" lies behind the whole evolution of Christianity. The three chapters that follow treat in turn of the Pauline evidence, the Gospel evidence and the Extra-Biblical evidence for Jesus' existence. Of course he writes here too from his own standpoint, and there is much assumed—as for example in the Gospel criticism—with which we cannot accord. But the results are for the main point satisfactory. We advert in passing only to a matter or two of detail. We are surprised by the looseness of the handling of the facts about Papias (pp. 208 *sq.*). When it is asserted that "the fact seems to be that many persons in this period," that is, early in the second century, "prized oral tradition above written records," on the strength of the report that Papias "said that in his youth he did not think he could derive so much profit from the contents of books as from 'the utterance of a living and abiding voice,'" there is a reversion to pre-Lightfootian misinterpretation of Papias which is lamentable. More distressing still is a persistent confusion of λόγια with λόγοι which really ought to be no longer possible. "According to Eusebius" we read, "Papias, in his expositions of the 'sayings' of the Lord." . . . But Eusebius says nothing of Papias' Expositions of the 'sayings' of the Lord (λόγων τοῦ κυρίου). What he speaks of is Papias' Expositions κυριακῶν λογίων—which is something very different, viz. "the Oracles concerning the Lord," that is to say, those particular Holy Scriptures which we know as the Gospels. Neither does Papias say either that Mark in recording what he remembered of Peter's reports of what was said or done by Christ "had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's 'sayings'"—but (if this reading is right as it seems to be) τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων, that is, of the Oracles that concern the Lord; or that "Matthew composed the sayings in the Hebrew language" but rather that Matthew composed his Oracles, that is his Gospel, in the Hebrew language. We wonder again why the Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ of Josephus *Ant.* XX. ix. 1. is persistently rendered "of Jesus the so-called Christ" (pp. 251, 254). The phrase means nothing more or less than simply "Jesus, surnamed Christ," and intimates neither denial nor doubt that Jesus was really the Messiah, but only informs us that He had another name, viz. Christ (cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 503; Meyer on Mat. i. 16). If we will bear in mind that Josephus thus knew Jesus also by the name of "Christ" and—as is also intimated here,—knew that He was more widely and better known by the name of "Christ" than by that of "Jesus", as was certainly true for the time at which Josephus wrote—perhaps it will not seem as strange as it might otherwise seem, that recent opinion appears to be becoming more favorable to the genuineness of the famous passage in *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 3. If the central phrase in that passage, ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν, may be read, not "This was the Messiah," but "This Jesus whom I am describing was the well-known Christ"—Christ being taken as a proper name,—the chief difficulty at

least to accepting the passage as genuine disappears. That there is little in the rest of the passage that Josephus might not be supposed to say in his zeal to take credit for the Jews from anything great which was reported of their hero by "the race of Christians"—from which he separates himself—is illustrated, not contradicted, by what he says of Vespasian (*War*, VI. v. 4). For it is inaccurate to say that there he identifies Vespasian "with the promised Messiah", just as it may be inaccurate to say that he identifies Jesus with the Messiah here. He only says that the prophecy that one from the country of the Jews should become the ruler of the world was fulfilled in Vespasian,—glorying in this manifest mark of Divine favor to the Jews in granting them supernatural knowledge of what was to come. So in *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 3 he may be only glorying in similar supernatural marks of Divine favor in connection with a Jew who had become famous.

In the last two chapters (ix. and x.) we reach the portion of the book which has the most interest for us. For here we learn most fully what Professor Case's own point of view is. The former of the chapters he entitles, "Jesus the historical founder of Christianity" and in it he inquires into the sense in which Jesus can justly be called the founder of Christianity. In the latter, which he entitles, "Jesus' significance for modern religion," he inquires into the relation in which a modern man may properly conceive himself to stand to Jesus. Christianity, he tells us, "was not a finished product in Jesus' day," "it is a growth," "a movement to whose origin and development many factors contributed," and not merely many factors, but also many persons, extending through several generations (pp. 272-3). We can say that any individual "founded" such a religion in no other sense than "that he furnished the initial impulse without which historically speaking the new movement would not have come into being" (p. 274). In this sense we may say Jesus was the founder of Christianity. The impulse which He gave to His followers was, in brief, the impression which His personal religious life made on those who enjoyed personal association with Him. "In the last analysis it was his power as a religious individual that made possible the early faith; the personal religion of Jesus was the foundation of the disciples' religion about Jesus" (p. 281). Jesus, then, may be said to be the founder of the Christian religion because His personality, His teaching, His activity "made Christianity possible" (p. 303). We may even call Him "the minister of salvation to men," if we mean only that He made men understand, by His teaching and example, that "God's presence means salvation," and so led them—of course by virtue of their own free will (for Professor Case is a great stickler for the autonomy of the human will, p. 297)—to enter into communion with God. But what, after the passage of time has made it impossible to come under the personal influence of this purely human Jesus who lived so impressive a religious life two thousand years ago and then fell on sleep? What is the significance of Jesus, in this sense the

founder of Christianity, for the men of to-day? Professor Case posits the question, states, expounds and criticises the several main views which have been held in the matter, and finally arrives at the conclusion that the passage of time has not essentially altered the relation in which the movement which we call Christianity stands to its "founder". He may speak indeed of "the shadowy form of Christianity's traditional founder" (p. 304). But His form has not become so "shadowy" as to lose entirely the power to stimulate and inspire which it manifested in those who knew it at first hand. It was "his personal religion" which was the source of Jesus' influence then: "He lived religiously and thus inspired believers to live similarly" (p. 336). We can have no immediate contact with Him now, but still "history discloses his superior personal efficiency in the spiritual sphere." "He has for men to-day the same essential value that he had for the primitive disciples, in so far as history permits acquaintance with him and he answers modern needs" (p. 336). "In so far!" But is it not, for men who occupy this standpoint, just the question of questions, how far history permits acquaintance with Him, how far He answers modern needs? And have we not just been told that it is only a "shadowy form" that looms through the mists of history? And have we not had it carefully explained to us that in the flux of things, men's needs have continually changed, and Christianity has changed with them, and if Christ was to be saved for this developing Christianity, He too must needs endlessly change? And yet we read (p. 536), "Nevertheless, the power of his person and his message continues to be a mighty inspiration prompting modern men to the worthiest spiritual attainments and encouraging them to realize in their own lives a genuine experience of God." Dimly seen through the murk of time the shadowy form of Jesus still inspires men to the religious life. That is all. We get from Him a great religious ideal. "Moderns" may prefer to describe it in "more secular language" and say we are encouraged by the memory of Jesus ourselves also to endeavor "to establish right relations with the universe." Call it what we may, however, "the ideal remains, and not the least important feature in Jesus' significance for many moderns will be the fact that his religious life reveals the secret of transforming the ideal into the real" (p. 337). Question may be raised whether these things would not have been realized without Him. It is a theoretical question. Is it not enough to know that they have often been realized in the past, that they are still realized, under the influence of His memory? In this sense, and to this extent, Jesus has significance for the religion of to-day.

Professor Case does not in the least imagine that his "interpretation" of Christ and Christianity has hitherto been the usual one. "It has been the Christ-idea," he says frankly (p. 308), "the idea of a Saviour-God perhaps we may say, that has held the first place in Christian thinking." This is far too little to say; but it is enough to point the moral. What reason is there to suppose that the new

"interpretation" of Christ and Christianity will "work" as the old has worked? And what justification is there derivable from history for calling the new Christ, Christ, the new Christianity, Christianity? The new "interpretation" stands out of all relation to fact,—whether the facts of history or the facts of experience. The Christ which it offers us is not the Christ of the historical tradition; the Christianity it teaches is not the Christianity which has conquered the world; nor can the Christ and Christianity which it provides meet the needs of sinful men. Its idea of sin must be deepened, its idea of salvation must be heightened, its conception of the function of Christ in salvation must be illimitably enlarged, before this "Christianity" can possess the slightest historical claim to that name, or become in the slightest degree glad-tidings to a sin-cursed race.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Historic Jesus. Being the Elliott Lectures delivered in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. By the Rev. DAVID SMITH, M.A., D.D., Professor of Theology in the McCrea-Magee College, Londonderry. New York and London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1912. 12mo; pp. iv, 119.

The Western Theological Seminary is to be felicitated upon the admirable course of Elliott Lectures which it has shared with the world in this delightful volume. Professor Smith has chosen a living subject and has treated it, if somewhat slightly, yet with insight and grace. Readers of *The Expositor* will recall, in its volumes for 1901, a series of articles from his pen bearing the general title of "Recent New Testament Criticism" in which the topics here dealt with are discussed at somewhat greater length, and, from which indeed the present lectures have been extracted and popularized. They were worth repeating; and in their repetition here a greater unity has been given them and a wider appeal. What Professor Smith has undertaken to do is to vindicate the Jesus of the Evangelists against the attacks of modern naturalistic criticism, as the really historical Jesus; or, as he himself puts it, "to reassure ourselves of the trustworthiness of the evangelical records, that we may enjoy the certainty that their testimony is true, exhibiting our Lord as He appeared to the eyes of His contemporaries." Addressing, however, a general audience, he has eschewed "the intricate and fascinating problems of New Testament Criticism," and elected rather "to pursue a line of argument, which," as it rightly seemed to him, "is at once simple and effective, instituting a comparison between the Evangelic portraiture as it stands and the pictures which the decadent imagination of the second century produced." Two of his five lectures, at least, are devoted to this comparison, the former of them adducing for this purpose the Apocryphal Gospels and the latter, the heathen religious romances of the time. These are preceded by a brief account of the critical contention, which supplies the starting-point for the argument, and are followed by lectures in which the self-evidence of the