

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1902.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

ESCHATOLOGY.

Eschatology is the doctrine of holy Scripture concerning temporal death and the intermediate state of departed souls, the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, final judgment, the consummation of all things, the everlasting damnation of the wicked, and the eternal bliss of the righteous in the world to come. Concerning all these things God has, in his word, revealed whatever he would have us know concerning them, and while, also in this respect, *whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning,*¹⁾ the words of the apostle, *Behold, I show you a mystery,*²⁾ with which he sets forth one particular point of these *ἔσχατα*, apply to all of them. Here, too, *we know in part, and we prophesy in part,*³⁾ and with the psalmist we say, *My soul doth wait, and in his word do I hope.*⁴⁾ The last things, being mostly, in their nature, future events, are, as such, objects of Christian hope, and inasmuch as Christian hope is essentially faith concerning things to come, it must be in all its points based upon the

1) Rom. 15, 4.

2) 1 Cor. 15, 51.

3) 1 Cor. 13, 9.

4) Ps. 130, 5.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

Answered by one who does not know.

When Charles Darwin wrote his book on the *Origin of Species*, he had, of course, a great deal to say on Species; but on one thing connected with this subject he left those who knew no more than he could tell them in profound ignorance, and that was the *origin* of species. When in the winter of 1899—1900, Professor Adolf Harnack, of the University of Berlin, delivered sixteen lectures on the subject, *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, he had, of course, a great deal to say on Christianity. But if there was anything that the "six hundred students drawn from all the Faculties" who heard these lectures, and the readers of the German and English printed editions, did certainly not learn from Professor Harnack, it was a correct answer to the question which forms the title of the English translation published with the author's approval and preface,—*What is Christianity?* There is, however, this difference between Darwin and Harnack, that the former knew considerably more about species than the latter knows about Christianity. In fact, we do not doubt that even Prof. Harnack has more correct notions concerning the subject of animal species than he has on the subject of his sixteen lectures.

Or how should Prof. Harnack know what Christianity is? He cannot know by examining himself; for he is not a Christian. He openly denies everything distinctively Christian, as, the triune God, the Divine nature of Christ, the resurrection of Christ's body from the dead, the vicarious atonement, justification by faith. He could hardly put forth more conclusive proof of his profound ignorance of the nature of Christianity than he does by mistaking himself for a Christian. Here is his own portraiture as drawn by himself in the closing words of the last lecture:—

Let me, if you please, speak of my own experience, as one who for thirty years has taken an earnest interest in these things. Pure knowledge is a glorious thing, and woe to the man who holds it light or blunts his sense for it. But to the question, Whence, whither, and to what purpose, it gives an answer to-day as little as it did two or three thousand years ago. It does, indeed, instruct us in facts; it detects inconsistencies; it links phenomena; it corrects the deception of sense and idea. But where and how the curve of the world and the curve of our own life begin—that curve of which it shows us only a section—and whither this curve leads, knowledge does not tell us. But if with a steady will we affirm the forces and the standards which on a summit of our inner life shine out as our highest good, nay, as our real self; if we are earnest and courageous enough to accept them as the great Reality and direct our lives by them; and if we then look at the course of mankind's history, follow its upward development, and search, in strenuous and patient service, for the communion of minds in it, we shall not faint in weariness and despair, but become certain of God, of the God whom Jesus Christ called his Father, and who is also our Father. P. 300 f.

But while a Christian may, in a way and measure, study the nature of Christianity by observing his own inner life, the picture thus obtained must always be subjected to the test of close comparison with the portraiture of the children of God delineated in the infallible word of God, whence all true notions of spiritual things must ultimately be derived. And here again Prof. Harnack has placed himself at a serious, even fatal, disadvantage. He knows of no infallible word of God. Of the Old Testament he says:—

The new church possessed a sacred book, the Old Testament. . . . What a blessing to the church this book has proved! . . . Yet the possession of this book has not been an unqualified advantage to the church. To begin with, there are many of its pages which exhibit a religion and a morality other than Christian. . . . There was always a danger of an inferior and obsolete principle forcing its way into Christianity through the Old Testament. This, indeed, was what actually occurred. Nor was it only in individual aspects that it occurred; the whole aim was changed. P. 186.

The New Testament, also, is, in Harnack's estimation, far from being a reliable source of information. He says:—

Our authorities for the message which Jesus Christ delivered are—apart from certain important statements made by Paul—the first three Gospels. Everything that we know, independently of these Gospels, about Jesus' history and his teaching, may be easily put on a small sheet of paper, so little does it come to. In particular, the fourth Gospel, which does not emanate or profess to emanate from the apostle John, cannot be taken as an historical authority in the ordinary meaning of the word. . . . Although, therefore, his work is not altogether devoid of a real, if scarcely recognisable, traditional element, it can hardly make any claim to be considered an authority for Jesus' history; only little of what he says can be accepted, and that little with caution. P. 19 f.

And again:—

The Gospels are not "party tracts": neither are they writings which as yet bear the radical impress of the Greek spirit. In their essential substance they belong to the first, the Jewish, epoch of Christianity, that brief epoch which may be denoted as the palaeontological. That we possess any reports dating from that time, even though, as is obvious in the first and third Gospel, the setting and the composition are by another hand, is one of those historical arrangements for which we cannot be too thankful. P. 21.

And once more:—

It is true that, measured by the standard of "agreement, inspiration and completeness," these writings leave a very great deal to be desired, and even when judged by a more human standard they suffer from not a few imperfections. Rude additions from a later age they do not, indeed, exhibit—it will always remain a noteworthy fact that, conversely, it is only the fourth Gospel which makes Greeks ask after Jesus—but still they, too, reflect, here and there, the circumstances in which the primitive Christian community was placed and the experiences which it afterwards underwent. People nowadays, however, put such constructions on the text more readily than is necessary. Further, the conviction that Old Testament prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus' history had a disturbing effect on tradition. Lastly, in some of the narratives the miraculous element is obviously intensified. P. 23.

Holding such views of the gospel narratives, Harnack is but consistent when he deals with these divine records as he does, unceremoniously casting aside and disregarding what he discards as unworthy of his consideration. The

Christmas tidings of great joy, of the babe in the manger who was Christ the Lord, the Savior, whose cradle song the angels sang, in short, the whole story of the conception, birth and childhood of Jesus, he brushes away like cobwebs are swept away by the housemaid's broom. We quote:—

Our evangelists, as we know, do not tell us anything about the history of Jesus' early development; they tell us only of his public activity. Two of the Gospels do, it is true, contain an introductory history (the history of Jesus' birth); but we may disregard it; for even if it contained something more trustworthy than it does actually contain, it would be as good as useless for our purpose. P. 30.

Paul, too, is silent; so that we can be sure that the oldest tradition knew nothing of any stories of Jesus' birth.

We know nothing of Jesus' history for the first thirty years of his life. Is there not a terrible uncertainty here? P. 30.

Most certainly, a terrible uncertainty, and not only here, but everywhere. For where is the criterion for distinguishing those parts of the gospel which are to be considered better than cobwebs and rubbish? Harnack still seems to think that there are such parts of the gospels; he says:—

Now, however certain it may be that our materials are insufficient for a "biography," they are very weighty in other respects, and even their silence on the first thirty years is instructive. They are weighty because they give us information upon three important points: In the first place, they offer us a plain picture of Jesus' teaching. . . . P. 31.

But when it comes to answering the question, What is Christianity? Harnack is again driven to disavow in part even what he finds recorded of "Jesus' teaching." Even here he distinguishes between husk and kernel:—

What was kernel here, and what was husk, history has itself showed with unmistakable plainness, and by the shortest process. Husk were the whole of the Jewish limitations attaching to Jesus' message; husk were also such definite statements as "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." P. 180.

And now, Prof. Harnack comes to us as a "historian," in the performance of what he considers "the historian's task." He says, more explicitly:—

What is Christianity? It is solely in its historical sense that we shall try to answer this question here; that is to say, we shall employ the methods of historical science, and the experience of life gained by studying the actual course of history. P. 6.

Let us suppose that a man, claiming to be a socialist, but openly discountenancing all the distinctive tenets and principles of socialism, should appear before an audience and announce a lecture on the question, *What is Socialism?* Suppose that this man, having at the outset declared his intention to answer the question in its historical sense, should begin by casting aside as spurious or for other reasons unreliable a considerable part of what the masses of real socialists and their best teachers and leaders looked upon as the most valuable sources of historical information on their doctrine and practice, and that even of what he retained he should reject a part as husk. What would this man's standing for reliability be in the eyes of the socialists among his hearers? Or to what credence would he be entitled in the eyes of any man of average intelligence?

But what if this pseudo-socialist should, over and above all this, make such execrable use of the "kernel" of the historical material before him, that he must be held guilty of gross perversion and persistent ignorance of facts and principles clearly set forth in records and testimonies? This is the use to which Harnack puts his garbled "first three Gospels" and "certain important statements made by Paul." These Gospels and St. Paul do, indeed, give us and every one who will read and accept what they plainly say a true and full answer to the question, What is Christianity? The answer which Harnack purports to draw from this source is a great falsehood from beginning to end. The lectures also teem with falsehoods in detail, denials of truths and facts, assertions of untruths, false statements in the face of plain words to the contrary, falsehoods—but let the reader judge for himself. We give the following specimens in their natural order.

Miracles, it is true, do not happen; but of the marvellous and the inexplicable there is plenty. In our present state of knowledge we have become more careful, more hesitating in our judgment, in regard to the stories of the miraculous which we have received from antiquity. That the earth in its course stood still; that a she-ass spoke; that a storm was quieted by a word, we do not believe, and we shall never again believe; but that the lame walked, the blind saw, and the deaf heard, will not be so summarily dismissed as an illusion.

From these suggestions you can arrive for yourselves at the right position to take up in regard to the miraculous stories related in the Gospels, and at their net results. In particular cases, that is to say, in the application of general principles to concrete statements, some uncertainty will always remain. So far as I can judge, the stories may be grouped as follows:— (1) Stories which had their origin in an exaggerated view of natural events of an impressive character; (2) stories which had their origin in sayings or parables, or in the projection of inner experiences on to the external world; (3) stories such as arose in the interest of the fulfilment of Old Testament sayings; (4) stories of surprising cures effected by Jesus' spiritual force; (5) stories of which we cannot fathom the secret. It is very remarkable, however, that Jesus himself did not assign that critical importance to his miraculous deeds which even the evangelist Mark and the others all attributed to them. . . . And the remarkable fact that these very evangelists, without appreciating its range, hand down the statement that Jesus "did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief," shows us from another and a different side, with what caution we must receive these miraculous stories, and in what category we must put them. P. 28 f.

If, however, we take a general view of Jesus' teaching we shall see that it may be grouped under three heads. They are each of such a nature as to contain the whole, and hence it can be exhibited in its entirety under any one of them.

Firstly, the kingdom of God and its coming.

Secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul.

Thirdly, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.

P. 51.

Take whatever parable you will, the parable of the sower, of the pearl of great price, of the treasure buried in the field—the word of God, God himself, is the kingdom. It is not a question of angels and devils, thrones and principalities, but of God and the soul, the soul and its God. P. 56.

Jesus Christ calls to every poor soul; he calls to every one who bears a human face: You are children of the living God. P. 67.

In the combination of these ideas—God the Father, Providence, the position of men as God's children, the infinite value of the human soul—the whole Gospel is expressed. P. 68.

In thus expressing his message of the higher righteousness and the new commandment of love in these four leading thoughts, Jesus defined the sphere of the ethical in a way in which no one before him had ever defined it. But should we be threatened with doubts as to what he meant, we may steep ourselves again and again in the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. They contain his ethics and his religion, united at the root, and freed from all external and particularistic elements. P. 74.

The history of religion marked an enormous advance, religion itself was established afresh, when through poets and thinkers in Greece on the one hand, and through the prophets in Palestine on the other, the idea of righteousness and a righteous God became a living force and transformed tradition. The gods were raised to a higher level and civilised; the warlike and capricious Jehovah became a holy Being in whose court of judgment a man might trust, albeit in fear and trembling. P. 76.

No religion, not even Buddhism, ever went to work with such an energetic social message, and so strongly identified itself with that message as we see to be the case in the Gospel. How so? Because the words "Love thy neighbor as thyself" were spoken in deep earnest; because with these words Jesus turned a light upon all the concrete relations of life, upon the world of hunger, poverty and misery; because, lastly, he uttered them as a religious, nay, as *the* religious maxim. Let me remind you once more of the parable of the Last Judgment, where the whole question of a man's worth and destiny is made dependent on whether he has practised the love of his neighbor. P. 98 f.

It is not only that the Gospel preaches solidarity and the helping of others; it is in this message that its real import consists. In this sense it is profoundly socialistic, just as it is also profoundly individualistic. P. 99.

Before we examine Jesus' own testimony about himself, two leading points must be established. In the first place, he desired no other belief in his person and no other attachment to it than is contained in the keeping of his commandments. P. 125.

Let us first of all consider the designation, "Son of God." Jesus in one of his discourses made it specially clear why and in what sense he gave himself this name. The saying is to be found in

Matthew, and not, as might perhaps have been expected, in John: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." It is "knowledge of God" that makes the sphere of the Divine Sonship. It is in this knowledge that he came to know the sacred Being who rules heaven and earth as a Father, as *his* Father. The consciousness which he possessed as being the *Son of God* is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God as the Father and as his Father. Rightly understood, the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God. Here, however, two observations are to be made: Jesus is convinced that he knows God in a way in which no one ever knew him before, and he knows that it is his vocation to communicate this knowledge of God to others by word and by deed—and with it the knowledge that men are God's children. In this consciousness he knows himself to be the Son called and instituted of God, to be *the* Son of God, and hence he can say: *My* God and *my* Father, and into this invocation he puts something which belongs to no one but himself. How he came to this consciousness of the unique character of his relation to God as a Son; how he came to the consciousness of his power, and to the consciousness of the obligation and the mission which this power carried with it, is his secret, and no psychology will ever fathom it. P. 127 f.

Jesus was the "Messiah" and was not the Messiah; and he was not the Messiah, because he left the idea far behind him; because he put a meaning into it which was too much for it to bear. P. 141.

He takes the publican in the temple, the widow and her mite, the lost son, as his examples; none of them knew anything about "Christology," and yet by his humility the publican was justified. P. 143.

The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son. This is no paradox, nor, on the other hand, is it "rationalism," but the simple expression of the actual fact as the evangelists give it. P. 144.

The sentence "I am the Son of God" was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself, and to put that sentence there side by side with the others is to make an addition to the Gospel. But no one who accepts the Gospel, and tries to understand him who gave it to us, can fail to affirm that here the divine appeared in as pure a form as it can appear on earth. P. 146.

The Gospel is no theoretical system of doctrine or philosophy of the universe; it is doctrine only in so far as it proclaims the reality of God the Father. It is a glad message assuring us of life eternal,

and telling us what the things and the forces with which we have to do are worth. By treating of life eternal it teaches us how to lead our lives aright. It tells us of the value of the human soul, of humility, of mercy, of purity, of the cross, and the worthlessness of worldly goods and anxiety for the things of which earthly life consists. And it gives the assurance that in spite of every struggle, peace, certainty, and something within that can never be destroyed, will be the crown of a life rightly led. What else can "the confession of a creed" mean under these conditions but to do the will of God, in the certainty that He is the Father and the one who will recompense? P. 146 f.

Any one who will look into history will find that the sufferings of the pure and the just are its saving element; that is to say, that it is not words, but deeds, and not deeds only but self-sacrificing deeds, and not only self-sacrificing deeds, but the surrender of life itself, that forms the turning point in every great advance in history. In this sense I believe that, however far we may stand from any *theories* about vicarious sacrifice, there are few of us after all who will mistake the truth and inner justice of such a description as we read in Isaiah liii.: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend" — it is in this light that Jesus' death was regarded from the beginning. Wherever any great deed has been accomplished in history, the finer a man's moral feelings are, the more sensible will he be of vicarious suffering; the more he will bring that suffering into relation to himself. Did Luther in the monastery strive only for himself? — was it not for us all that he inwardly bled when he fought with the religion that was handed down to him? But it was by the cross of Jesus Christ that mankind gained such an experience of the power of purity and love true to death that they can never forget it, and that it signifies a new epoch in their history.

Finally, in the third place: no reflection of the "reason," no deliberation of the "intelligence," will ever be able to expunge from the moral ideas of mankind the conviction that injustice and sin deserve to be punished, and that everywhere that the just man suffers, an atonement is made which puts us to shame and purifies us. P. 158 f.

If the resurrection meant nothing but that a deceased body of flesh and blood came to life again, we should make short work of this tradition. But it is not so. The New Testament itself distinguishes between the Easter message of the empty grave and the appearances of Jesus on the one side, and the Easter faith on the other. Although the greatest value is attached to that message, we are to hold the Easter faith even in its absence. The story of Thomas is told for the exclusive purpose of impressing upon us that we must

hold the Easter faith even without the Easter message: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." The disciples on the road to Emmaus were blamed for not believing in the resurrection even though the Easter message had not yet reached them. The Lord is a Spirit, says Paul; and this carries with it the certainty of his resurrection. The Easter *message* tells us of that wonderful event in Joseph of Arimathaea's garden, which, however, no eye saw; it tells us of the empty grave into which a few women and disciples looked; of the appearance of the Lord in a transfigured form — so glorified that his own could not immediately recognise him; it soon begins to tell us, too, of what the risen one said and did. The reports became more and more complete, and more and more confident. But the Easter *faith* is the conviction that the crucified one gained a victory over death; that God is just and powerful; that he who is the firstborn among many brethren still lives. . . . Certain it is that what . . . the disciples regarded as all-important was not the state in which the grave was found but Christ's appearances. But who of us can maintain that a clear account of these appearances can be constructed out of the stories told by Paul and the evangelists; and if that be impossible, and there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter faith to be based on them? Either we must decide to rest our belief on a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts, or else we must abandon this foundation altogether, and with it the miraculous appeal to our senses. But here, too, the images of the faith have their roots in truth and reality. Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the matter of appearances, one thing is certain: *This grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal.* . . . What else can we believe but that the earliest disciples also found the ultimate foundation of their faith in the living Lord to be the strength which had gone out from him? It was a life never to be destroyed which they felt to be going out from him; only for a brief span of time could his death stagger them; the strength of the Lord prevailed over everything; God did not give him over to death; he lives as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep. P. 160—163.

If there be in all this long series of extracts one true statement concerning Christ, the Gospel of Christ, and Christianity, we have failed to find it and would thank any reader who would point it out. What is said on miracles is false in what it states and in what it suggests. The five

groups of "miraculous stories" are five falsehoods. It is false that Jesus differed from the evangelists in the estimate of his miracles. It is false that "these miraculous stories" must be received with caution, and that this falsehood is based on certain sayings of Christ is another falsehood. It is not true that Jesus' teaching may be grouped under the three heads given on p. 51. Neither is it true that "the word of God, God himself, is the kingdom of God." It is false that according to Jesus' teaching every one who bears a human face is a child of the living God. The Pharisees bore human faces; yet Jesus said to them, *Ye are of your father the devil*. Neither the "whole Gospel," nor any part of the Gospel, is expressed in the combination of the ideas enumerated on p. 68. It is a fatal falsehood that the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount contained the ethics and the religion of Christ, and it is not true that Christ had introduced a new and unheard-of definition of the sphere of the ethical. The next quotation is a veritable bundle of blasphemous lies culminating in the horrid utterance that, as the heathen gods were elevated and civilised, so "the warlike and capricious Jehovah became a holy Being." The falsehood that the injunction, *Love thy neighbor as thyself*, is the religious maxim of Jesus, that in this message the real import of the Gospel consists, and that Jesus desired no other belief in or attachment to him than is contained in the keeping of his commandments, leads more people to hell than the sins of murder, theft, and adultery, taken together. The chain of falsehoods running through the extract dealing with the designation, "Son of God," amounts to a complete denial of the Divine Sonship of Christ. Of course, Jesus was the Messiah, though Harnack falsely says he was also not the Messiah. The publican was not justified by his humility. Indeed, the statement that the Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son, "is not a paradox," but an open, unmitigated falsehood. So is the statement that the sentence "I am the

Son of God" was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself. Or how in the world did it get in, if not from the lips of Jesus? Is Matt. 26, 63 f. or Mark 14, 61 f. an addition to the Gospel? It is not true that the Gospel "is doctrine only as it proclaims the reality of God the Father," and what in the words following this quotation purports to be a summary, is but another perversion of the Gospel into a jumble in which nothing specifically Christian is to be found. The same must be said of the next specimen, which is nothing but a somewhat elaborate and highly profane denial of Christ's vicarious sacrifice. In like manner is what Harnack says of "the resurrection" a conglomerate of falsehoods, the whole trend of which is a disavowal of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of Christ Jesus from the dead. It is not true that "we are to hold the Easter faith even in the absence of the Easter message." What is said of the purpose of the story of Thomas is false; the very words of Jesus quoted give it the lie; for they are not: Blessed are they that have not *heard* and yet have believed. What is said of the disciples on the road to Emmaus is equally false; for the Easter message *had* reached them, their own words recorded Luke 24, 22—24 being in evidence. It is not true that the Pauline dictum, *The Lord is a Spirit*, "carries with it the certainty of his resurrection." See Luke 24, 39. When Harnack says, with reference to "the stories told by Paul and the evangelists," that if "there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter faith to be based on them?" this is a falsehood based on a falsehood. The alternative, "Either we must decide to rest our belief on a foundation unstable and always exposed to fresh doubts, or else we must abandon it altogether," is another falsehood resting on false suppositions. And, finally, when Harnack would make his hearers and readers believe that he, too, like "the earliest disciples," rejoiced in the Easter faith that Jesus "lives as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep"—this is but

another falsehood; for he has no Easter faith as surely as he has discarded the Easter message.

In fairness to Prof. Harnack it must be said that the treatment which the first three Gospels receive at his hands is neither better nor worse than that which he accords to Paul and the early Christian church. We exemplify.

No long period elapsed before it was taught in the Church that the all-important thing is to know how the person of Jesus was constituted, what sort of physical nature he had, and so on. Paul himself is far removed from this position — "Whoso calleth Christ Lord speaketh by the Holy Ghost" — but the way on which he ordered his religious conceptions, as the outcome of his speculative ideas, unmistakably exercised an influence in a wrong direction. That, however great the attraction which his way of ordering them may possess for the understanding, it is a perverse proceeding to make Christology the fundamental substance of the Gospel, is shown by Christ's teaching, which is everywhere directed to the all-important point, and summarily confronts every man with his God. P. 184.

Under the influence of the Messianic dogmas, and led by the impression which Christ made, Paul became the author of the speculative idea that not only God was in Christ, but that Christ himself was possessed of a peculiar nature of a heavenly kind. P. 185.

The most important step that was ever taken in the domain of Christian doctrine was when the Christian apologists at the beginning of the second century drew the equation: the Logos = Jesus Christ. Ancient teachers before them had also called Christ "the Logos" among the many predicates which they ascribed to him; nay, one of them, John, had already formulated the proposition: "The Logos is Jesus Christ." But with John this proposition had not become the basis of every speculative idea about Christ; with him, too, "the Logos" was only a predicate. But now teachers came forward who previous to their conversion had been adherents of the platonico-stoical philosophy, and with them the conception "Logos" formed an inalienable part of a general philosophy of the world. They proclaimed that Jesus Christ was the Logos incarnate, which had hitherto been revealed only in the great effects which it exercised. P. 202 f.

The identification of the Logos with Christ was the determining factor in the fusion of Greek philosophy with the apostolic inheritance and led the more thoughtful Greeks to adopt the latter. Most of us regard this identification as inadmissible, because the way in

which we conceive the world and ethics does not point to the existence of any logos at all. P. 204.

Even though the Christological formula were the theologically right one — what a departure from the Gospel is involved in maintaining that a man can have no relation with Jesus Christ, nay, that he is sinning against him and will be cast out, unless he first of all acknowledges that Christ was *one* person with two natures and two powers of will, one of them divine and one human. Such is the demand into which intellectualism has developed. Can such a system still find a place for the Gospel story of the Syrophenician woman or the centurion of Capernaum? P. 236 f.

We were not preoccupied against Prof. Harnack by adverse criticism, having read a hundred times as much of his works as about them. We believe that, if he were invited to lecture on the question, What is Socialism? he would go to work, if he accepted the invitation, and would, with the aid of the writings of Lasalle, Marx, Bebel, and others, some volumes of "Der Socialdemocrat," the "Programs" of Eisenach and Gotha, the Wyden Manifesto, and other sources of reliable information, prepare a fairly profitable historical treatise on Socialism. But we are, also, fully persuaded that an audience assembled to hear a lecture on this subject would simply refuse to tolerate what the hearers of his sixteen lectures tolerated and even appear to have appreciated. It would be impossible to find in all Germany six hundred sane men who would voluntarily sit through sixteen lectures dealing with Socialism as Harnack's do with Christianity, and an audience of socialists treated with such bosh on their political creed would call the speaker down as a malicious ignoramus before he had finished his first lecture. Harnack's portraiture of Christianity is far worse than a caricature, which, while it distorts the features of its subject, always leaves enough of them for recognition. Harnack's is not a distorted Christianity. It is not Christian truth and satanic error mixed and blended together, as in Romanist theology. It is unmixed and unmitigated heathendom, a religion of works by which man must save himself. Har-

nack's Jesus Christ is not the Christ of history and of Scripture, but a fiction, a Jesus who never and nowhere existed. The Jesus of history was born at Bethlehem, God's very Son, not only by knowledge, but begotten of the Father from eternity, and a virgin's son, laid in a manger, carried into Egypt, reared at Nazareth; and all this Harnack's Jesus was not. Harnack's Jesus was born in Harnack's brain. Harnack's Gospel, too, was "made in Germany," though after a pattern which has hung and still hangs in hundreds of shops in all continents and in the devil's own smithy. Christ's Gospel is the Gospel of salvation by faith, without the deeds of the law. Harnack's Gospel is a gospel of damnation without faith, according to the curse of the law; "for as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," and "he that believeth not shall be damned."

But again we must not be unjust to Prof. Harnack. Though these lectures have certainly added largely to a burden of tremendous responsibility resting upon him, he by no means carries this fearful load alone. He is but one of many, a representative man, an exponent of modern scientific theology, which is neither modern, nor scientific, nor theology. His errors are old Arian and Pelagian and other heresies condemned many centuries ago by the Christian church, brushed up and decked out in trappings of more recent fashion. His methods are those of Marcion and other earlier Gnostics and of scores of rationalists of later times, and fully as unscientific as the endeavors of an idiot who would investigate the nature and motion of the moon by applying a stethoscope to a bombshell. His theology is but one form of the monster which has in our day usurped the chairs of Christian doctrine, theology in no sense, neither as to its source, nor to its substance, nor to its form, nor to its end and aim, but a philosophy gone crazy, according to the word of St. Paul: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." A. G.
