

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. VI

August, 1935

No. 8

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Enhypostasia of Christ's Human Nature. Walter Albrecht	561
Kleine Studien aus dem Galaterbrief. L. Fuerbringer	580
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	592
Die kirchlichen Vorgaenge in Deutschland, lutherisch ge- sehen. W. Oesch.	594
Dispositionen ueber die altkirchliche Evangelienreihe	600
Miscellanea	609
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	616
Book Review. — Literatur	631

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren. — *Luther*.

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24.*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?
1 Cor. 14, 8.

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVES

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. VI

AUGUST, 1935

No. 8

The Enhypostasia of Christ's Human Nature.

"Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." The Incarnation is the assumption of a human nature by the preexistent, eternal Son of God, the addition by the Son of God of a human nature to His divine nature, the embodiment of the divine nature of the Son of God in a human nature. It is not the junction, association, partnership, of a divine and a human person under one title for some moral end. It is not a combination of two personalities somehow, but the most intimate union, without conversion, of a divine personality with a complete human nature, so that the product remains *one* person, but becomes a *divine-human* person, the theanthropic person Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man.

Accordingly we teach the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ, *i. e.*, the taking part of the human nature in the personality of the divine nature. This we find to be the teaching of Scripture. It teaches: "The Word was made flesh," John 1, 14. God became man not by the conversion of God into a man, but by the Second Person of the Trinity adding a human nature to His divine person. The only-begotten Son of God as described by John in the preceding verses — therefore not exclusive of, but including, His divine nature — became man, entered upon a truly human existence, adopted a truly human nature, never ceasing to be God nor becoming a plurality of persons. The Word *is* flesh. This enabled John and his fellow-apostles to hear, to see with their eyes, to look upon, to handle with their hands, the Word of Life, which was from the beginning, 1 John 1, 1. A spirit taught by God, John says, confesses "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," or, as he expresses it in the same chapter, "that God sent His only-begotten Son into the world," 1 John 4, 2. 9. The Son of God came into the flesh, embodied Himself by assuming a human nature created and developed by the Holy Ghost in the blessed among women. The fulness of the Godhead, the divine nature, indivisible and inseparable from the divine person, because it

is identical with it, made a human nature its body, Col. 2, 9. "As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He [His Son, whom He hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds, who, being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, chap. 1, 2] also Himself likewise took part of the same" (of flesh and blood), Heb. 2, 14. He partook in the same; *i. e.*, He, the eternal God and Creator and Preserver of all things, added to Himself flesh and blood, the nature of the children of men. The subject remains, but receives an addition, though not a partner. "The union of the natures in Christ is not an alliance of two beings who have entered into an agreement to coexist, say, like the two kernels of an almond in a common shell. The divine and the human nature are not two equal parts contained in the theanthropic person or the containing and surrounding medium." (Dau, *Notes*.) "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman," Gal. 4, 4. By the miraculous working of the Holy Ghost the Son of God assumed a full human nature, including body and soul, from a virgin. The very embryo developing in the Virgin is the Lord our God according to His human side, Luke 1, 43. The body and soul miraculously called forth and growing in the womb of Mary, joined to the body of Mary, are even more intimately joined from the outset to the Second Person of the Trinity. They are the body and soul of the Second Person of the Godhead. The human nature created in the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost came into existence within the person of the Son of God, because its assumption by the Son of God as His human nature and its creation in the Virgin occurred simultaneously. "When the human nature of Christ was conceived in the Virgin's womb, it was at once in personal union with the Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity. 'The Word was made flesh' when the Virgin conceived, and the angel does not say, 'Thy son shall be united with the Son of God,' but, 'that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' Neither does St. Paul say, 'God sent His Son to be united with the son of a woman,' but, 'God sent His Son, made of a woman.' Mary was not the mother of a human person with whom at some later period the divine person of the Son of God was to unite Himself, but she was the mother of God, *θεοτόκος*, when Elizabeth greeted her as 'the mother of her Lord' even before the child was born of whom she said: 'Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.'" (Aug. Graebner, *Theol. Quart.*, IV, p. 8 f.) "*Es ist auch entschieden abzulehnen, dass die goettliche und die menschliche Natur Christi erst ALLMAEHLICH zu einer Person zusammengewachsen seien. Vielmehr war die Vereinigung sofort eine VOLLSTAENDIGE; das heisst, die menschliche Natur war vom ersten Augenblick ihrer Existenz an zur PERSON des Sohnes Gottes gezogen. Die Hervorbringung (productio) der mensch-*

lichen Natur und ihre Vereinigung (unitio) mit dem Sohne Gottes werden nur BEGRIFFLICH geschieden, fallen aber zeitlich und sachlich zusammen. "Ἄμα σάρξ, ἄμα λόγον σάρξ." (Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.*, II, 89.) Chemnitz says: "The human nature did not assume the divine, nor did man assume God, nor did the divine person assume a human person; but the divine nature of the Logos, or the person of the Son of God, subsisting from eternity in the divine nature, assumed in the fulness of time a certain mass of human nature, so that in Christ there is an assuming nature, *viz.*, the divine, and an assumed nature, *viz.*, the human. In other cases, human nature is always the nature of a certain individual, whose peculiarity it is to subsist in a certain hypostasis, which is distinguished by a characteristic property from the other hypostases of the same nature. Thus each man has a soul of his own. But in the incarnate Christ the divine nature subsisted of itself before this union, and indeed from eternity. Yet the mass of the assumed nature did not thus subsist of itself before this union, so that before this union there was a body and soul belonging to a certain and distinct individual, *i. e.*, a peculiar person subsisting in itself which afterwards the Son of God assumed. But in the very act of conception the Son of God assumed this mass of human nature into the unity of His person, to subsist and be sustained therein, and, by assuming it, made it His own, so that this body is not that of another individual or another person, but the body is peculiar to the Son of God Himself, and the soul is the peculiar soul of the Son of God Himself." (*De Duab. Nat.*, 23; Schmid, 305.) "*Die Formierung der menschlichen Natur Jesu, ihre Beseelung, ihr Personlichwerden in der Person des Logos und die Empfaengnis der also im Logos personlich gewordenen menschlichen Natur sind UNTRENNBARE Akte.*" (Hoenecke, *Ev.-Luth. Dogm.*, III, 76.) "The Word did not unite Himself with a human being having individual life and personality, even in the most primitive stage, but from the first moment of the conception the Word assumed the flesh and constructed that into a temple which He filled with His divine majesty. *Animam creando assumpsit et assumendo creavit.*" (Dau, *Notes.*) "The flesh and soul were not first united into one person; but the *formation* of the flesh, by the Holy Ghost, from the separated and sanctified mass, the *giving* of a soul to this flesh as formed, the *taking up* of the formed and animated flesh into the subsistence of the Logos, and the *conception* of the formed, animated, and subsisting flesh in the womb of the Virgin were simultaneous." (Gerhard; Schmid, *Dogm.*, 301.) It is true the human nature miraculously created by the Holy Ghost in the Virgin Mary, a true and complete human nature, consisting of body and soul with every essential attribute of both, would have been able to subsist by itself, that is, to form a person. But it did not form a person, subsist by itself, because its creation and union with

the person of the Son of God perfectly synchronized. There was an individuality, a personality, an ego preexistent, that would assume humanity and thus qualify for the divinely appointed mode of salvation of mankind, namely, perfect obedience to the Law applying to man and suffering and death in the stead of man. This Person joined a truly human nature to His divine nature as the body is joined to the soul in man. "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." (*Athan. Creed, Trigl.*, 35, § 35.) The personality of the Son of God became the personality of the human nature He assumed. "*Die goettliche Natur ist bei der Menschwerdung die personbildende.*" (Hoencke, *op. cit.*, 76.) Lindberg (*Christian Dogm.*, p. 198) states it thus: "*Ἀνυπόστασία*. By this is meant that the human nature did not exist *per se* as a special personality which was assumed in the act of incarnation, since in that case there would have been two persons and two mediators and not two natures in one person. The human nature, therefore, lacked personality, but became personal by being made partaker in the personality of the Son of God, which is called *ἐνυπόστασία*. There was no separation in time, so that the human nature of Christ should have lacked the elements of personality even for a moment. At exactly the same moment that the human nature through the divine activity came into existence, it was made partaker in the most real and perfect way in the personality of the Son of God." "The Word, which was personality from everlasting, supplies its own personality also to the human nature of Christ. *Λόγου ὑπόστασις ἀμφοτέρων φύσεων ὑπόστασις*. However with this difference, that the personality of the God-man is and always remains the personality of the Son of God in the strict sense and in a sovereign manner (*κυρίως καὶ πρώτως*) and is the personality of the human nature in a secondary and subordinate sense (*δευτέρας καὶ κατ' ἄλλο*)." (Dau, *Notes*.) This thought is expressed by Hollaz in this wise: "The divine and human natures existing in the one united person of the Son of God have one and the same hypostasis, yet have it in a diverse mode. For the divine nature has this primarily, of itself, and independently; but the human nature has this secondarily, because of the personal union, and therefore by partaking of it from another" (Latin, *participative*). (Schmid, p. 303.)

Bear in mind we are here dealing with the *incarnation* of the Son of God, His assuming our flesh and blood as a means of obtaining our salvation. Granting to the human nature of Christ a human personality would cancel the incarnation; for then the man Jesus would be *another* than the Son of God, and we would in fact be assuming two mediators between God and men. The man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2, 5) is the one Mediator between God and men only because His ego, His subsistence, His personality is the Son of God.

“*Die Schrift zeigt Christum stets als EIN Ich.*” (Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, 76.) It is *mera verba, praeterea nihil* to speak of an *incarnation* of the Son of God as long as one teaches that the man Jesus was a separate subsistence, that is, was a person distinct from the Son of God. No amount of rhetoric can change this situation, not even the assurance that God unfolded a most extraordinary activity in the man Jesus, that the man Christ, not having innate sin to hinder Him, gave expression to the will of God most perfectly. The incarnation of the Son of God does not, according to the Bible, consist in the immanence of God in a self-subsisting human personality, in the absolute realization of the will of God in a perfect man, but in this, that the *person* of the Son of God, in distinction from the person of the Father and the Spirit, *received a human nature into His person*. Accordingly the doctrine of incarnation is surrendered when the doctrine of the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, considered by itself, is given up. Hollaz says: “If the human nature of Christ had retained its peculiar subsistence,” rather, had received its peculiar subsistence, “there would have been in Christ two persons and therefore two mediators, contrary to 1 Tim. 2, 5. The reason is that a person is formally constituted in his being by a subsistence altogether complete and therefore unity of person is to be determined from unity of subsistence. Therefore one or the other nature of those which unite in one person must be without its own peculiar subsistence; and since the divine nature, which is actually the same as its subsistence, cannot really be without the same, it is evident that the absence of a peculiar subsistence must be ascribed to the human nature.” (Schmid, p. 300.) “*Die Anhypostasie oder vielmehr Enhypostasie der menschlichen Natur Christi gehoert somit zum WESSEN der Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes.*” (Pieper, *op. cit.*, 86.) Gerhard: “The *formale*, the essence, of the union consists in this that the personality of the Logos has become the personality of the flesh.” (*De Persona*, § 115.) Adopting the words of John of Damascus, Gerhard says: The human nature “is not *αὐθυπόστατος καὶ ἰδιοσύστατος*, having its own subsistence, neither *ἀνυπόστατος*, having no subsistence whatever, but rather *ἐνυπόστατος*, subsisting in the Logos Himself.” (*L. c.*, § 121.)

It is, furthermore, evident from all that has been said that the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ is a necessary prerequisite of the doctrine of the personal union, as also of the doctrines of the communion of natures and the communication of attributes. The personal union is not a union of two persons. That would be a partnership. The closest partnership of this kind we have in matrimony, which in its product, the child, results in one personality originating in two personalities. But the two united in marriage are and remain two separate responsible persons. The

personal union is rather a union of two natures into one person, one of which natures is a person already before the union, the other receiving personality through the union. Again, a communion of natures in which one nature pervades the other as does the soul the body is plainly out of the question if both of two natures are persons. Just as little could there be a communication of attributes of one nature to the other if the two natures are both personally constituted. Plainly, then, without the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ the doctrines of the personal union, of the communion of natures, and of the communication of attributes must fall.

That the eternal Son of God took unto Himself a human nature and received it into His personal entity (*Einheit*), has always been the faith of the Christian Church. Since the dawn of the New Testament era the Christians have always held that Christ is indeed *ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο* (*zweiertelei*, twofold), but not *ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος* (*zwei*, two). Gerhard expresses the faith of Christendom when he says: "In Him [Christ] there is *ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο*, since another (*aliud*) is His divine essence or nature, another His human essence or nature; but He is not *ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος*, because not one is God and another man, but the one is *θεάνθρωπος*, God and man, and accordingly a single person." (*De Pers.*, § 34.) The same thought the *Athanasian Creed* expresses in the words: "It is necessary unto eternal salvation that he also believe faithfully the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. . . . Who, although He be God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but *by taking the manhood into God*. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by *unity of person*." (*Triglot.*, 35.) Schaff's *Encycl. of Rel. Knowledge* (III, 55) mentions as a seventh feature of the ecumenical Christology "the anhypostasia or, more accurately, the enhypostasia (impersonality) of the human nature of Christ" and says in this connection: "The meaning is that Christ's human nature had no independent personality of its own and that the divine nature is the root and basis of His personality. His humanity was enhypostatized through union with the Logos, or incorporated into His personality. The Synod of Chalcedon says nothing of this feature; it was an afterthought developed by John of Damascus." The remark that the Synod of Chalcedon says nothing of this feature is misleading, for listen to its statement and judge for yourselves: "One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in *one person and one sub-*

sistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ." Plainly one divine person or subsistence as the ego of both natures is taught. This John of Damascus pointed out and emphasized; it was no afterthought, therefore, but proper interpretation and defense of the Biblical doctrine expressed by the council. Klotsche in his *Outline of the History of Doctrines* (p. 78 f.) says of John: "In his Summary of the orthodox faith (third division of his principal work, *Fount of Knowledge*) John of Damascus (d. after 754) spoke for the Greek Church the final word in Christology. His object was to secure the unity of the two natures in the unity of one personality. To exclude the idea of a double personality, he held that the Logos-hypostasis became also the hypostasis of the potential man. This potential man is not *ἀνυπόστατος*, without hypostasis, nor *ἰδιοσύστατος*, of own independent subsistence, but enhypostatic in the Logos-hypostasis. There is, then, one hypostasis for both natures. This unity of the hypostasis involves a *περιχώρησις*, a communication of properties. But this communication proceeds only from the side of the divine nature, which interpenetrates, pervades and deifies" (rather: communicates divine attributes to) "the receptive and passive human nature. The human will in Christ has become the organ of the divine will." Hodge quotes even Thomas Aquinas from the darkest period of the Papacy as espousing this doctrine. Thomas says: "The human nature of Christ is indeed a particular substance; still, as it came into the union of a certain total, namely, the whole Christ as soon as He is God and man, it cannot be called hypostasis or *suppositum*" [person, *das, was fuer sich besteht*]; "but that total with which it unites (*concurrit*) is said to be a hypostasis or *suppositum*." (Hodge, *Dogm.*, II, 388.)

Since this had been the constant faith of the New Testament Church from its inception to the day of the Reformation and was held by our Lutheran dogmaticians, as we have seen, it would indeed be significant, if our Lutheran symbols by silence on it disavowed this doctrine, as Dorner and Bretschneider intimate. But in the *Augsburg Confession* we read: "Also they [the Lutherans] teach that the Word, that is, the Son of God, did assume the human nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably conjoined in one Person, one Christ, true God and true man." (Art. III, *Triglot*, p. 45.) And the *Formula of Concord* says: "We believe, teach, and confess that the Son of God, although from eternity He has been a particular, distinct, entire, divine person, and thus, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, true, essential, perfect God, nevertheless in the fulness of time assumed also human nature into the unity of His person, not in such a way that there now are two persons or two Christs, but

that Christ Jesus is now one person at the same time true, eternal God, born of the Father from eternity, and a true man, born of the most blessed Virgin Mary, as it is written Rom. 9, 5: 'Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.'” (*Triglot.*, 1017, 6.) And soon after it says: “We believe, teach, and confess also that now, since the incarnation, each nature in Christ does not so subsist of itself that each is or constitutes a separate person, but that they are so united that they constitute one single person, in which the divine and the assumed human nature are and subsist at the same time, so that now, since the incarnation, there belongs to the entire person of Christ personally not only His divine, but also His assumed human nature; and that, as without His divinity, so also without His humanity, the person of Christ or *Filii Dei incarnati*, that is, of the Son of God who has assumed flesh and become man, is not entire. Hence Christ is not two distinct persons, but one single person, notwithstanding that two distinct natures are found in Him, unconfused in their natural essence and properties.” (*Triglot.*, 1019, 11.)

The fact that the personality of the Son of God became the personality of the human nature of Christ at the incarnation is emphasized also by the confessions of the Reformed bodies. Thus the *Second Helvetic Confession*, of 1566, by Bullinger, chap. XI, says: “There are in one and the same Jesus Christ, our Lord, two natures, the divine and the human nature; and we say that these two are so conjoined or united that they are not swallowed up, confounded, or mingled together, but rather united or joined together in one person, the properties of each nature being safe and remaining still, so that we do worship one Christ, our Lord, and not two; I say, one, true God and man; as touching His divine nature, of the same substance with the Father, and as touching His human nature, of the same substance with us and ‘like unto us in all things, sin only excepted.’” The *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Church of England declare in Art. II: “The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried.” The *Westminster Confession* of the Presbyterians, of 1648, reads in chap. VIII, § 2: “The Son of God, the Second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon Him man’s nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance, so that

two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and men."

So we also find the Reformed dogmaticians defending this position. Hodge, *e. g.*, says: "There is, in the first place, the absence of all evidence of a twofold personality in Christ. The Scriptures reveal the Father, Son, and Spirit as distinct persons in the Godhead, because they use the personal pronouns in reference to each other. The Father says 'Thou' to the Son, and the Son says 'Thou' to the Father. The Father says to the Son: 'I will give Thee'; and the Son says: 'Lo, I come to do Thy will.' Moreover, the one is objective to the other. The Father loves and sends the Son; the Son loves and obeys the Father. The same is true of the Spirit. There is nothing analogous to this in the case of Christ. The one nature is never distinguished from the other as a distinct person. The Son of God never addresses the Son of man as a different person from Himself. The Scriptures reveal but one Christ. In the second place, besides this negative proof the Bible affords all the evidence of the individual personality of our Lord that the case admits of. He always says, 'I,' 'Me,' 'Mine.' He is always addressed as 'Thou,' 'Thee,' 'Thine.' He is always spoken of as 'He,' 'His,' 'Him.' It was the same person to whom it was said: 'Thou art not yet fifty years old,' and: 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thine hands.' The individual personality of Christ is set forth as clearly and as variously as that of any other personage of whose history the Scriptures give us the record. In teaching that Christ had a perfect human and a perfect divine nature and is one person, the Bible teaches the whole doctrine of the incarnation as it has entered into the faith of the Church from the beginning." (*Syst. Theol.*, II, 382 f.) Later he adds: "And as in man the personality is in the soul and not in the body, so the personality of Christ is in the divine nature. . . . The Logos, or Son, was from all eternity a distinct person in the Godhead. It was a divine person, not merely a divine nature" (there is no such genus), "that assumed humanity, or became incarnate. Hence it follows that *the human nature of Christ* separately considered *is impersonal*. To this, indeed, it is objected that intelligence and will constitute personality and, as these belong to Christ's human nature, personality cannot be denied to it. A person, however, is a *suppositum intelligens*, but the human nature of Christ is not a *suppositum* or subsistence. To personality both rational substance and distinct subsistence are essential. The latter the human nature of Christ never possessed. *The Son of God did not unite Himself with a human person, but with a human nature.*

The proof of this is that Christ is but one person. . . . Human nature, therefore, although endowed with intelligence and will, may be, and in fact is in the person of Christ, impersonal. That it is so is the plain doctrine of Scripture, for the Son of God, a divine person, assumed a perfect human nature and nevertheless remains one person." (P. 391.) Shedd (*Hist. of Doct.*, I, 407) first intimates his agreement with Chalcedon Christology, saying: "It is further to be noticed that, according to the Chalcedon doctrine, *the Logos did not unite Himself with a distinct individual, but with a human nature*. An individual man was not first conceived and born, with whom the Second Person in the Godhead then associated Himself, but the union was effected with the substance of humanity in the womb of a Virgin." Then he quotes Hooker (d. 1600) (*Eccl. Pol.*, Book V, chap. 53) to the effect: " 'He took not angels, but the seed of Abraham.' If the Son of God had taken to Himself a man *now made and already perfected*, it would of necessity follow that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming and the other assumed, whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's *person* into His own [person], but a man's nature to His own person, and therefore took *semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. The flesh and the conjunction of the flesh with God began both at one instant; His making and taking to Himself our flesh was but one act, so that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting." Also the Congregationalist Samuel Hopkins (d. 1803) is in agreement with these writers. He says: "The personality of Jesus Christ is in His divine nature and not in the human. Jesus Christ existed a distinct, divine person from eternity, the Second Person in the adorable Trinity. The human nature which this divine person, the Word, assumed into a personal union with Himself *is not, and never was, a distinct person by itself, and personality cannot be ascribed to it, and does not belong to it, any otherwise than as united to the Logos, the Word of God*. The Word assumed the human nature, not a human *person*, into a personal union with Himself, by which the complex person exists, God-man. Had the Second Person in the Trinity taken a human *person* into union with Himself, and were this possible, Jesus Christ, God and man, would be *two* persons, not one. Hence, when Jesus Christ is spoken of as a man, 'the Son of Man,' 'the man Christ Jesus,' these terms *do not express the personality of the manhood, or of the human nature, of Jesus Christ*; but these personal terms are used with respect to the human nature *as united* to a divine person and not as a mere man. For the personal terms 'He,' 'I,' and 'Thou' cannot with propriety or truth be used by or of the human nature *considered as distinct* from the divine nature of Jesus Christ." (Works, I, 283.)

It is true, this stand of the Reformed theologians for the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ, this their firm assertion of the personal union of the godhead and manhood in Christ, is sapped of its strength by their self-contradiction in denying the *genus maiestaticum*, the communication of divine attributes to the human nature of Christ. Still it remains notable that on this score, the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, their position is Biblical.

Here there is a sharp cleavage between the position of the genuinely Lutheran and Reformed theologians on the one hand and the Unitarian and modernistic theologians on the other. The Unitarians have always contended that a separate personality is essential to a human nature. They give us the choice either to ascribe to the human nature of Christ a distinct personality or to deny the true humanity of Christ. Their heavy artillery is: *Quot naturae humanae, tot personae humanae*. They call on us to bring from the history of mankind since the Creation a single example of a human nature that was not also a separate person. Smalcius, one of the authors of the *Racovian Catechism*, declares: "To give him the appellation of *man* who yet is not a human person neither reason nor Holy Writ permit. A *monster* of a man that would have to be called which is not also a human *person*. Since it is clear that this is true of all human individuals since the very beginning of the world, can this truth prove fallacious alone in the individual Christ? Then Christ would not even be a man as fully as other men were, are, or will be in the future. Why, then, is He called wholly a human (*homo*), Son of Man, and a man (*vir*)?" Quoted by Gerhard, *De Pers.*, § 92. It is imperative for Unitarians to insist on a human personality for the human nature of Christ, for without it they would indeed have a "monster," since they have always denied the true godhead of Christ. Wm. E. Channing, the spokesman of American Unitarianism, says: "According to this doctrine [Trinitarianism], Jesus Christ, instead of being one mind, one conscious, intelligent principle, whom we can understand, consists of two souls, two minds, the one divine, the other human; the one weak, the other almighty; the one ignorant, the other omniscient. Now, we maintain that this is to make Christ two beings. To denominate Him one person, one being, and yet suppose Him made up of two minds, infinitely different from each other, is to abuse and confound language and to throw darkness over all our conceptions of intelligent natures. According to the common doctrine each of these two minds in Christ has its own consciousness, its own will, its own perceptions. They have in fact no common properties. The divine mind feels none of the wants and sorrows of the human, and the human is infinitely removed from the perfection and happiness of the divine. Can you conceive of two beings in the universe more distinct? We have always thought that

one person was constituted and distinguished by one consciousness. The doctrine that one and the same person should have two consciousnesses, two wills, two souls, infinitely different from each other, this we think an enormous tax on human credulity." (Works, 1881, p. 373.) Note how Channing asserts again and again that the Christian Church teaches "two consciousnesses" in Christ. This does not agree with the facts. We do ascribe to Christ the divine mind and human reason, the divine will and a human will, for the Scriptures ascribe to Him the fulness of the Godhead and a full and unimpaired human nature, consisting of both body and soul. But we do not teach that these two natures have no communion with one another or that Christ has two consciousnesses. Scripture teaches that Christ is one person with two natures, one divine-human ego, has one divine-human consciousness, and that His every act is an undivided divine-human act; for the two natures, though distinct and unimpaired, pervade one another most intimately, and the lesser human nature, retaining its inherent attributes, by communication is enriched with the superlative divine attributes. See Pieper, *Dogm.*, II, 96 f. Again, Channing declares: "We believe, then, in the divinity of Christ as this term is often and properly used. How, then, it may be asked, do we differ from other Christians? We differ in this important respect: whilst we honor Christ as the Son, representative, and image of the Supreme God, we do not believe Him to be the Supreme God Himself. We maintain that Christ and God are *distinct beings*, two beings, not one and the same being. . . . The doctrine that Christ, who was born at Bethlehem, who ate and drank and slept, who suffered and was crucified, who came from God, who prayed to God, who did God's will, and who said on leaving the world: "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God,"—the doctrine that this Jesus was the Supreme God Himself and the same being with his Father, this seems to us a contradiction to reason and Scripture so flagrant that the simple statement of it is a sufficient refutation. . . . If to represent Christ as a being distinct from God and as inferior to Him be to degrade him, then let our opponents lay the guilt where it belongs, not on us, but on our Master, whose language we borrow, in whose very words we express our sentiments, whose words we dare not trifle with and force from their plain sense." (P. 402.) Observe that reason before Scripture is declared to be the source of this blasphemy.

Modern theologians universally teach that the human nature of Christ was also a human person. They reject the doctrine of the *unio personalis*, of the union of two natures in one person, as inconceivable. They define the person of Christ, as Luthardt expresses it, "anthropocentrically, instead of theocentrically"; *i. e.*, they ascribe to Him a human ego instead of a theanthropic ego. Whether they

approach the matter from a pantheistic or a deistic angle, they hold that Christ is a mere man with but one nature, the human. Men like Kant, Schleiermacher, Schelling, Hegel, Ritschl, Harnack, Biedermann, De Wette, Rothe, and their American followers, W. A. Brown, C. F. Clarke, G. B. Smith, Wm. De Witt Hyde, G. W. Gladden, Rauschenbusch, H. C. King, Sellars, Ward, Vedder, Fosdick, Grant, Cadman, Shailer Mathews, shower Christ with compliments; they portray Him as a moral genius, a religious genius, a thought genius, a genius in revealing, or a combination of several geniuses; they lavish adorning adjectives on Him; but He remains a mere man. Naturally, they must insist that He has not only a human nature, but also a human personality. The conservative theologians of the present century are the radicals of yesteryear. That is not to say that the radicals have improved, but rather that the standards of theology have deteriorated. But even the conservative nineteenth-century theologians, with very few exceptions, insisted that the human nature of Christ needs must have a human personality to be complete. While kenoticists like Thomasius, Delitzsch, Kahnis, Luthardt, Zoekler, *et alii* meant to hold on to the theanthropic Christ, they taught the humiliation of the divine nature of Christ, "the subject of the kenosis being the preexistent, not the incarnate Logos," and the kenosis consisting "in an actual abandonment of the divine attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence during the whole period of humiliation, from the incarnation to the resurrection"; and Schaff is not far from right in asserting that they were "assuming a truly humanized Logos dwelling in a human body." (*Ency.*, III, 60.) They were in fact reducing the divine person to the level of a human person. "Instead of raising the finite to the infinite, the kenotic theory lowers the infinite to the finite." Dr. Pieper is therefore justified in declaring: "*Dass durch diese Lehre der Kenotiker sowohl die gottmenschliche Person als auch das gottmenschliche Erloesungswerk Christi aufgegeben wird, liegt auf der Hand. . . . Hierdurch [durch diese Reduktion] scheinen die Kenotiker allerdings der menschlichen Natur mehr Raum fuer eine echt menschliche Entwicklung gesichert zu haben, aber um den Preis, dass ihnen bei der Sorge um die Menschheit die wahre Gottheit Christi und damit der Gottmensch und damit das gottmenschliche Werk Christi abhanden gekommen ist. . . . Es gelingt weder vernuenftigen Heiden noch denkenden Christen, sich den wesentlichen Gott ohne Allmacht, Allwissenheit und Allgegenwart oder gar ohne goettliches Ich vorzustellen.*" (Pieper, *Dogm.*, II, 101. 117 f.) While the kenoticists, then, are not declared opponents of the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ, the essential deity of Christ evaporates under their hands and they leave us but a human being with a divine name. They claim a divine personality for

Christ, but actually teach "a truly humanized Logos dwelling in a human body."

The *pankenoticists*, men like Gess, v. Hofmann, Frank, Jul. Mueller, Goodwin, Crosby, Van Dyke, let the Son of God shed all His divine attributes at the incarnation, even the divine self-consciousness and the divine ego; accordingly they teach a conversion of the eternal Son of God into a human personality. Van Dyke, for example, says: "The idea of self-emptying shatters the narrow dogma that the Son of God suffered no change in Himself when He became man. . . . He laid aside the existence-form of God in order that He might take the existence-form of man. . . . The distinctive attributes of personality (self-consciousness and self-determination) are not dual in Christ, as of two persons, the one divine and the other human, coexisting side by side in a double life. They are individual and manifested as the life of one person. That person is the Son of God, who laid aside the glory which He had with the Father and emptied Himself and so became the Son of Man. . . . The theories which have been put forward in modern times, . . . theories which have been stigmatized as *kenotic*, . . . are so far from being heretical that they have the rare merit of conserving and emphasizing a truth of surpassing value undoubtedly taught in the Bible. . . . Jesus Christ is not the Son of God hidden in the Son of Man, retaining all the attributes of Divinity in a latent state. This would be to admit an irreducible duality which would withdraw Him from the normal conditions of human life." Accordingly he speaks of "the *divine* humiliation and the human exaltation of Christ." (Works, *Evangel*, pp. 127. 139.) The *autohypostatians*, e. g., Seeberg and Kirn, drop entirely the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ, i. e., its reception into the person of the Son of God, and teach that Christ was a separate human person. For them there are no two natures in one person, but the man Jesus is and remains solely a human being in whom God unfolds a singular influence and activity. Some, as Dörner and Schaff, assert that the Chalcedonian dyophysitism "puts the final result at the beginning and ignores the intervening process" (Schaff, *Ency.*, III, 55), that the Logos and Jesus gradually grew together until at the ascension they finally became one person. Schaff says: "The being and actuality of the Logos remained metaphysically and morally unchanged; but Jesus of Nazareth possessed the Logos merely so far as was compatible with the truth of human growth and the capacity of His expanding consciousness. In other words, the eternal personality of the divine Logos entered into the humanity of Jesus, measure by measure as it grew, and became capable and worthy of receiving it. There were two corresponding movements in the life of Christ—a descent of the divine consciousness and an ascent of the human consciousness. There was a progressive self-communic-

tion of the divine Logos to Jesus and a moral growth of Jesus in holiness keeping step with the former. The process of union began with the supernatural conception and was completed with the ascension." (*Ency.*, III, 62.) It is true, Schaff wants to cling to the one theanthropic personality of Christ ("Both constituted one undivided personality." "There was a personal unity and identity throughout the whole period." "Christ is also the eternal Son of God." "How the whole fulness of uncreated divinity can be poured out into a human being passes our understanding." "The death of His only-begotten Son for the salvation of a sinful world." P. 62 f.); but at the same time he plainly indicates two personalities, gradually uniting until ultimately they become one ("Jesus of Nazareth possessed the Logos merely so far as was compatible with the truth of human growth and the capacity of His expanding consciousness. . . . There was a progressive self-communication of the divine Logos to Jesus. . . . The process of union began with the supernatural conception and was completed with the ascension." *L. c.*, p. 62). This amounts to an actual denial of the incarnation taught in Holy Writ. It takes this union thirty-three years to become a *unio personalis*. Only after its completion had the Word actually become man, John 1, 14. And the angel of the Lord must have been a trifle premature in announcing: "Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord," Luke 2, 11. That is a yes-and-no theology as only a mind floundering about and drowning in the sea of Modernism can produce it. In short, with the exception of the few Lutheran and Reformed theologians who still cling to the faith of their fathers, the entire Protestant world declares Christ to be a human person.

And since they deny the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ, they also reject the impeccability of Christ's human nature, which rests on this fact that the governing principle of the human nature is not a human ego, but the divine ego. The fact of Christ's sinlessness does indeed also result from this, that He became man not after the order of nature, but through supernatural, divine intervention, namely, through the miraculous working of the Holy Ghost. But that would merely have established the *potuit non peccare*, the possibility of not sinning, which Adam, too, possessed in the state of innocence. The *non potuit peccare*, the impossibility of sinning, results from the fact that the human nature of Christ never existed as a separate person, but from the first moment of its existence belonged to the person of the Son of God. And this person is indeed superior to the Law and guilt. Matt. 12, 8: "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." Dr. Pieper says: "*Auch die MÖGLICHKEIT des Suendigens Christi ist entschieden zu verneinen. Nicht zwar wegen der Suendlosigkeit der menschlichen Natur Christi an sich, denn Adam, wiewohl suendlos erschaffen, fiel doch in der Ver-*

suchung, sondern weil Christi menschliche Natur nicht fuer sich, als eigne Person, existierte, sondern mit dem Sohne Gottes eine Person bildete. Wenn wir die Moeglichkeit des Suendigens fuer den MENSCHEN Christus zugeben wollten, so muessten wir auch die Moeglichkeit des Suendigens fuer den Sohn Gottes zugestehen, mit dem der Mensch Christus eine Person bildet. Diejenigen, welche die Moeglichkeit des Suendigens bei dem Menschen Christus annehmen, geben eo ipso, bewusst oder unbewusst, die Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes, die unio personalis von Gott und Mensch, preis." (Dogm., II, 80.) Philippi is an exception among modern theologians in asserting: "Wollten wir die Moeglichkeit des Suendigens in Christo setzen, so wuerden wir ganz abstrakt ihn nur als Menschen betrachten, und der Gottmensch wuerde uns verloren gehen; denn daechten wir, dass diese Moeglichkeit zur Wirklichkeit geworden waere, so waere damit das Band PERSOENLICHER Einheit zwischen dem Sohne Gottes und dem Menschen Jesus durchschnitten. . . . Das *potuit non peccare* gilt vom ersten, das *non potuit peccare* von dem zweiten Adam, weil eben der zweite Mensch der Herr vom Himmel ist, 1 Kor. 15, 47." (Glaubenslehre, IV, 1, p. 150 f.) The modern rationalistic theologian will grant the *potuit non peccare*, but he rejects as incompatible with a human personality the *non potuit peccare*.

The objections raised by Unitarians and modern theologians against the doctrine of the impersonality of Christ's human nature, separately considered, are naive. They include the following: A human nature spells a human being or person. That has been true of all human natures since the beginning of time. It is the rule. — But that does not prove that this rule must apply to the Son of God when He chooses to assume the human nature to become our Savior. If the Scriptures stated that the Son of God by becoming man became two persons, it would be true, and we should so teach. But now the Scriptures state that "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily*," Col. 2, 9. They speak throughout of Christ in the singular. It is the same ego that says: "I and My Father are one," and: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world"; the same ego that says: "I was an hungred," and: "I am the living bread that came down from heaven"; the same personality that says: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending," and: "I am among you as he that serveth." — The same objection is clothed in this form, "that the term *Son of Man* is just as much a designation of a person as is the term *Son of God*." (Mueller, *Chr. Dogm.*, p. 262.) So it is. But both are designations of the one theanthropic person, the incarnated Son of God; for Matt. 16, 13—17 Jesus in reply to the question: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" accepts as correct only the answer of His disciples: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

The chief objection of the opponents is that the enhypostasia makes impossible a genuinely human development of the human nature of Christ. We quote Schaff's wording of it, though he does not employ it to combat the impersonality of Christ's human nature, but rather to support his theory of a gradual and progressive incarnation. He says: "It [the Chalcedonian Christology] does not do justice to the genuine humanity of Christ in the gospels and to all those passages which assert its real growth. It overshadows the human by the divine. It puts the final result at the beginning and ignores the intervening process. If we read the gospel history, we find that Christ was a helpless infant on his mother's breast and therefore not omnipotent till after the resurrection, when 'all authority in heaven and on earth' was given unto Him (Matt. 28, 18); He grew in wisdom and learned obedience (Luke 2, 40; Heb. 5, 8) and was ignorant of the day of Judgment (Mark 13, 32), therefore not omniscient; He moved from place to place and was therefore not omnipresent before His ascension to heaven; He was destitute of His divine glory, which He was to regain after His death (John 17, 5). To confine these limitations and imperfections to His human nature, while in His divine nature He was, at one and the same time, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, even in the manger and on the cross, is to destroy the personal unity of life and to make two Christs. How can ignorance and omniscience simultaneously coexist in one and the same mind? How can one and the same individual pervade and rule the universe in the same moment in which He exclaims: 'My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me?' Christ speaks and acts throughout as one undivided ego. We must therefore so reconstruct or improve the Chalcedonian Christology as to conform it to the historical realness of His humanity, to the full meaning of His own sayings concerning Himself, and to all the facts of His life." (*Ency.*, III, 55.) This worry that the human nature cannot find room for development if it is embodied in one and the same person with the divine nature is wholly superfluous. "*Die hoechste Autoritaet, die es gibt, ueberhebt uns dieser Sorge. Wir haben in der Schrift Gottes Wort dafuer, dass die menschliche Natur Christi durch die Aufnahme in die Person des Sohnes Gottes in ihrem menschlichen Wesen durch nichts verkuert worden ist, weil die Schrift Christum wie als wahren Gott, so auch durchweg als wahren, vollkommenen Menschen beschreibt. . . . Was insonderheit die 'echt menschliche Entwicklung' Christi betrifft, so ist diese nach der Schrift dadurch vermittelt, dass Christus im Stande der Erniedrigung die goettliche Herrlichkeit, die durch die persoenliche Vereinigung seiner menschlichen Natur gegeben war, NICHT GEBRAUCHTE.*" (Pieper, *op. cit.*, II, 87.) Dr. Pieper refers us to this passage in our Confessions: "This majesty He [Christ] always had according to the

personal union, and yet He abstained from it in the state of His humiliation and *on this account (qua de causa)* truly increased in all wisdom and favor with God and men." (*Triglot.*, 821, 16.)

It is also asserted by the opponents that the union of the Son of God with an embryo is out of the question because it would not be proper and decent for God. In answer we say, first, that even human reason at bottom sees nothing more objectionable in the union of God with an embryo than with a human nature under any conditions. Secondly, the books on this matter are closed. The Bible states not merely that the grown Man, the Boy of Twelve, the new-born Babe, but that the Child in its mother's womb is the Lord God and accordingly teaches that the embryo had already been received into the person of the Son of God. Thirdly, the Scriptures establish a causal relation between the union of the Son of God with an embryo and our salvation. For in the fulness of time "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, that He might redeem them that were under the Law," Gal. 4, 4. 5. Christ had to pass through all stages of our life that He might radically cure our impure conception and nativity.

Another objection raised is this: if the human nature of Christ is without a peculiar subsistence, it will be more imperfect than our nature, which is *αὐθυπόστατος*, or subsisting by itself. This is an old objection, reported already by Hollaz. A newer version is framed by Schaff: "It [that Christ's humanity was enhypostatized through union with the Logos] seems inconsistent with the dyotheletic theory; for a being with consciousness and will has the two essential elements of personality, while an impersonal will seems to be a mere animal instinct." (*Ency.*, III, 55.) It is the old story of man's reason criticizing Scripture. The Bible ascribes a human mind and a human will and every other essential feature of humanity to Christ. It shows Christ conscious of His humanity. But the Bible does not ascribe to Him a merely human consciousness with a human personality. Neither does it absolutely anhypostatize His human nature; *i. e.*, it does not assert that His human nature has no personality whatever. On the contrary, the Bible enhypostatizes His humanity; *i. e.*, it gives the human nature of Christ a personality, the preexistent divine personality. Why, then, should the man Christ be worse off than we if He received something better in the line of personality than did we? Only a thoroughgoing rationalist would dare even to hint at "a mere animal instinct."

Rationalism is at the bottom of all objections voiced against the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ. But science is the dugout in which the rationalists are hiding. Professor Paine in his *Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism* (Boston, 1900) marvels "how such a bald antinomy, Christ wholly

God and wholly man, could have been adopted by theologians who were adepts in the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophies." (P. 279.) Again, he declares our Biblical Christology "an unhistorical and unscientific violation of logical and psychological laws." Reduced to their least common denominator, these scientific objections are simply the inconceivability of the fact that God and man become one ego, or one person, without the humanity's being doomed to a phantom existence in this union. These objections tacitly assume as incontrovertible truth that facts depend upon their conceivability or comprehensibility. This the opponents of the enhypostasia will hardly assert in earnest. Every one grants that facts in nature and in history are not dependent on their conceivability or comprehensibility. Why, then, should this greatest fact of history, that the Son of God became man and that thus godhead and manhood were united in one person, depend upon its reasonableness? To object to this fact because reason finds it inconceivable is therefore unscientific inconsistency. And how is the doctrine espoused by the Modernists, the doctrine of divine immanence in the man Jesus, God dwelling in Him and working, causing, effecting, sustaining, every activity of body and soul, mind and will, in Him, more explicable than the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ? Is it not just as unthinkable how such an all-sustaining, determining activity on the part of God leaves room for an unhampered unfolding of the human personality? Modernism here grants as fact what is nevertheless inexplicable to the human mind. Granting the all-embracing activity of God in every one of us, even our responsible human personality is a mystery to us. Still we maintain the human personality as a fact over against pagan pantheism and determinism. Accordingly it is inconsistent and therefore unscientific to object to the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ on the ground of its inconceivability.

It is evident that the doctrine of the enhypostasia of the human nature of Christ has taken on an added importance in this day of Modernism. It has become a touchstone by which to tell Modernists, embryonic and matured, from Bible Christians. As the question, Has the Son of God His human nature with Him everywhere? uncovers the Reformed theologian, so the question, Did the human nature of Christ constitute Him a human person? reveals the Unitarian, the Modernist. And this holds true in spite of the fact that in the past also orthodox Christians and theologians have in off moments used the inadvisable expression *Deus assumpsit hominem*, God assumed a man. Luther draws attention to this deviation, saying: "Thus, *e. g.*, the Symbol (*Te Deum*) sings: Thou wouldst for our deliverance assume *the man*, as Augustine often says this, while the rule, it seems, prescribes that we say, Thou wouldst for our deliverance assume *humanity* or *the human nature*." (St. Louis, X,

1141.) Dr. Hoppe adds the note: "As Augustine also often expressed *this*: 'The Word did not assume the person of man, but the nature of man.'" Chemnitz also cautions us that we shall find the inaccurate expression with men who held the correct view of the incarnation. He says: "Since the person of the Logos did not assume the person of a man, but the nature of man, it is therefore, because the divine nature is the assuming, the human nature, however, not the assuming, but the assumed, correctly stated, God is become man, while one does not so in the proper sense say, A man is become God, God has assumed a man, even though some of the Fathers at times so expressed themselves." (*De Duabus Nat.*, c. 14, f. 70.) Turn to the *Formula of Concord*, and you there read: "That man (*homo ille*) was assumed into God." (*Triglot.*, 821, 10.) But finish the sentence, and you will see that all is correct, for it reads on, "when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost in His mother's womb, and His human nature was then already (*jam tum*) personally united with the Son of the Highest." Brenz, too, used the expression *Filius Dei assumpsit filium hominis*. (Pieper, *op. cit.*, Note 146.) But avoidance of this inaccurate way of stating the assumption of the human nature by the Son of God is imperative to-day, because the Christian Church is at present engaged in a war unto death with Modernism. Dr. Pieper therefore cautions against using this expression, "*insofern die letztere Redeweise auf den irrigen Gedanken fuehren kann, als ob die menschliche Natur Christi vor ihrer Verbindung mit dem Sohne Gottes schon eigenpersoenlich existiert habe.*" (*Op. cit.*, II, 89.) And Dr. Mueller (*Chr. Dogm.*, 262 f.) is justified in stating it even stronger: "In view of the fact that modern rationalistic theology has changed the doctrine of the two natures (*Zweinaturenlehre*) into a doctrine of two persons, this distinction (*Deus assumpsit humanitatem*, and not: *Deus assumpsit hominem*) is very important."

Springfield, Ill.

WALTER ALBRECHT.

Kleine Studien aus dem Galaterbrief.

II.

In der vorigen Nummer ist der erste der drei Teile des Galaterbriefes kurz in Betracht gezogen worden, der sogenannte historische oder persönliche Teil, Kap. 1 und 2. Nun kommen wir zu dem zweiten oder dogmatisch-polemischen Teil des Briefes, der Darlegung der apostolischen Lehre, Kap. 3 und 4. Aber da nehmen wir eine besondere Weise der Darstellung wahr. Paulus beginnt diese Darlegung tatsächlich schon im zweiten Kapitel in seiner Strafrede an Petrus zu Antiochien. Darum beginnen wir auch unsere Ausführung mit diesen Schlüsselworten des zweiten Kapitels, B. 16—21. Und diese Verse führen uns auch recht in das positive Zentrum seiner Lehre.