

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Published by the
Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.

VOLUME I.



St. Louis:
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1897.

Theological Review.

The Ecumenical Councils. By William T. Du Bose, S. T. D.¹⁾
—Vol. III of "TEN EPOCHS OF CHURCH HISTORY."—
New York, the Christian Literature Co. 1896. xi and
350 pp. Price to subscribers \$1.00.

This book is an object-lesson in modern theology. It "does not profess to be properly a history."²⁾ Its ulterior purpose is that "of tracing the evolution of a process of thought."³⁾ What the author intended was "properly an historical study of the growth and formation of the catholic doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ."⁴⁾ But this process of evolution, according to our author, is not now and never will be finished; "Christology will never be complete."⁵⁾ And Dr. Du Bose is himself occupied in contributing his share toward the "science" of Jesus Christ. "If we are"—these are the closing words of his Preface—

"to study these questions anew we must begin by going back to the past; but we must not expect to find a completed and satisfactory solution of them in past thought, because the mind of Christendom has not yet fully thought them out. We must accept the genuine results of a former science, but we have something of our own to add to those results, as each succeeding age will have something to add to ours." p. XI.

Precisely *what* our author has added of his own, we have not succeeded to discover. As to the subject-matter, his work is avowedly indebted to "the great classic of

1) "DU BOSE, *William Porcher*, S. T. D. Episcopalian; b. at Winnsborough, S. C., April 11, 1836; graduated M. A. at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., 1859; and studied at the theological school, Camden, S. C., 1859—61; was rector at Winnsborough, S. C., 1865—67; at Abbeville, S. C., 1868—71; chaplain of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., 1872—83; and since 1872 professor of moral science and also New-Testament exegesis in the same institution." *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*.

2) p. IX.

3) Ibid.

4) Ibid.

5) p. X.

Dr. Dorner." But it strikes us that not only the subject-matter, but the entire scope of the book is very much that of Dorner's work, which, according to its very title, is also intended as a "History of the *evolution* of the doctrine concerning the person of Christ."¹⁾ The introductory chapter of Dorner's work opens with the statement that "The idea of the God-man is not an idea peculiar to this or that religion only, but the germs thereof are found in all religion because and inasmuch as they are religions."²⁾ And Dr. Du Bose says in his opening chapter:

"The principle of the cross itself was not a novelty. It had its truth for him only as it has, and always had, its truth for all. . . . If we see in Jesus not merely the ethical but the religious ideal of humanity, just as little was his religion as his morality different from that of all men. . . . There is no spiritual aspiration in *any religion of any race*,³⁾ no feeling anywhere after God if haply it might find him, that has not in it the essential principle of the perfect religion of him who has felt in himself all human want and aspiration, and found in God all human satisfaction and fulfilment." pp. 5. 6.

And again:

"Indeed, if Christianity is the truest, it must also be the most natural thing in the world, and only truest because most natural." p. 9.

Thus also the closing chapter of Du Bose reminds us very forcibly of many things said in the last section of Dorner's work, his review of modern Christology.⁴⁾ And throughout the entire volume before us, there is not a position of any consequence which has not been occupied by some modern German theologian.

Not that we would accuse our author of plagiarism. He is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of modern theology, which is a "fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind."

1) "Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi."

2) Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte* etc., vol. I, p. 1.

3) The italics in the quotations here given are our own, unless otherwise stated.

4) *Entwicklungsgesch.*, Vol. II, pp. 1198 cet.

The source and norm of his theology, more especially, his Christology, is not the inspired Word. In fact, he knows of no inspired Word in the scriptural sense of the term. Scripture is to him not the thought and power of *God*, but the "thought and life of the *church*," p. 25, the first self-expression of Christianity and an embodiment of *its* teaching. We quote:

"The first movement, manifestation and self-embodiment of Christianity, as destined to be not merely an idea but a realization and an institution in the world, was certainly its most living, plastic and creative act. When this stage was at an end *it* was found to have *formed for itself* an outward expression of worship and life, an organization for discipline and government, *and a body of sacred books* that embodied *its teaching*. Confining ourselves to the latter we might say that the action of the church in accepting a canon of Scripture need not have been more than the instinctive and practical wisdom of receiving as highest, truest and best *Christianity's own first*, living and creative *expression of itself*, and making this the norm and measure of all *subsequent self-expression* of it. It is self-evident to the mind that takes it in as a whole that the *New Testament* is a single *movement of spiritual and Christian thought* and life and that it is complete and sufficient in itself. It is equally certain that neither the succeeding nor any subsequent age had in it either the plastic capacity or the creative power to take for itself a living form, such as Christianity easily, freely and naturally assumed in its initiative stage. And therefore it was, to say no more, an act of practical wisdom to accept *that first embodiment and expression of itself* as in principle at least and in substance final and irreformable." p. 25. —

"The *writings* that passed into the permanent acceptance of the church as its canon of Scripture belong to a single and complete movement of thought and life *in which Christianity expressed its first and whole impression and conception of the person and work of Jesus Christ*. Only then and there was such an expression and record of the original and originating facts of Christianity possible." p. 27.

"There was much still and would be always for Christian thought and science to occupy itself with the Christian faith and life, but so far as the materials were concerned for all this future occupation, they were complete in *the primitive experience as recorded in the Scriptures*." p. 27 f. —

Dr. Du Bose, of course, also speaks of "inspiration;" but what this term signifies in his mind appears when he says:

"At any rate the church recognized in them (the Scriptures) that highest *elevation of the human spirit to receive and understand the things of the divine Spirit* which it accepted as its own measure and standard of knowledge and to which it gave the name, by excellence, of *inspiration*. *This highest knowledge of spiritual things* as they are revealed in Christ it may be true that we are but is *not necessary* that we should be able to distinguish *in kind* from that which the church continues to possess and which *every human soul may have* of God and of his revelation to it of himself. All that was necessary is that those who were nearest to him in time and space should have so known our Lord as it was essential that he should be known if he was to be any revelation at all of God and of human salvation, and that *they* should have so *recorded* and transmitted *their knowledge* of him that it should continue to be the possession of the church after them." pp. 40. 41.

There is, then, in our author's conception, no essential difference between the utterances of the church in later days and the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, between the authority of the utterances of St. Paul and those of the council of Nicaea. He says,

"It was more than two centuries before the church was in condition or circumstances to think and express itself *again* as a whole. p. 28.

The New Testament is a source and norm of subsequent self-expression of the church, since the *church* made it so, and that the church gave it this normative dignity, "need not have been more than instinctive and practical wisdom." p. 25. The Apostles themselves were by no means the authoritative, infallible teachers of the church of their day and future days, and the apostles' doctrine in which the church at Jerusalem continued steadfast from the day of Pentecost¹⁾ was not the sound doctrine which should abide to the end of time. Our volume says:

1) Acts 2, 41. 42.

“Whatever we may say of the apostles, very certainly the infant church of Jerusalem held no perfect and explicit doctrine of the truth completely present in its midst. It would have been pure miracle or magic if it had at once consciously held the whole truth or been wholly free from error. . . . We must remember then that while the infant church was Christian it was also still Jewish and we must endeavor to realize what this meant for its immediate further progress and development. There were certainly many in it who remained much more Jews than they had become Christians and there was probably not one who had become so Christian as to be no longer a Jew. When St. Paul through his experience with Jews and Gentiles was brought at first practically and then theoretically and as a matter of essential and vital principle to see that the church could only become wholly and truly Christian by wholly ceasing to be Jewish, there was not one of the original apostles who was prepared to go the whole length with him.” p. 49.

The authority of the Scripture, accordingly, does not rest on the fact that the Holy Spirit spoke through the inspired penmen, and Scripture is not its own and only authentical interpreter, but we are here informed that

“as the right and power of the individual soul to know God and to know the things that are freely given to it of God is thus the *basis* of the authority of Scripture, so equally is it that of the authority of the church in after-time to interpret the Scriptures.” p. 40. —

“Not God himself nor Jesus Christ nor the Scriptures could sufficiently attest to us the truth of Christianity as our truth and our life if it were not equally attested as such by the spiritual common sense and experience of men always and everywhere.” p. 44. —

“Divine omnipotence and human authority combined cannot of themselves constitute a dogma. That requires in addition a *doxai*, a *placet*,¹⁾ from the universal spiritual understanding and experience of spiritual and rational men.” p. 259.

While our Author says: “It makes no difference for our present purpose what we think of the Bible, or how we define prophecy,” p. 9, *we* beg leave to say that it does make a difference for *our* present purpose what a leading Episcopalian theologian and educator of theologians thinks

1) The Author's Italics.

of the Bible, and how he defines Inspiration and fixes the source and norm of Christian doctrine.

How, then, we further ask, are Christian doctrines established? Our Author answers:

"We have thus recognized *the function of the church as a whole as necessary* to a complete comprehension and representation of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. It was inevitable that the *church* should very soon be forced to discharge this function in the formation of a body of catholic truth." p. 45.

In the beginning, the prospects of success in the performance of this task must have been slender indeed. For we are informed,

"that from the first and always, even within the church, there were not only partial and incomplete conceptions but also denials and contradictions of the essential truth of Christ, it is needless to say. The founder and the first teachers of Christianity foresaw that it was not only inevitable but needful that it should be so. Truth is only made known and indeed only knows itself in conflict with error." p. 29.

Not even the Apostles, perhaps with the exception of St. Paul, were in possession of the truth.

"What theory of the nature and of the person of Jesus Christ is necessarily involved in such an original conception of the effects produced by him, and the abiding and influential relations borne by him to the whole human race, *may not yet be present in the minds or apparent in the testimony of the first evangelists.*" p. 14.—

"To St. Paul as apostle to the Gentiles fell the painful task of cutting Christianity loose from all trammels of Judaism and of exposing their irreconcilable difference and contrast. . . . *The other apostles may very well not have so seen it or so clearly seen it.* . . . St. Paul did not suffer too much, nor did he attach too much consequence to the principle at stake, since—*although he alone at the time may have seen it—the principle was indeed the essential and vital one of Christianity.*" p. 19.—

"St. Paul does indeed 'say *my*¹ gospel,' and that as against a narrower and exclusive gospel which would place or magnify barriers in the way of the universal extension of the free gift and impartation of God to humanity in Jesus Christ." p. 18.

1) Author's Italics.

Of course, the first steps in pursuit of truth must have been very uncertain.

"The decision of the church was that in Jesus Christ man was become divine because God was become man. If in reaching this decision there was a *wavering* or a temporary *lingering* on the way, and if *even within the New Testament Scriptures* there can be found at any point evidence of *such halting*, there is nothing in this inconsistent with the character either of the Scriptures or of the truth." p. 17. It was, therefore, a necessary provision that "the church as a whole through the true representatives and leaders of its thought and mind" should be "the *judge* and interpreter of *revelation* and tradition." p. 132.

But was the church prepared to perform these functions, and what do we hear of its leaders and representatives?

"The church had *instinctively* detected and rejected whatever was inconsistent with its faith and life, but doctrinal investigation and speculation, all that we would now call theology, was, as we have said, *confined to very few.*" p. 137.

Most of the teachers of the congregations were in a sad plight when they were called upon to assist in doctrinal investigation. Even at the Council of Nicaea,

"of a sudden, and unexpectedly to the great mass of them, the simple pastors of simple flocks were brought together from the ends of the earth and made to give in language above their comprehension a scientific or philosophical reason for the faith that was in them." p. 137.

And when their task was done,

"their faith without knowledge had led them, and they had followed it like Abraham not knowing whither they went." p. 138.

But even men of more excellent talents must have found themselves handicapped and their pathway to truth seriously obstructed by the church itself.

"When the abler and more thoughtful minds of the church like Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen began to be driven toward the construction of a rational and catholic doctrine of the Trinity they had to encounter a mass of *conservative piety* to

which the application of such methods as pertain to natural and secular knowledge to the truth of God seemed profane and irreligious." p. 79.

"The church at first was Trinitarian simply because the truth is Trinitarian, and because it accepted the truth as it was objective to itself and had not yet converted it into subjective knowledge. That this had to be done, that there had to be formed a subjective consciousness of the church corresponding to the objective form of the truth, is manifest; and it is equally manifest that that *could* only be effected *through manifold mistakes and corrections*, through much high thought and deep experience." pp. 78. 79.

And then, who was to decide whether "with much high thought and deep experience," and after "manifold mistakes and corrections" those "abler and more thoughtful minds" had really developed a religious truth or form of doctrine? Let us hear.

"Just as the reason of humanity points on the whole to the truth and the conscience of humanity acquiesces in the right, so the common or universal spiritual consciousness and experience of the whole Christian church is the only test of what Christianity is. The question is how to get its verdict; and even when under the most favorable conditions and with the best guarantee of truth the council has assumed to render this, it can only be ascertained that the verdict is true, and will stand by a long and silent process through which the decision is referred back to the church again to say whether it has correctly expressed itself through its council. If the church thus accepts the council as its voice, by that fact it imparts to it an authority which is its own and not that of the council. The truth of Christianity is the truth of Jesus Christ, and the truth of Christ is a matter of ourselves as well as of God. If it is indeed the truth and the whole truth of ourselves, then we know that it is God's truth of us. It is impossible that we should know otherwise whether or not it is of God. The authority of the church, the authority of the Scriptures, the authority of our Lord, the authority of God, are all a very great deal along with the authority of a really universal human experience (which means not all experience, but all that truly experiences). Without the latter it would be impossible that all the former should possess for us any weight or value. pp. 46. 47.

This is strong language. But if the authority of the Scriptures, the authority of our Lord, the authority of God,

cannot establish a truth as truly divine, and if, to do this, a really universal human experience is required, then no specifically Christian truth has ever been established; then theology is the most hopeless of all mental occupations, and Christianity the most wretched of all religions. For this, Dr. Du Bose's own words are in evidence. He says:

"The two facts, of the very Godhead and the very manhood, of the completeness of the two natures in the unity of a single personality, were destined to lie side by side in the treasury of the church's thought a long time before they should enter into a really organic and vital union. *Indeed have they done so yet?*" pp. 267. 268.

And:

"The difficulty with Leo, *as with the mind of the church as yet*, is that he did not himself so understand either the divine or the human nature in our Lord as to present a satisfactory and convincing picture of their unity." p. 259.

And again:

"The difficulty with Apollinaris *as with most Christians now* is that he was so concerned that our Lord should be God that he was not sufficiently willing that he should be man." p. 191.

Here, then, we are told that one of the first fundamental truths of Christianity, on which the assurance of our salvation rests, is, as far as the church is concerned, to this day an unsolved problem. And how can it be otherwise when our author has announced on the threshold of his book that "Christology will never be completed"! But such is modern theology, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."¹⁾

We now proceed to review what our author submits on his special subject, the development of the catholic doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ.

"The Christian doctrine of the *Trinity*," he says, "was perhaps before anything else an effort to express how Jesus Christ was God ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$) and yet in another sense *was not God* ($\delta\ \Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$); that is to say, was not the *whole* Godhead." p. 72.

1) 2 Tim. 3, 7.

This distinction is admitted to have been foreign to the primitive church. "Sabellianism," we are told,

"was not only actually or historically, it was logically and of necessity the first step in conceiving the divine or theological side of the truth as it was revealed through Jesus Christ. To the simplest and most *primitive faith* Christ was *simply God*, not θεός merely but ὁ θεός. Nothing less than God—not something, not anything, not everything from God but *God himself*—is what the soul wants." pp. 71. 72.

But that "simple and most primitive faith" appears to have been superseded by another form of doctrine.

"As in the incarnation so in the creation the rational, ideating, creative principle and cause of the world, that which is manifest in phenomena, cannot be anything else than God (θεός) *and yet it is not God (ὁ θεός).*" p. 167.

This is, later on, further explained thus:

"When our Lord said 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' he did not mean we had seen in him the divine omnipotence or omniscience. . . . Omniscience or omnipotence cannot be in him and he remain man. . . . An omnipotent or omniscient man is an impossibility. . . . Just those things are incarnate in him that *could*¹⁾ become man, not those that could not." p. 332 f.

And again:

"It may not be possible for us to explain how the omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent Logos entered personally into humanity *without bringing with him into it all these properties.*" p. 336.

That this is not the doctrine of St. Paul, according to whom *all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in Christ*,²⁾ is evident, and what our author says concerning the scope of later Christian doctrine of the Trinity is not history, but fiction.

But to do full justice to Dr. Du Bose, it will be necessary that we should give a series of extracts exhibiting his treatment of the Incarnation of the Logos. He says:

1) Author's Italics.

2) Col. 2, 9.

"With the New Testament, all Christology must begin with the fact and facts, precisely as they are, of the human personality and personal life of Jesus Christ. The historical Jesus is *human through and through*. . . . At the same time the Jesus of history is *humanity raised to the power of God*. . . . *Humanity as our Lord received it was not what it is as he has made it*. His conquest in it of sin and death, his own human death to sin and life to God have constituted it at least actually what it was before only potentially, son of God through personal participation in the divine nature, character and life. All this in him was *strictly a human act* and was *only what it was the nature and destination of humanity in and through him to do and become*. It is what is meant by *man's eternal predestination to $\nu\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta$* or the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ unto God. Our Lord became *Son of God through the process*, his whole human life of *love and self-sacrifice* was itself indeed the *process, by which alone humanity becomes or can become son of God*." p. 324 f.

"Apollinaris saw first and saw with no little depth and penetration that the *incarnation* so far from being an unnatural or irrational thought was *the very truth of both nature and reason*. . . . What was the Logos in the universe but the ideation of man, what was man but the actualization of the Logos? *The Logos was eternal humanity*, the eternal idea of humanity which was to be actualized in time through the creation. The true end and destiny of man is to be that which *the Logos will become* when he shall through the creation have actualized himself in time. *The Logos and man are then the eternal and the temporal of one and the same thing; the Logos is man, the eternal of him; and man is the Logos, the temporal of him*. So that *each becoming the other is only becoming himself*; the eternal Logos temporally in and through creation realizes or becomes itself in man; and man who temporally realizes the Logos in himself eternally realizes or becomes himself in the Logos. The incarnation is *accidentally*, because of the fact of sin and the fall, human redemption; it is *essentially*, and *would be if there were no sin or fall, human and cosmical completion*." p. 185.

"Christ is not only individual but *generic* man. He is not only a man but *all men*, who are to be included in him in the church which is the body of the incarnation and in which the Logos is to realize or anew become himself. Apollinaris in this way teaches the *eternal humanity* of the Son of God, as also therefore, in idea at least, the *eternal divinity of man*; and so the eternal predestination and pre-constitution of the Logos and man to become one in the incarnate Son, both God and man. The great and comprehensive *truth* con-

tained in this representation might have been carried out with substantial orthodoxy and with no little gain to the theology that preceded it, if it had been within the grasp of a single mind. . . . That God *must* become man, *must* personally realize or become anew himself in the highest of his creatures, *from the very nature and necessity* of the divine Word to become that which it means, to actualize itself in that of which it is the idea, *was a great thought.*" p. 186.

"He was the man he was, and we shall be the men we shall be in him, because it was God who was incarnate in him in order that through him he may become incarnate in us." p. 14.

"Jesus Christ wholly revealed God in that he was and not otherwise than as he was *the divine revelation of the whole nature, life, and destiny of man.* As such he is the divine and the whole, as well of every man as *of all humanity.*" p. 16.

"It is the nature of man as creation's crown of susceptibility and conscious need of God to be taken into personal and free union and unity with him." p. 196.

"We hope to realize more and more as we proceed that it was the *eternal* divine nature and predestination of the Logos *through nature and through grace to become man*—to become as we have said before not only alike in nature but *one in person with every man.*" p. 87.

"When God shall have incarnated himself in a redeemed and completed humanity it must equally be a *humanity* that has *incarnated in itself the living God.*" p. 86.

"Perhaps the very first impression calculated to be produced by even the most natural and human study of the person of Jesus Christ is that of *the universality of his humanity.* He is man to every man, *the manhood of every man in the world.* . . . Every human being knows himself and becomes himself only in Jesus Christ. . . . So Jesus Christ is God's truth and word to every man of himself—not only of God's self, but *of every man's self.* For the true, better, higher, eternal divine self of every man, that selfhood which is the infinite and eternal aim of every man to realize and attain, is God. It is in this sense that Jesus Christ may be said to be *the Logos, first of all, of man.* . . . It is an *insufficient* account of the incarnation to say that God *assumed our nature. He became ourselves.*" p. 82, 83.

"*Human personality* . . . is itself also an *infinite, eternal and absolute thing.* . . . In *this way* the divine Logos and Christ, the divine man who is our Lord, *is eternal and absolute humanity.* 'Not I but Christ' does not mean '*not I but the Logos* or the Second Person in

the Trinity': it means 'not I but my essential and true self or personality' which while it is in the truest sense 'I' is also God." p. 316.

"Thus he who was in his deity essential or proper Son of God in his humanity was constituted or *became through his holy obedience and self-sacrifice Son of God by grace* and adoption. He was (Rom. 1, 3) *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*, through his offering of himself by the eternal Spirit without spot to God, *constituted and instituted Son of God in power by his resurrection from the dead.*" p. 308 f.

"Such a *Sonship by grace* the Adoptionists predicated of our Lord in his humanity without at all impugning the proper and essential Sonship of his divinity. It is questioned by some who would impute obscurity and uncertainty to their views whether they meant to associate the divine adoption of humanity in Christ with his birth, baptism or resurrection. Their meaning is clear enough *and is true.*" p. 310.

"There was however a limitation in the view of the Adoptionists that not only prevented success in carrying out the *truth* for which they stood but also brought them into a collision with the church as hurtful to it as it was fatal to them. . . . Our Lord was indeed very man, *more truly* even because more wholly and completely *man than we ourselves*, but that does not mean that he is only a *single or particular* human being precisely in the sense in which one of us is so. . . . On the whole there can be little doubt that the Adoptionist representation of the man Christ Jesus as a limited and individual human being like one of us did justify the charge of their great antagonist Alcuin that though they did not mean it their position led practically to a Nestorian twofold personality of the Lord. It would have been infinitely better if the church instead of extirpating Adoptionism for its incompleteness had taken it up and carried it on into a true catholic completion. What was needed to do this was a truer and fuller *construction* of our Lord's humanity than had yet been attained. What the Adoptionists failed to see needed be shown, that it was possible to ascribe to our Lord a true personal *humanity that was in itself also true and proper personal deity* instead of being only united and associated with it. In order to appreciate this it is necessary to reflect upon the peculiar predicates applied and applicable to our Lord's manhood alone among men. Of whom else beside him can it be said that he recapitulates and includes humanity in himself and is the head of it? or that he is *not a single and limited human individual but universal humanity, all men and every man?* . . . Jesus Christ is the personal human perfection of every human person. *It is the end of every man to become Christ.*" p. 314 f.

"There is no doubt that man in his divine idea and intention was predestined to incarnate God. . . . Now what we say of man as the head of creation we may say of creation itself. . . . The *whole creation* is already, in its idea and intention, and is predestined to become *actually* as well as ideally the *living body of the living God*—the outward form and perfect expression of his divine Logos, his personal Reason, Wisdom and Word. When in this way we *identify God and the world* and say that he is to fulfil or realize himself in the world, which is to become as it were an outward form and body of himself and not merely an external and impersonal expression of his wisdom and power, we do not mean that the world is going to become the Godhead or the Godhead the world. *In one sense he will become it and it will become he* but in another sense he will forever remain above it and he and it can never be identical." . . . p. 74 f.

"True Christian theism sees *God in Christ* as not only ideal humanity but also *ideal cosmos or universe*." p. 75.

"More than all this, the first mind of the church saw in Jesus Christ the divine *Logos* not only of humanity but *of the whole creation also*. . . . The *Christ of the future* is the goal and crown of the *entire creation of God*. Then and there, where *Creator and creature shall be one*, God shall be all in all. He will have fulfilled himself in all things and all things in himself." p. 83 f.

"If nature is God's work, God does not work outside of it; he works in, not upon it. If there is a *Logos of natural evolution* or creation it may be God's, it *may be God*; but it is also nature's and nature. *The two must be one and not two*. Faith may see it as God, science can and must see it only as nature. God is and acts in nothing whatever otherwise than in the being and acting of the thing itself." p. 85.

"Thus in Jesus Christ the church from the very first recognized the divine personal principle both *of nature and of grace*, the meaning, end and purpose of the whole creation. He is the eternal mind, will and activity of God revealed in all things, everywhere one and the same. He is the truth of the atom, of motion, law, life, of the soul, of human and divine reason, the world, man, God." p. 88.

"The true Christian consciousness knows no operation, influence or presence of God that is not God himself; whatever is divine is personal, is God. To it *nature is God*, events are God, *everything is God* save those finite spirits to whom in the free will God has given the power to be other than himself and even contrary to himself." p. 89.

"In Christ the church sees indeed a man, but not only a man; it sees all men and *the whole creation taken up into and made one with God*, through God's own fulfilling himself in them." p. 183.

"But he who is Logos of God is *Logos of all else*. . . *He is the rational or ideal world* of which all things are but the outward appearances or phenomena. . . The only thing in the world that is not in a sense God is sin." p. 328 f.

Maximus the Confessor is criticised in the following remarks:

"Thus Maximus not only asserts for our Lord a true human will, but secures to it a relative independence from the overpowering and effacing activity of the Logos in and through it. But the freedom which he thus preserves in one connection he surrenders in another. In order to insure the certainty of his human obedience, he attributes to our Lord not that truly human holiness which is the result of freedom and choice and of an actual human development and growth, but a holiness necessary and complete from the first and incapable of progress or change. It is a holiness *φύσει*, though not by his divine but by his human nature. It is the effect of his virgin birth by the power of the Holy Ghost that his humanity is *ἀτρέπτος*, incapable of moral change. Thus his humanity is not only not ours which is fallen but it is not that of Adam which was capable of falling; it is a third kind which was neither. And a holiness by necessity of nature and not by act of will is no more a human holiness because the nature is a so-called human one than if it were the divine nature." pp. 287. 288. And again: "*A holiness φύσει*, by necessity of nature either human or divine, *is not a human holiness*." pp. 296. 297.

That all this is not scriptural Christology, is again evident. The Christ of Scripture was God in his mother's womb and in the manger at Bethlehem in precisely the same sense and to the same extent as when he ascended into heaven,¹⁾ and is in no sense generic man, but as truly as any other man a human individual, made of a woman in the fulness of time,²⁾ not of necessity, but according to the counsel of divine wisdom and goodness for the salvation of sinners, not by a human act, or a process of self-sacrifice,

1) Luke 1, 32. 35. 43. 2, 11.

2) Gal. 4, 4.

but by the power of God;¹⁾ God and mankind and God and the world are in no sense identical, Christ is neither ideal nor actual cosmos;²⁾ the impeccability of Christ, who is indeed *φῶς* holy, is taught in Scripture.³⁾

After what we have heard of our author's Christology, we must not be surprised at his doctrine of Justification and Sanctification, when he says:

"The first (truth) is that Jesus Christ is equally God who by a divine incarnation fulfils himself in man, and *man who by a human faith and obedience realizes himself in God*. The second is that Jesus Christ is equally an objective human righteousness or self-realization or salvation, presented to our faith and made ours by divine grace, and a subjective human righteousness *appropriated, made our own and wrought in us by our own obedience*." p. 21.

"It is as true in its place to say that God alone without us cannot make us righteous as it is to say that we ourselves without God cannot be righteous. But St. Paul was standing for the second and if to many he seems to contradict the first it is only seeming. In reality he knows as much that *the material cause and condition of our righteousness is our own being righteous and doing righteously* as he knows that the efficient and producing cause of our righteousness is the grace and power and new creation of God in Christ working through our faith." p. 22.

"The end of the *law* under Judaism was *to make man moral* in preparation for making him spiritual, to convert his unconscious, natural and necessary relation and dependence upon God into a conscious, personal and free one, to make his will his own that he might make it God's. It is a necessary part of the *evolution of a true manhood* that it should *learn both its independence and its dependence upon God*, both that God cannot make it without itself, without the free and *perfect exercise of its own will*, and that it cannot make itself without God, without a free and perfect realization in itself of the divine will." p. 52.

"To say that Christ is our righteousness is to say that he is the absolute freedom of our wills, our spiritual and moral activities." pp. 315. 316.

1) Luke 1, 35. Gal. 4, 4. 5.

2) Matt. 24, 35. 2 Pet. 3, 10. Ps. 102, 26 f.

3) Luke 1, 35. Acts 2, 22—32.

"*Man's redemption*, while it can come only from God, can come only through and in himself and *can consist only in the restoration of the freedom and ability of his own will* and personality to discharge his function by realizing himself and completing and perfecting the world." pp. 205. 206.

"What is of *most* consequence in what is revealed in him is not how God may be human but *how man may become divine*. The former is God's part which we may safely leave to him, *the latter is ours and it behooves us to know and perform it.*" p. 330.

In full keeping with all this we find Dr. Du Bose's doctrine of Predestination, of which the following extracts may serve as specimens.

"Without going further into these questions, the teaching of St. Paul and we may say that of all the epistles of the New Testament is that it is the *natural* predestination of *human nature* to find its complement and completion in a participation in the divine nature, human life in the divine life. And this *ὑποθεσία* was to be attained 'through Jesus Christ' (Eph. 1, 5). In the man Christ Jesus humanity attained the adoption of sons, was made and became God." p. 308.

"In the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul describes humanity as having been eternally predestined to *ὑποθεσία*, or the relation to God of a *ὑπὸς θεοῦ*. Translated into ordinary language this means that man is constituted by his spiritual nature to enter or be taken into such a participation in the divine nature and life as to become a son of God." p. 306 f.

Thus this theology is consistent with itself inasmuch as it is persistently unscriptural, maintaining what the Scriptures explicitly deny, and explicitly denying what Scripture affirms. But being unscriptural, it is certainly not theological. Teaching an incarnation which is not the incarnation taught in Scripture, a divinity of Christ which in a certain sense is not divine, a humanity of Christ which in a sense is not truly human, a redemption of mankind which is not redemption in the biblical sense of the term, justification which is not the forgiveness of sins and cannot justify, salvation which is not *in solidum* the work of God and cannot save, Pauline doctrine which St. Paul never taught—this "theology" is certainly not Christian theology. But

what is it? It is a kind of modern *Gnosis* to which we can pertinently apply the masterly remarks of our author on the Gnosticism of the second century, as follows:

“Gnosticism might almost be said to have taken Christianity and run away with it. But while Gnosticism thus in a sense became Christian, Christianity itself refused to become Gnostic. In many different forms Christologies arose so remote from the sober truth of Christ as wholly to cease to be Christian. The so-called Christian gnosis was not at all Christianity making use of outside philosophical principles or methods; it was outside philosophy of the most reckless speculative type availing itself of Christian ideas and suggestions and perverting them to its uses and ends.” p. 63.

Between the “so-called Christian gnosis” as characterized in this extract, and modern so-called theology as exhibited in Dr. Du Bose’s book, the analogy is perfect.

We have hitherto discussed the work before us as an object-lesson in modern theology, and as such we deem it highly instructive and profitable reading. But in all fairness we would say that the book is instructive in still another way. Some very good things are said in it. Its portraiture of Constantine is excellent, as also in the main that of Athanasius. We have rarely found so cordial an appreciation of the great theologian of the fourth century as here. It affords us pleasure to quote such statements as:

“We must remember that during the time when the imperial policy toward Christianity was turning from persecution to patronage and men had everything to gain instead of everything to lose by becoming Christians, the immediate effect had been to convert the church from a purely religious to a very largely secular and political body.” p. 139.

Dr. Du Bose makes a fine point when he says:

“Finally it was not the least providential circumstance of the career of Athanasius that his very youth when called into the arena left him a long lifetime in which to labor and to suffer for the principles which none of his contemporaries but himself could have brought to their final and permanent triumph.” p. 124.

With reference to the unionistic attitude of Eusebius of Cesarea and his followers in submitting their undefined

creed and opposing the *ὁμοούσιον* at Nicaea we find the exquisite stricture:

"The claim for it (the Eusebian formula) was that it was the language of Scripture, and of the traditional faith; the issue made was that it was wrong and unwise to use a language outside of these to express or explain divine truth. But the question was not what Scripture and tradition said—they were all agreed on that; but what Scripture and tradition meant, upon which they disagreed. You cannot interpret and explain Scripture by simple quotation of scriptural language or expressions, but only by the use of other terms by means of which they might be defined and illustrated." p. 122.

Of Pope Leo I, who happened to be on the orthodox side in the Eutychian controversy, our author very truly remarks:

"It was characteristic of Leo that throughout his career he subordinated and consecrated his great personal gifts and powers to the task of consolidating and extending the paramount authority of the Roman see." p. 263.

And we would most cordially recommend to the most serious consideration of every theologian, our author not excepted, his beautiful saying: "*Truth alone unites, error only hopelessly confuses and divides.*" p. 127. A. G.

Christianity and Social Problems. By Lyman Abbott.¹⁾ Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896. —370 pages 16mo., gilt top, \$1.25.

"Christ's mission was twofold,"—this is the opening statement of Dr. Abbott's *Preface*, and it is thus in a twofold sense the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of his book. Christ's mission

1) "Abbott, Lyman, D. D., Congregationalist, b. at Roxbury, Mass., Dec. 18, 1835; graduated at New York University, 1853; was for a time partner in his brother's law-firm, but then studied theology under his uncle, J. S. C. Abbott, and was pastor at Terre Haute, Ind., 1860—65; Secretary American Union (Freedmen's) Commission, New York, 1865—68; pastor at New-England Church, New York, 1866—69; editor of *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, 1871—76; and since 1876 of *The Christian Union*. Elected pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, as successor of Henry Ward Beecher, 1889." *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*.

was one, and one only, "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."¹⁾ His very name was called Jesus because he was to "save his people *from their sins*,"²⁾ and true to his mission he says, "The son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."³⁾ Whatever else may be subsumed under the work of Christ is either of the ways and means included in the purpose, or of the effects and consequences related to Christ's work as the fruit is to the tree; but never another purpose aside of and coordinate with the said one object of his coming. Jesus of Nazareth was not a social reformer for the advancement of the temporal interests of society considered in themselves as distinguished from the spiritual interests of man; the kingdom he came to establish is *in* the world, but in no sense *of* the world, spiritual throughout and invisible. Though the children of God eat and drink, the "kingdom of God *is* not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."⁴⁾ Says Luther: "Christ does not so rule in his kingdom that we should under him make money, go to war, grow rich and mighty on earth, all of which temporal kings teach and do. For they must see that peace be maintained in their country, that their subjects may live in quiet and harmony and attend to their business. Christ does not reject and condemn all this; for he too eats and drinks as a guest in this world; but in his kingdom, in which he is lord and king, he does not teach us how we should plow, sow, reap, keep house, save money, wage war, govern, and rule the people and state."⁵⁾ Christianity is a religion with its doctrines, precepts, ordinances, worships, tasks, and duties, and manifold blessings, but not a social order or a political theory intended to supplant other theories of inferior excellence and an order of society less conducive to

1) Gal. 4, 5.

2) Matt. 1, 21,

3) Luke 19, 10.

4) Rom. 14, 17.

5) Works Erl. ed., 2, 199.

the welfare of the individual, the family, and society at large. The church is an absolute monarchy in which the will of the king is the law of the realm, and no one but the fellow citizens with the saints is able and willing to submit to and obey that law, to render unto God the things that are God's.¹⁾ From the things that are God's, the things which are Caesar's must always be carefully distinguished, and a confusion of the two will invariably prove detrimental both to the church and to the state. The state cannot be constituted under principles which are spiritual throughout while the carnal mind is enmity against God and is not and cannot be subject to the law of God,²⁾ and as long as "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."³⁾ And, in fact, we are in position to quote Dr. Abbott against Dr. Abbott himself when he says:

"Christ proceeded on the directly opposite assumption. He made almost no attempt to change the social order or the social organism. The system of taxation which prevailed in the Roman empire was abominably unjust. Christ said never a word about taxation. Labor was not only underpaid and ill-paid, but, for the most part, worked with its hands in manacles; but Christ never said a word about slavery. If drinking and drunkenness were not as bad in their forms then as they are now, by reason of the modern use of distilled liquors, then comparatively unknown, drinking habits and animalism, in all its forms were worse in Greece than they have ever been in America; but Christ never leveled his shafts against the liquor trade, or the making of wine. Pharisaism had the prestige of a great hierarchical system. Christ did not strike at the hierarchy and the system; he struck at the Pharisee, not at the ism. He struck at the injustice, not at the form which the injustice took at a particular era, in a particular country, under particular circumstances. He sought to change, not methods, but men. He struck, not at the outward clothing of the wrong, but at the wrong itself. Accordingly, he said almost nothing about social evils, and a great deal about individual sins. In strictness of speech, a nation does not sin. The in-

1) Matt. 22, 21.

2) Rom. 8, 7.

3) 1 Cor. 2, 14.

dividuals who make up the nation are the sinners. Sins are individual, and Christ proceeded on the assumption that, if we can get rid of sin in the individual, we shall get rid of evil in the state; but if we leave the sin in the individual, all social reform will result only in a change in the form of social evil.

“Christ’s method of dealing with social injustice is strikingly illustrated by the history of the abolition of slavery. Leaving the slave in bondage and the master in power, Christianity delivered to them both its twofold message. To the master it said, Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master, also, is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with Him. To the slave it said, Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it; with goodwill do your service, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, as unto Christ. It thus dignified the slave and honored his toil. Under his teaching, slaves did not count themselves disgraced because they were slaves, nor degraded either by the toil put upon them, or by the unjust punishments often inflicted upon them. Under this teaching the masters came to look upon their slaves as their brethren, to whom they owed far more than the law required of them, far more than self-interest could suggest to them. By this conception of it the whole relationship of master and slave was lifted up and transfigured, as an earthly parable of the relation between man and his God. Schmidt’s ‘History of the Social Results of Early Christianity’ and Lecky’s ‘History of European Morals’ trace the effect of this teaching in the gradual and unrevolutionary abolition of slavery. Says the former:—

“Long before Chrysostom had raised his voice in favor of slaves, there had been glorious examples of Christian masters freeing their slaves. The earliest known of these is Hermes, Prefect of Rome under Trajan, who embraced Christianity with his wife, children, and 1,250 slaves. On Easter Day, the day of their baptism, Hermes gave them all freedom, and ample assistance to enable them to gain a livelihood. Shortly afterwards he suffered martyrdom with bishop Alexander, who was the means of his conversion. Another Prefect of Rome, under Diocletian, Chromatius, was celebrated in the church for his zeal and charity. He set free 1,400 slaves, and gave them abundant means of support; he said that those who had God for their Father ought not to be the servants of man. Melania, with the consent of her husband Pinius, gave freedom to 8,000 slaves; Ovinus, a French martyr, to 5,000. These great examples were followed by Christians who were not so rich. In the early part of the fourth cen-

ture three brothers set free their seventy-three slaves. Augustine told the people in one of his homilies that several clerks of the church of Hippo were going to emancipate some slaves they possessed. We cannot doubt that many others did the same, though the historians, struck only with what shows in large proportions, have preserved no account of the less startling facts. Whilst rich pagans directed in their will that the blood of their slaves should be shed in combats in the arena, Christian masters, taught by the church, gave freedom and legacies to their slaves, by their will." pp. 130 ff.—

But there is still another misconception which pervades the entire work before us. The title of the book is "*Christianity and Social Problems*." Now the doctrine of Christianity is properly the *Gospel* of divine grace in Christ Jesus; the soul of Christianity is *faith* in Christ, the savior of mankind; the end and aim of Christianity is the *eternal salvation* of sinners and the glory of God; the signature of Christianity in this world is the *cross of Christ* borne by the followers of Christ. Of all this, however, very little is said in this book. On the other hand we hear of the *Golden Rule*, of Christ's *law* of the family, Christ's *law* of service, Christ's *law* for the settlement of controversies, all of which are not specifically Christian at all, but simply applications of the moral law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If this is Christianity, then Christianity might have been essentially what it is without Christ, the Redeemer. But the substitution of the Golden Rule, according to which all men must be damned, for Christianity, by which sinners are saved, is so generally practiced to-day and so pernicious a perversion of the truth, that thousands are thereby deceived into the fatal error of mistaking themselves for Christians while, in fact, they are as truly "without Christ"¹⁾ as any pagan ever was. If Christ were only or chiefly a new law-giver, he could not be the Savior of the transgressors of the law. And that the moral precepts of Christianity are in substance what they are, simply the moral law in-

1) Eph. 2, 12.

scribed in man's heart by the Creator's hand, is ample evidence of the comforting truth that Christ is *not* the author and promulgator of a new, a specifically Christian, law, and that, therefore, his mission must have had a different, a higher import and purpose than what our author would make it when he says: "In his life work he was more than a social reformer,—he was a social revolutionist." p. 19.

There are other things in this book to which we take exception. Thus when the author says of the Jewish people:

"Their sacred books, which constituted their sole literature, required them to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present life, as a necessary means of realizing the hope of a life to come." p. 2.

Speaking of the Apostles of Christ, he says:

"Instructed in the principles of a new social order, inspired by a new and divine life of faith, hope, and love, the disciples went forth to preach the kingdom of God on earth. Of course they could not believe that they were to establish this future kingdom. . . . It was impossible that they should believe this, and they did not. They believed the Messiah would come again in great glory. They waited and watched for that coming, and grew heartsick because he did not come. Little by little the church abandoned its hope of a world-wide kingdom, drew a line between itself and the world, and applied the teachings of their Lord only to the church. It divided men into two classes, the religious and the secular." p. 25 f.

He thinks that the Jews in the time of Solomon

"knew nothing of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, atonement, the inspiration of the Bible." p. 147.

According to Dr. Abbott's estimate,

"the difference between the rationalist and the orthodox to-day in their interpretation of Christ seems to be chiefly this: Both look at the image in the mirror; the orthodox says, 'This is the image of God;' the rationalist says, 'This is not the image of God, but God looks exactly like him.'" p. 352. —

The suffering and death of Christ was void of its chief and proper purpose, if the following statements are true:

"Man is God's child, and therefore has supremacy over himself. This is the divine foundation of liberty in State, in Church, in Society,—the doctrine that in man himself is dormant a power

to control himself . . . ; man is God's son, and sonship gives him liberty. . . . Our Goddess of liberty . . . should be the figure of Christ; he holds the torch which illumines the world." p. 364. —

These specimens will suffice to show of what stamp Dr. Abbott's *theology* is, and knowing this, the reader will not be surprised at other neological utterances which he will encounter in the perusal of this, otherwise, highly interesting book. Having for many years made the labor question and other social problems the subject of extensive and continued study, we do not hesitate to say that, as far as the *sociological* scope of the work is concerned, we have found but very few books of superior excellence. With few exceptions, the sociological positions occupied and ably advocated by the author are those of the *materiale* of the moral law in its bearing upon the points taken up for consideration. The following extracts will go to substantiate our judgment.

"The church at Jerusalem is sometimes referred to as having adopted a species of communism because the disciples held property in common. But it was not communism, and it was not, strictly speaking, communistic. For the church did not deny—on the contrary it affirmed—the rights of private property. The members of the church might turn their property into the common stock or not, as they pleased, and might turn in as much or as little as they pleased. The contribution to a common treasury was a wholly voluntary contribution. When Ananias and Sapphira sold a possession and pretended to offer the proceeds of the sale to the church, while they really gave only a part, Peter, in his condemnation of them, affirmed the right of private property, and the recognition of that right by the infant church. 'Whiles it remained,' said he, 'was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?' A brotherhood which has a common treasury, and to which any member may contribute all or a part of his property as he pleases, is not, properly speaking, a communistic brotherhood. Such holding of property in common for special purposes is not communism nor communistic, for it does not tend to the doctrine that there is no true right of private property." p. 74 f. —

"Property is a trust. Whatever a man possesses is given to him, but the gift is not absolute; it is a gift in trust. He is to use it for

the benefit of the whole community. He is to consider himself only as a single member of that community. The doctrine that property is a trust is implied in the law, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' If love means emotional ecstasies, this is not a command to love at all. No man is entranced by his own picture, thrilled by his own loveletters, or desirous to caress himself, to love one's neighbor as one's self is to count one's self one of the community, and treat all as worthy of equal consideration. If it is right to respect a neighbor's property, it is right to respect one's own; but it is not right to have one law for one's self and another for the neighbor. He who loves his neighbor as himself will count his own interests part of the common interests; his rights will be measured in his judgment by the rights of his neighbor. Personal welfare and public welfare will become identified. Egoism and altruism will be cooperative, not conflicting. The doctrine that property is a trust is explicit in the teachings of Christ concerning property. Man is a steward; to different men are given different possessions; each one is to trade with the talents entrusted to him, but all are to give account to the Master in a future day of reckoning. Christ reinforces this truth by showing the wisdom as well as the beauty of beneficence. Even the unjust steward who does not care for his Master's interests, or for those of the tenants, is shrewd enough to seek the tenants' favor by his administration of his Master's estate for the tenants' benefit. The right use of property is one of the tests of the judgment day. The faithful and wise servant is one who sees that his Lord has made him ruler in order that he may give to the servants of the household meat in due season. Not skill to acquire, but skill to bestow, is evidence of wisdom. The man who, when his barns are full to bursting, purposes to build greater barns for more grain, and whom the world calls shrewd and prosperous, Christ calls Fool! For such a man knows only how to accumulate, not how to distribute. . . . This is Christ's law of ownership. Property is a trust. Every man who has property is a trustee. Whether it is one dollar or a hundred and fifty million dollars, in no way affects the nature of the responsibility. Any man who uses his property, or any part of his property, for himself alone is guilty of a breach of trust. He is a defaulter before God. For his defalcation he must at the last give account. It will not be enough that he has earned the money honestly; nor that he has not used it oppressively; nor that he has given certain portions of it—a tenth, for example—in what he calls benevolence. It is not his to use. To the affirmation, 'What's mine 's mine,' the answer of Christ is, 'It is not.' No man owns anything. At the last every man must meet the question, 'How have

you administered the trust?' If he is wise he will be asking himself this question day by day. . . .

It does not follow that all property is to be held in common and administered in common, but it does follow that any man who controls any part of his property, whether it has come from the soil or from natural forces, or from public highways, or from what he calls private enterprise, has taken it from the hands of God, and is to administer it in trust for humanity. That is the doctrine of Christianity. It leaves to the people individual enterprise; it contemplates and intends variations of wealth and of condition; but it maintains this fundamental principle: That every man is a trustee, and every man must account for the administration of his trust.

He is a trustee, first of all, for his own family. Whatever money comes to us we are to hold in trust, first, for our own household, not for luxury, which enervates and destroys, but for education, culture, development. We have not only a right, but a duty, to make provision for the manhood of our boys and the womanhood of our girls.

Next, we are trustees for those who are engaged with us in industrial life. A writer in the 'Forum' a few years ago expressed the following judgment:—

'I admit—no, I assert—the demands of charity on every human being, but charity and business are and forever ought to be divorced. An employer is under no more financial obligation to his workmen after he has paid their current wages than they are to him, or to a passerby on the street whom they never saw.'

I believe that is an unchristian heresy. Every man who has workmen in his employ is a trustee for them. He and they are in a true sense partners engaged in a common enterprise. He owes them an obligation which wages do not meet. The first duty of an employer to his employed is the duty of loyalty. When a ship founders in storm, the captain is not the first to abandon her, leaving the crew to go down. When a regiment is in peril in battle, the colonel does not flee and leave the regiment to go under the sod. When the Christians in Armenia are trembling in fear of martyrdom, the missionaries do not follow the advice given to them and flee to the coast for protection. They stay with their native Christian brethren so long as staying can be of any possible service. And the time will come when every merchant and every manufacturer will follow the example which is now set by many a merchant and many a manufacturer, and will stand by his crew in stormy times.

Lastly, there is the trust held by men of wealth for the benefit of the entire community." pp. 81 ff.

"In all work hand and brain must cooperate. Labor is not all hand-labor. An American humorist has said with great truth, 'In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread, but some men sweat outside and some inside.' The brain has need of the hand, and the hand of the brain. Both are entitled to their share of the world's products, but this one fundamental truth remains: the world has just so much as we put into it; no more. If we do not by our consecrated use of hand or head or heart, by our personal activity or our wise direction of the activity of others, by our serving or our suffering, endeavor to add to the world's wealth—material, intellectual, or spiritual—at least as much as we have taken out of it, we belong in the category of the beggars, the thieves, and the gamblers.

"The first principle, then, is respect for labor, and respect for each other's labor; respect by the man who works with his brain for the man who works with his hand, and respect by the man who works with his hand for the man who works with his brain,—mutual respect. When we have thoroughly learned this one fundamental principle, that to destroy is not honorable and to produce is, that the glory of the nation lies in its production, that the glory of life lies in adding to the wealth of life,—its material, its intellectual, its spiritual wealth,—we shall have learned one great underlying lesson. Until we have learned this all other learning is in vain, for this is the foundation. The greatest of all is the servant of all. We believe this in the church: the minister is the servant of the congregation. We believe in politics: the President is the servant of the people. We shall not get to the Christian basis of industry until we come to recognize in industry also that there is no such thing as independence, and that the greatest and the richest and the strongest is great only as he is the servant of the weak and the poor." p. 177 f.

"The final authority in the normal family is the husband; he is the head of the household. What is the alternative? Either there is a rift in the family, in one department the wife supreme, in the other department the husband supreme, neither entering into the other's department,—then there is not a unit, not these twain one flesh, not a single person with one life, one will, one heart; but a divided household, divided at the very foundation: or there is a perpetual struggle going on between the husband and the wife; she endeavoring to get control by cunning, he endeavoring to get control by force; she generally getting the better of it, for cunning habitually gets the better of force,—then the family is a perpetual battlefield. Or else the divine order is reversed, and the wife is the head of the household,—a condition which does not need any comment.

The husband and wife may wisely divide between them, by a common consent, the responsibilities of the household; that does not affect the autocracy. In some families, through invalidism, intellectual or physical or moral, or all three combined, the husband cannot be at the head and the wife must be, usually to the discomfort of both. But that is not a normal household. The normal, the divine order, is the order in which the husband is the head of the household, and the household is an autocracy.

"This is not to affirm that man is superior to woman. That has often been affirmed; I repudiate it with indignation. It is not to affirm that the husband is superior to the wife. That has been affirmed; I repudiate it no less indignantly. There is no question of superiority or inferiority. The question is of headship, not of superiority. An inferior individual may be a superior officer. During the Vicksburg campaign Grant was the greater general, but Halleck was the superior officer. The President of the United States is the head of the nation, but he is not necessarily the greatest man in the nation. I understand then, that Christ's law of the household, as interpreted and applied by Paul, involves these two laws: First, Wives, submit to your husbands; second, Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved you and gave himself for you. In the poems and stories and sermons, the women are eulogized as cross-bearers. It is small credit to husbands that literature always puts the crosses on the wives. It is the men who ought to be the cross-bearers.

"This does no dishonor to women. It is honoring her. It does not deprive her of her rights. It confers upon her the rights which paganism takes away. For, in the order of nature, man is the soldier. It is the man who is to shoulder the musket and go forth to battle to protect the wife. If bread is to be got by hard toil, it is the man who is to subdue nature, and get the bread for his wife. It is not a woman's right to harness herself with the ox and plow in the fields, as women do in some countries. It is the man who is to do the work and take the responsibilities, that woman may minister to love and life. Responsibility and authority are always commensurate. An undefined authority means an undefined responsibility, of all responsibilities the hardest to bear. . . . I cannot look with enthusiasm upon the new era in which women are rushing into every kind of employment, and lowering the wages of men by doing men's work. I would not close the door against them, nor shut them out from any vocation; I would give them the largest liberty. But men, with their strong arms, ought to fight life's battle and win life's bread, and leave the women free from the burden of bread-winning and

battling, that they may minister to the higher life of faith and hope and love. Nor will our industrial situation be what it ought to be, until every faithful husband and father can earn enough for his wife and children, without calling them to labor by his side in the mine, the mill, the shop, or the office.

"In the third place, since marriage is not a civil contract, and the husband and wife are not co-equal partners in a common enterprise, marriage is not dissolvable at the pleasure of the parties to it. The common argument for such dissolution is very simple and easily stated. 'Why should those remain bound together by law whose hearts are not bound together by love? Why should a woman remain in marital bondage to a man when she does not love and perhaps cannot even respect him? Marriage is the union of souls; if the souls are not united the marriage is dissolved.' Such is the argument for freedom of divorce. Such is not Christ's view of either marriage or divorce. Marriage is not a union of souls: it is the mating of two persons in one flesh. Two souls may be joined, and yet there be no marriage; marriage there may be, and yet no union of souls. Marriage is the creation of new earthly relation. For the highest happiness, where the life is one the souls should be one; but it is the unity of the lives, not of the souls, which constitutes marriage. Hence marriage ceases at death, though spiritual union does not. Hence, too, marriage is not dissoluble because love is dead. The mere cessation of sympathy no more annuls marriage than it annuls any other family relation. It is very desirable that the son should reverence the father, and that the father should sympathize with the son. But the son does not cease to be a son because the father is unworthy of reverence, nor does the father cease to be father because he is unable to sympathize with his son. So it is of the utmost moment that the husband and wife love and honor each other, but they do not cease to be husband and wife because they cannot love and honor. Love and honor make the result of the marriage blessed, but they do not constitute the relation.

"And as Christ does not accept the definition of marriage as a 'union of souls,' so neither does he accept incompatibility of temper as a ground of divorce. His words on this subject are as explicit as any in his teachings: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away committeth adultery.' . . .

"The remedy for connubial infelicities is not flying from them. The remedy for an ill is not flying from it. The remedy for infelicities in the pastorate is not short pastorates. It is more patience by the

pastor towards the church, and more patience by the church toward the pastor. The remedy for the friction which enters into our households is not separation; it is closer union. I have sometimes heard the wife say after a funeral, 'He never spoke a cross word,' and have blessed the widow's short memory. A life without a cross word would be a miracle of self-restraint. There are very few married couples in which each does not have to exercise patience with the other. The spirit which produces separation is the spirit that suffers and is cross, that seeketh its own,—the spirit of suspicion, not trust; of discouragement, not hope,—the spirit that seeks to escape from life's burdens, not that beareth all things, trusteth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; the love which counts another's fault as his burden, and bears it for him; the love which is never suspicious, but trusting and confiding, and, when confidence is wronged and trust is no longer possible, still hopes: and, when hope long deferred makes the heart sick, still endures; a love like the love of Christ, who, having loved his own, loved them unto the end." pp. 148 ff.

All this is, sociologically considered, delightful reading, and social reformers will do well to heed and ponder what Dr. Abbott here says in pointing out the direction in which the solution of the social problems of the day may be, though not ultimately and definitely, yet in a measure approximately, solved and existing difficulties may be, though not in all, yet in many cases satisfactorily adjusted. We must, however, once more emphasize that we cannot allow these and similar recommendations to pose as specifically Christian. They are even far from going the full length of the moral law, which demands that all our acts should be prompted by the fear and love of God and performed in filial obedience to his will, not because of their expediency or conduciveness to our temporal welfare and the improved condition of society. Society, at large, or the State, which is society organized within a given territory under national and municipal laws and a government with legislative, judicial, and executive functions, can consistently deal only with the *materiale* of the moral law, and with that only as far as it relates to the temporal affairs of the community

and its individual members, while it must leave the entire *formale*, according to which the law is the exhibition of the holy will of God, and also the *materiale* of the First Table, to the *religious* life of men and to the religious community, the Church. Civil laws are reasonable and expedient only as far as they can be generally enforced. But the love of God and man can never be enforced and should, therefore, never enter into civil legislation. The love of God and man is the daughter of faith and, like faith itself, can be engendered only by the Gospel. And the Gospel is not an aggregate of social principles, but a means of grace, and was not entrusted to the State, but to the Church, by him who has ordained that civil government should bear the sword. However important the social problems dealt with in Dr. Abbott's book may be, the thorough theoretical and practical separation of Church and State is of greater importance for the welfare of both Church and State.

A. G.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. By W. M. Ramsay, D. C. L. LL. D. Professor of Humanity, Aberdeen, etc. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1896. XVI and 394 pp. 8vo with a map. Price \$3.00.

The author of this book is not a theologian; but St. Paul was, and so was St. Luke; and even when a lawyer at the hand of St. Luke "the historian" exhibits "St. Paul the traveller and the Roman citizen," his work ought to be profitable reading for theologians and a proper subject for "theological review." In fact, there is more of acceptable historical theology in Dr. Ramsay's book than in many works of modern Doctors of Divinity, and as a commentary to the *Acts of the Apostles* this book ranks high above the productions of the Tuebingen school of theologians who would have us put down the author of the

Acts as a second or third rate writer of historical romance of a post-apostolic age and bent upon deceiving his readers by hiding away the "antagonism between the Petrine and the Pauline types of Christianity." We sincerely regret to find Dr. Ramsay, too, on the wrong side of the line inasmuch as Luke is to him simply a human author, whom he does not except when he says, "We may admit the possibility that a first-century historian has made errors."¹⁾ But we are, on the other hand, delighted to see the so-called historical criticism of so-called theologians put to shame by a writer who, while perhaps no more a theologian than they are, is vastly their superior as a historian and a critic. He demonstrates that the *Acts* are not a crazy quilt of various materials variously patched, but a masterpiece of historical composition which can be followed from beginning to end without let or hindrance by internal inconsistencies or real disagreement with contemporaneous writings. The book is not chiefly critical; but we cannot withhold from our readers the following specimen of the author's manner of handling critical questions.

"7. PAUL'S ACTION ON THE SHIP.²⁾ The account of the voyage as a whole is commonly accepted by critics as the most trustworthy part of the *Acts* and as 'one of the most instructive documents for the knowledge of ancient seamanship' (Holtzmann on XXVII 4, p. 421). But in it many critics detect the style of a later hand, the supposed second-century writer that made the work out of good and early documents, and addressed his compilation to Theophilus. Many hold that this writer inserted vv. 21—26, and some assign to him also vv. 33—35; because the character there attributed to Paul is quite different from his character in the genuine old document, especially vv. 10 and 31: in the original parts Paul is represented as a simple passenger, cautious to a degree, suffering from hunger, apprehensive of the future, keenly alive to prospective danger, and anxious to provide against it: on the other hand, in vv. 21—26 he knows that their safety is assured; he speaks as the prophet, not the anxious passenger; he occupies a position apart from, and on a higher plane than human.

1) p. 16.

2) *Acts* XVII.

This is a fair hypothesis, and deserves fair and dispassionate consideration; no one whose mind is not already definitely made up on all questions can pass it by; and only those who feel that they understand the entire narrative in every turn and phrase and allusion would willingly pass it by, for every real student knows how frequently his knowledge is increased by changing his point of view.

We may at once grant that the narrative would go on without any obvious awkwardness if 21—26 were omitted, which is of course true of many a paragraph describing some special incident in a historical work.

But it is half-hearted and useless to cut out 21—26 as an interpolation without cutting out 33—38; there, too, Paul is represented as the prophet and the consoler on a higher plane, though he is also the mere passenger suffering from hunger, and alive to the fact that the safety of all depends on their taking food and being fit for active exertion in the morning. Some critics go so far as to cut out vv. 33—35. But if they are accepted, I fail to see any reason for rejecting 21—26; these two passages are so closely akin in purport and bearing on the context that they must go together; and all the mischief attributed to 21—26 as placing Paul on a higher plane is done in 33—35.

Further the excision of 21—26 would cut away a vital part of the narrative. (1) These verses contain the additional fact, natural in itself and assumed in v. 34 as already known, that the crew and passengers were starving and weak. (2) They fit well into the context for they follow naturally after the spiritlessness described in v. 20, and Paul begins by claiming attention on the ground of his former advice (advice that is accepted by the critics as genuine because it is different in tone from the supposed interpolation). 'In former circumstances' says he, 'I gave you different, but salutary advice, which to your cost you disregarded; listen to me now when I tell you that you shall escape.' The method of escape, the only method that a sailor could believe to be probable, is added as a concluding encouragement.

But let us cut out every verse that puts Paul on a higher plane, and observe the narrative that would result: Paul twice comes forward with advice that is cautiously prudent, and shows keen regard to the chance of safety. If that is all the character he displayed throughout the voyage, why do we study the man and his fate? All experience shows that in such a situation there is often found some one to encourage the rest; and, if Paul had not been the man to comfort and cheer his despairing shipmates, he would never have

impressed himself on history or made himself an interest to all succeeding time. The world's history stamps the interpolation-theory here as false.

Moreover, the letters of Paul put before us a totally different character from this prudent calculator of chances. The Paul of Acts XXVII is the Paul of the Epistles: the Paul who remains on the interpolation-theory could never have written the Epistles.

Finally, the reason why the historian dwells at such length on the voyage lies mainly in vv. 21—26 and 33—38. In the voyage he pictures Paul on a higher plane than common men, advising more skillfully than the skilled mariners, maintaining hope and courage when all were in despair, and breathing his hope and courage into others, playing the part of a true Roman in a Roman ship, looked up to even by the centurion, and in his single self the saviour of the lives of all. But the interpolation-theory would cut out the centre of the picture.

There remains no reason to reject vv. 21—26 which I can discover, except that it introduces the superhuman element. That is an argument to which I have no reply. It is quite a tenable position in the present stage of science and knowledge to maintain that every narrative which contains elements of the marvelous must be an unhistorical and untrustworthy narrative. But let us have the plain and honest reasons; those who defend that perfectly fair position should not try to throw in front of it as outworks flimsy and uncritical reasons, which cannot satisfy for a moment any one that has not his mind made up beforehand on that fundamental premise. But the superhuman element is inextricably involved in this book: you cannot cut it out by any critical process that will bear scrutiny. You must accept all or leave all." p. 336 ff.

While this is not a theological way of dealing with the matter in hand, it shows that St. Luke has no reason, and our negative critics have every reason, to fear sober historical criticism. Faith will forever receive the *Acts* as the word of God. Reason is capable of recognizing a gem of historical literature, where unsound minds have surmised a mass of ill-assorted scraps. And "probably," says Dr. Ramsay, "there will always be those who prefer the scraps."¹⁾

A. G.

1) p. 204.

The Literary Study of the Bible; an account of the leading forms of Literature represented in the Sacred Writings.

Intended for English readers by Richard G. Moulton, M. A. (Cambr.) Ph. D. (Penna.), Professor of Literature in the University of Chicago, Late University Extension Lecturer (Cambridge and London). Boston U. S. A.: D. C. Heath & Co. London: Isbister & Co., Limited. 1896. XII and 533 pp. 8vo; price \$2.00.—

This is a peculiar book. That the author has *searched the Scriptures*, is evident on every page; that *in them he thought he had eternal life*, appears nowhere. The Bible is not here a Paradise for sweet communion with God, or a storehouse of spiritual blessings, but a botanical garden with fine specimens carefully labeled, or a museum of articles of vertu arranged in glass cases. Now we would by no means deny that a botanical garden well kept and a museum of objects well selected and arranged may prove very instructive and highly interesting and entertaining, especially to the educated visitor. Thus also we hold that a well trained reader will derive some measure of valuable information from a careful perusal of the volume before us. He will be led to a better understanding of many of the sacred texts here analyzed or grouped together after the author's method, and to an increased enjoyment of many of the beauties in which the Scriptures abound. We say this although we are not unmindful of the fact that the author has in the preparation of his work drawn quite largely on his imagination, a practice which he shares with the "higher critics," of whom he is a professed admirer.¹⁾ For these and other reasons we can recommend the book to such only as "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." As a fair specimen of Dr. Moulton's workmanship we give the following "literary" analysis and arrangement of the CXVIII Psalm.

1) pp. IV. X.

“In the psalm the sequence of verses clearly suggests a solo and two distinct choruses. At the beginning the Worshipper is approaching the Temple with an Escort of Friends; later on a second chorus of Priests must be added.

PSALM CXVIII.

The Worshipper and his Escort approach the Temple.

Tutti. O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good:
For his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let Israel now say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let the house of Aaron now say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Let now them that fear the LORD say—

Escort. That his mercy endureth for ever.

Worshipper. Out of my distress I called upon the LORD:
The LORD answered me, and set me in a large place.
The LORD is on my side; I will not fear:
What can man do unto me?
The LORD is on my side among them that help me:
Therefore shall I see my desire upon them that hate me.

Escort. It is better to trust in the LORD
Than to put confidence in man;
It is better to trust in the LORD
Than to put confidence in princes.

Worshipper. All nations compassed me about:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. They compassed me about;

Yea, they compassed me about:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. They compassed me about like bees;

They are quenched as the fire of thorns:

Escort. In the name of the LORD I will cut them off!

Worshipper. Thou didst thrust sore at me that I might fall:
But the LORD helped me.
The LORD is my strength and song;
And he is become my salvation.

A voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tents of the righteous:

The right hand of the LORD doeth valiantly.

Escort. The right hand of the LORD is exalted:

The right hand of the LORD doeth valiantly.

Worshipper. I shall not die, but live,

And declare the works of the LORD.

The LORD has chastened me sore:

But he hath not given me over unto death.

Open to me the gates of righteousness:

I will enter into them,

I will give thanks unto the LORD.

The Temple gates open and disclose a Chorus of Priests.

Priests. This is the Gate of the LORD:

The righteous shall enter into it.

Worshipper. I will give thanks unto thee, for thou hast answered me

And art become my salvation.

The stone which the builders rejected

Is become the head of the corner.

Escort. This is the LORD'S doing;

It is marvellous in our eyes.

This is the day which the LORD hath made;

We will rejoice and be glad in it.

Save now, we beseech thee, o LORD:

O LORD, we beseech thee, send now prosperity.

The Worshipper enters the Temple: the Escort prepare to retire.

Priests (to the Worshipper).

Blessed be he that entereth in the name of the LORD!

(to the Escort, retiring).

We have blessed you out of the house of the LORD!

Priests. The LORD is God, and hath given us light:

Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar.

Worshipper. Thou art my God, and I will give thanks unto thee:

Thou art my God, I will exalt thee.

Tutti. O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good:

For his mercy endureth for ever."

A. G.

Country Sermons on Free Texts, by F. Kuegele, a Lutheran Country Parson.

Two years ago a volume appeared which bore this title and contained thirty-eight sermons for the Sundays and festivals of the church year from the first Sunday in Advent to Pentecost. The book was welcomed by many as it deserved to be, and the author was encouraged to continue his work and publish a second volume containing sermons on the rest of the Sundays in the church calendar and, perhaps, an appendix of occasional sermons and addresses. We are pleased to announce that such encouragement has not been in vain. Advance sheets of a part of the desired second volume of the "*Country Sermons*," comprising 160 pages and eighteen sermons, have been forwarded to us by the publisher. From the specimens before us we see that the volume now in course of publication will be equally deserving of cordial recommendation as the first part of what will soon be a complete Postil of Lutheran sermons has proved to be.

A. G.

In our next issue we shall acquaint our readers with a work which together with another volume mentioned in these pages arrived when nearly all the space at our disposal in the present issue was already occupied. It is *Buddhism, its History and Literature*, by T. W. Rhys Davids, LL. D. Ph. D., published by G. P. Putnam's Sons.
