

whole matter, on the present footing, and try a radically new plan.' Fourteen years of toil, and fever, and contradiction, and sorrow, and repeated disappointment! And he is strongly inclined, not to shake off the dust from his feet, not to return to England, but to try a radically new plan.¹

What if wise men had, as far back as Ptolemy,
Judged that the earth like an orange was round,

¹ R. P. Ashe, in *Mackay of Uganda*, 444.

None of them ever said, Come along, follow me,
Sail to the West, and the East will be found.
Many a day before
Ever they'd come ashore
Sadder and wiser men,
They'd have turned back again ;
And that *he* did not, but did cross the sea,
Is a pure wonder, I must say, to me.²

² Clough, *Poems*, 78.

Positive Theological Research in Germany.

BY DR. PAUL FEINE, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE-WITTENBERG.

II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN regard to New Testament study, the greatest commentaries which appeared in the nineteenth century were those of H. A. W. Meyer and J. Chr. Hofmann, the former of moderate conservative tendencies, the latter the representative of the Erlangen Neo-Lutheran theology. Meyer followed the glossator's method. Hofmann began from the general, utilized the particular for the benefit of the general, and always tried to reconstruct the statements of the Biblical writer in their inner form and coherence. It was not his aim to make the text comprehensible by comparing its different parts, but to understand it as an organic whole. He therefore studied carefully the progress of ideas. He did this, however, by entering into detailed discussion of exegetical views differing from his own. His commentary acquired in this way a certain heaviness and obscureness, while Meyer, who also followed out the history of exegesis, especially at important passages, was far more readable.

Nevertheless Hofmann's Commentary has had much greater influence on scientific exegesis than Meyer's. His influence is still at the present day clearly recognizable on some who have followed absolutely different lines of theological study. Even some parts of Meyer's Commentary, as the Prison Epistles, have lately been re-edited by E. Haupt in line with Hofmann's exegesis. On the whole, however, the latest issues of Meyer's Commentary are the work of the critical theologian.

The exegesis of Hofmann suffers, apart from its

heaviness, from several faults which cannot be treated in detail here. Now Th. Zahn in Erlangen, who in theology is a close follower of Hofmann, has undertaken the editing of a Commentary on the New Testament which avoids, at least in great measure, these faults, and at the same time endeavours, in conformity with the resources of present-day science, to utilize the excellences of Hofmann's exegesis. For example, Zahn's commentary follows on the lines laid down by Hofmann in this respect, that it subjects to close examination the inner chain of ideas in the text and so facilitates the understanding of the Biblical writer. A continuous analysis of the ideas of others no longer has a place in the book; instead, Zahn has himself brought his immense knowledge in the sphere of patristic study to bear on the exegesis, so that the expert will find there a rich fund of information. The most important parts of this commentary are those treated by Zahn himself: Matthew, John, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Galatians. His commentary on Matthew, to select one example, has had a phenomenal sale. But the commentaries of his collaborators: Mark, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the Pastoral Epistles, treated by G. Wohlenberg, Zahn's successor in the professorial chair in Erlangen; 1 and 2 Corinthians, treated by Ph. Bachmann; and the Prison Epistles by P. Ewald, are also excellent pieces of exegetical work.

By the side of this great commentary, a smaller work, destined chiefly for the use of students, is about to be undertaken, under the editorship of B. Bess, with the general title *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek*. Just as H. Lietzmann on the critical

side obtained the help of a number of scholars for his *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, so for this conservative work the following have placed themselves at Bess's disposal: J. Leipoldt, who will treat the Synoptics; W. Lütgert, the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; G. Hönnicke, the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse; E. Kühl, the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians; A. Juncker, the Epistles to the Corinthians; and several other scholars. This commentary is to contain textual criticism, discussions of grammar and vocabulary, exegesis in the narrower sense, questions of exegetical controversy, Biblical criticism, references, parallels from religious history, and an estimate of the significance of the part under discussion for the continuity of the book, and as viewed in the light of a history of primitive Christianity.

But Bess's *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek* is more than a commentary. Its first part consists of a series of compendia for the separate branches of theology. The want of short comprehensive works of this kind has made itself widely felt in Germany. For students, teachers, clergymen, religious scholars, and those interested in religious matters, many of the religious text-books are too comprehensive and not always suitable for rapid reference. As a librarian, Bess has had ample opportunity for discovering this. When it came to the working out of the proposed plan, it was conservative theologians who placed themselves at his disposal. Sellin wrote the introduction to the Old Testament; the present writer undertook the introduction to the New Testament and the religion of the New Testament; F. Arnold, Church History; F. Kropatscheck, Dogmatics; P. Althaus, Ethics; J. Kunze, Symbolics; R. Seeberg, the History of the Theology of the Nineteenth Century; and so on.

Alongside of those smaller condensed works, attention has also been paid to larger handbooks. While in the critical branch of theology comprehensive works are being published by J. C. B. Mohr in Tübingen, in the *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher*, and in the smaller volumes of the *Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften*, a *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher* in the conservative branch of theology has been undertaken by the publishing firm of A. Deichert, late W. Scholl, in Leipzig, the same firm which is publishing the commentaries of Zahn and Sellin. The following

have already appeared in this series: Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*; E. Lehmann, *Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte*; R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*; Frank Grützmacher, *Geschichte der neueren Theologie*; L. Ihmels, *Christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit*; M. Kähler, *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*. Other volumes are still to follow, e.g. W. Lütgert, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*; P. Feine, *Leben Jesu*; A. Seeberg, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*; Church History, by G. Grützmacher and H. Böhmer; Symbolics, by W. Walther; Apologetics, by A. W. Hunzinger; Ethics, by R. H. Grützmacher.

We shall now make a more exhaustive survey of some comprehensive works of New Testament study which have appeared within the last few years. Until a few years ago, in the sphere of introduction to the New Testament, the works of H. J. Holtzmann and A. Jülicher on the side of historical criticism, and that of B. Weiss in conservative theology, were the chief. Now Th. Zahn has published his *Introduction to the New Testament*, in two volumes, 3rd edition, 1907. In this work Zahn has handled a great mass of scientific material with brilliant insight and scholarship. The uniqueness of Zahn's method lies in this, that he starts with Church tradition and, as a rule, comes to conclusions which are in harmony with it. Even those who object to this method will not be able to come away from the study of this work without taking with them a rich fund of information. Controversy with Zahn is always fruitful. A shorter introduction to the New Testament, which pays more attention to the needs of students, and so does not always explain the problems fully, is written by F. Barth, 2nd ed. 1911. The same scholar has also written a very convenient and serviceable book as a contribution to the investigation of the life of Christ, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*⁴, 1911.

The text-books on Biblical theology which were chiefly used at the end of last century were those of B. Weiss and W. Beyschlag from the moderate conservative standpoint, and those of H. J. Holtzmann from the critical standpoint. In the sphere of positive theology, two new Biblical theologies have now appeared, those of A. Schlatter, 2 vols., 1909 and 1910, and of Feine, 1910, 3rd and 4th thousand, 1912, to which was added last year the critical religio-historical theology of H. Weinel. Although Schlatter and Feine have been influenced

to a great extent in their fundamental ideas by Hofmann of Erlangen, yet they proceed by very different ways and pursue different methods. Schlatter has given an exposition of the principles followed by him in a special work entitled 'Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments und die Dogmatik' in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1909, xiii. 2. According to this work, he regards as the first task of Biblical theology the perception of the given facts, and the observation of the processes by which the New Testament convictions have come into being. It must be clearly demonstrated how one tenet has been evolved out of the other, and how every single tenet is bound up with the whole consciousness and concentrated will of the person who thought it out and wrote it down. Schlatter demands that a simplified scheme of the religious process should be used as the basis of investigation, so that for those processes which are essential to every stage of piety and every particular form of faith, the New Testament data ought to be collected. He says that by extracting from the New Testament the convictions which are closely bound up in Christian experience as their causes and effects, we get New Testament theology. For the word of the New Testament does not consist of creations of the mind which have come into being quite apart from will and conduct, but of those which have grown out of the experience of life and have been created for it. As is obvious from this, Schlatter is especially concerned to give a picture of the religious and ethical life of the personalities of the New Testament. He desires to sketch the sum of facts exemplified by their lives, and to establish the inferences to be drawn from them for the Christian community. In this he consciously limits himself to the complex of tradition embodied in the New Testament.

In my theology of the New Testament I have also tried, above all, to bring to light the facts which may be gathered from the New Testament writings. Again and again in them we come upon a distinctive religious life, which in its manifestations and results is plainly visible. For the understanding of these documents, however, investigation is not limited to the sphere of the New Testament; the lines of communication leading back into the Old Testament and Jewish literature are followed out, and the whole mass of material contributed by modern research in the field of

religious history is brought to bear on the subject. Thus it is made evident almost everywhere that New Testament religion is firmly grounded in Old Testament religion but goes beyond it, that the science of comparative religion contributes a not unimportant result in that it shows the forms in which primitive Christianity was able to make itself comprehensible to the people of that time, but that its true content and its religious nature can be understood only from the Divine person of Jesus and the power which flowed from Him. Further, as a result of this, it is manifest that the conception of the two great Apostles, Paul and John, held in critical work up till now, stands in need of correction. They have frequently (by Holsten, Pfeiderer, Holtzmann, and also on the conservative side by B. Weiss) been regarded predominantly in an intellectual light. Their doctrinal views were described in critical theology under the scheme of a combination of genuine Christian and Hellenistic elements, so that a glaring dualism was often apparent in them. The matter takes on another complexion, however, if we try to understand, from Christian experience and dependence on the gospel of Jesus, the intellectual world of Paul and John, in view of the stage of religious development they had reached. In this way the living and personal side of their declaration of faith is brought out much more clearly.

Of no less importance for the present theological situation is the course taken by two great New Testament discussions of late years—the question of Paul's dependence on Jesus, and the historicity of the Biblical picture of Jesus.

At the time when I was forming my own opinions upon theological matters, I discovered that one of the greatest theological problems which exist was the question, in what measure Pauline religion and theology were dependent on the historical Jesus. Accordingly, in 1899, I published *Das gesetzesfreie Evangelium des Paulus nach seinem Werdegang dargestellt*, in which, entering into discussion, more especially with C. Holsten, I followed out the lines of communication between the pre-Christian and the Christian life ideal of Paul, and proved at the same time that the reality of the occurrence at Damascus offers the key to the understanding of Paul's conversion from a Pharisee into an Apostle. In 1902 the further work *Jesus Christus und Paulus* was published, in which the question of the dependence of Paul on Jesus, treated in

various independent inquiries, was summarized and gone into more deeply. The result of my research was that Paul must have been much better acquainted and much more thoroughly conversant with the gospel of Jesus, His words, thoughts, and deeds, than would appear from a superficial examination. The proclamation and teaching of Paul on the subject of the person of Jesus, his faith in God, his doctrine of redemption and justification, his ethics, his position with regard to the law, his views on the sacraments, and his eschatology, are in my opinion only an acceptance and continuation of what was already directly present in Jesus or certainly prepared in Him. My opinions found a favourable reception in some quarters, even on the side of historical criticism (Holtzmann), but for the most part they raised dissent; in fact, an attempt was made to come to a directly opposite conclusion. W. Wrede maintained in his *Paulus*, 1905, that it was an undeniable fact that the life-work and the personality of Jesus had *not* influenced Pauline theology. The name 'Apostle of Jesus' was in no way suitable for Paul, if by that was meant his historical relationship to Jesus. In all essential points he was, in comparison with Jesus, an entirely new being; he was the second founder of Christianity, and as such he had, in comparison with the first, exercised, if not the better, at least the stronger, influence. Paul, so Wrede maintained, was much more independent of Jesus than Jesus Himself was of the noblest representatives of Jewish religion. This raised a lively discussion upon the subject of Jesus and Paul. Even the theological friends of Wrede found his judgment too extreme. Scholars even on his own side began to recognize numerous points of connexion between Jesus and Paul. By going into the religious and theological views of the primitive community, they noticed that Paul's proclamation of Christ, as well as his ethics and eschatology, agreed to a great extent with Christianity as it was before his own time. Even in those circles where stress was laid on the originality of the Pauline gospel, an active search was made for points of connexion not only between Paul and contemporary religion and mythology, but also between him and the historical Jesus.

Numerous scholars took part in this discussion, e.g. Goguel in France; in Germany, Kölbing, J. Kaftan, Jülicher, M. Brückner, J. Weiss, and

others.¹ People were brought to reason, however, by the course taken by the discussion upon the Christ-myth. We may regard as a favourable sign the remarks which H. Weinel, though belonging to the critical branch of theology, has addressed to his theological colleagues, in a descriptive survey of this dispute. Again and again, says Weinel in his paper, *Ist das liberale Jesusbild widerlegt?* 1910, p. 16, critical theology has laid stress on how little one may learn of Jesus from Paul. He himself had formerly placed the matter in this false light. He now admits, however, not only that what Paul says about Jesus and His words is enough to prove the existence of Jesus in the Epistles of Paul, but that in all important passages the words of Jesus are heard in Paul; and that besides a whole host of details which Paul knew and wrote down, the decisive characteristics of Jesus' preaching and character have been preserved for us in the writings of this Apostle. Thus the opinion which we have long held is thoroughly justified. Let us give a warm welcome to the work of the Norwegian, P. Olaf Moe, *Paulus und die evangelische Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1912, in which the close connexion between the proclamation of Paul and the gospel of Jesus is once more demonstrated.

A unique view of the Apostle appeared last year in A. Deissmann's *Paulus*. In the same way as Renan once tried to explain the gospel of Jesus from the knowledge of the country and people of Palestine, so Deissmann now tries to explain the Apostle from the blue sky, the sultry summer heat of the East, the wearisome mountain paths over which the Apostle had to wander, and so on. What is really theological he takes away from Paul almost entirely, and sees in him the mystic, the man of moods, the meditative spirit. We fear that only a small part of this theory will prove to be tenable.

The dispute about the so-called 'Christ-myth,' which has been raging for the last three years in Germany, did not break out by chance. With Bruno Bauer, 1841; A. Kalthoff, *Das Christusproblem*, 1902, *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1903; W. von Schnehen, *Der moderne Jesuskultus*, 1905; W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, Giessen, 1906; P. Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*

¹ See also the article 'Jesus and Paul,' by John Gresham Machen, in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912, pp. 547-578.

in der Weltliteratur, i. 1906, the ground had been well prepared for the attack on the historical portrait of Jesus which was made by Arthur Drews, Professor of Philosophy in the Polytechnic in Karlsruhe, in his work *Die Christusmythe*, Jena, 1909, Pt. II. 1911. Drews maintained that the gospel writings did not contain the history of a real man, but only the myth of the 'God-man,' Jesus, clothed in the form of history. Old Testament prototypes of the Messiah (Moses, Elias, Elisha, etc.), as well as certain mythical conceptions of the neighbouring heathen tribes—conceptions which were closely connected with the belief in a Divine Redeemer—had contributed to the 'history' of that Jesus. Everything of consequence and of decisive religious importance in the Christian faith, as, for example, the baptism, the last supper, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, was borrowed from the cult symbolism of the mythical Jesus, and owed its rise not to an historical fact, but to the pre-Christian faith in the half-Jewish, half-heathen redeeming Deity.

The theological deductions of Drews are diletante, through and through. He has made the most glaring mistakes and omissions; he has taken very little trouble, before publishing his opinions on these matters, to investigate them thoroughly in a scientific way. The mainspring of his argument, however, is, as is clearly seen in his work, his monistic view of things. That this has led him to take up a position of antagonism to historical Christianity is only natural. But our opponents have, as is well known, the sharpest eye for our weaknesses, and so Drews has undoubtedly discovered a vulnerable point in the armour of theological research. This is the argument of liberal theology that an historical portrait of Jesus which does not overstep the limits of the human may be obtained from the Gospels by means of historical criticism. The bitter arguments of Drews and his colleagues are directed against the religious worship of the ideal man, Jesus. It has time and again been pointed out by the representatives of the theory of the Christ-myth that 'the *Jesuanism* of liberal theology,' i.e. the claim to be able to draw a true portrait of Christ on the foundation of historical criticism, is a Utopia; what really appears in the Gospels is the portrait of the Son of God who appeared on earth as Redeemer.

It is not without a certain amount of justifica-

tion that Drews and his colleagues claim that the logical result of liberal-theological research is the complete denial of the historical existence of Jesus. Bousset—who has since, it must be admitted, taken up the symbolical view of the person of Jesus—in his controversy with Kalthoff in the first decade of this century, would allow only a few of Jesus' words to stand as historically trustworthy—such as the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the declaration of the Fatherly love of God, or Jesus in dispute with the Pharisees. In his *Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901, Wrede tried to prove that the contents of Mark's Gospel along with Christ's proclamation of Himself as the Messiah before Cesarea Philippi are in their essential points nothing but a new form of the primitive Christian communal tradition, so that Jesus probably never did designate Himself the Messiah. In the same direction, Wellhausen, in his works upon the Synoptic Gospels advances a very far-reaching criticism.

Thus the impression was naturally made upon outsiders that everything was still rather obscure in the field of critical research into the Gospels, and that an entirely new construction was necessary. Was an impetus in that direction not given when the whole portrait of Christ in the Gospels was declared unhistorical and the rise of the gospel tradition explained otherwise?

The objections of the representatives of the Christ-myth to the liberal portrait of Jesus correspond to a great extent, so far as contents are concerned, to what we on the modern positive side have always brought against the liberal portrait of Jesus, and always will bring against it. The only difference is that we as colleagues aim at a more friendly style of polemic, while they set to work in much more drastic fashion. In particular, we have always shown that the transmission of the Gospels offered no excuse for suppressing some of the features of the portrait of Jesus while setting up the rest as historically certain. We also recognized that the real reason for such a differentiation did not lie in the sources, but in the mind of the critic.

Those representing the theory of the Christ-myth have no intention of pursuing a course of apologetics. The Christian belief in a divinely human Redeemer is nothing more to them than a myth. But the real reason of this judgment is not historical but religio-philosophical; or, to express it differently, it is a judgment of the volition. Here we find ourselves, however, outside the sphere of

what may be scientifically proved. At the same time those holding this view have formed correct opinions on many points. Historical tradition in itself does not offer the security which faith needs. A simple historical personage cannot be the foundation of religious faith. A man, though he be an ideal man, cannot redeem us. The gospel has from the very beginning, however, always been the proclamation of the Divine Jesus sent by God into the world for our redemption. This mission may be accepted or rejected; it cannot be changed. So we conservative theologians held ourselves in reserve at first in this dispute. We have followed with great pleasure the many tendencies on the part of the critical school towards a deeper view of the Person of Jesus; but we think that our particular task lies in penetrating with the means and methods of present-day scientific research into the fulness, the wealth and the super-historicity of the Biblical evidence of Christ, and in so working at our part that our knowledge also may help to bear

witness to the majesty of Christ as our Divine Saviour.

In conclusion, we may call attention to the unique attempt of a conservative theologian to find the beginnings of ecclesiastical dogma in the Apostolic period. A. Seeberg has in a number of works, of which the most important are *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 1903; *Das Evangelium Christi*, 1904; *Christi Person und Werk nach der Lehre seiner Jünger*, 1910, tried to prove the existence in the Apostolic period of a christological dogma, which forms the foundation of the second article of the Apostolic Confession of Faith. This dogma Seeberg considers as 'the gospel' which was preached from the beginning by Jesus' disciples, and he traces the origin of this gospel back to Jesus Himself. Even though these contentions will not easily be justified, yet Seeberg is at any rate right in this, that the beginnings of creed-making reach back to New Testament times.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Feine's 'New Testament Theology.'

THE first edition of this excellent work was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, July 1910, pp. 454-456. Its comprehensiveness of treatment, sanity of judgment, and religious insight have carried it already into the honour of a second edition; and, as the author has diligently worked over many sections, it deserves more than a mere chronicle of its appearance in this form. Numerically, there are only ten more pages. But Dr. Feine has introduced a much larger amount of material than this addition would suggest; a number of paragraphs have been abbreviated; small print has been used pretty freely; and in this way space has been secured for fresh matter² which often clears up the processes of argument. These changes make it practically a new book, although there is no retreat from the conclusions of the original edition.

¹ *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Von D. Dr. Paul Feine. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911. Zweite, stark umgearbeitete Auflage. M. 12.50; geb. 14.50.

² Particularly in connexion with the *religionsgeschichtliche* movement, which is criticized not only in the introductory chapters, but throughout the course of the whole book.

The chapters on the Synoptic Gospels have been radically re-cast. Instead of starting with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, Dr. Feine, in deference to his critics, now begins with the attitude of Jesus towards Judaism; this is followed by Jesus' call to repentance, and by a chapter on the kingdom of God,³ which leads up to the moral demands of Jesus (replacing a chapter on his ethics, which formerly stood between chapters 8 and 9). The seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters on 'Die Versöhnung,' 'The resurrection, return, and judgment,' and 'the permanent significance of the person of Jesus,' remain on the whole much as they were, with the exception of the first, in which the author has stated with greater precision his view that the redemptive element is organic to the teaching of our Lord (p. 167 f.). There is a detailed defence (p. 152 f.) of the authenticity of the ransom-saying (Mt 20²⁸ = Mk 10⁴⁵); it goes back, Feine thinks, to a combination, in the

³ In this chapter (p. 68) Dr. Feine frankly admits that neither Mt 16^{18f.} nor Mt 18^{18f.} are authentic sayings of Jesus, as they stand. Both represent the standpoint of the Jewish Christian Church, though some genuine word of Jesus may be at the root of the former passage.