

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII

APRIL 1910

NUMBER 2

## MODERN POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

During the last few years considerable interest has been aroused in theological circles in Germany over a movement which goes by the name of "Modern Positive Theology" or "Modern Theology of the Old Faith". This movement has originated in the conservative camp. Its demand is for a theology which shall preserve the Gospel or the "Old Faith", and restate it in terms of modern thought. It is contended that the modern liberal theology has really destroyed the Gospel in its attempt to modernize it, while the old evangelical theology has erred in identifying the Gospel with worn out forms of theological thought in which from age to age the Gospel has found expression. The Gospel or the Old Faith, it is said, can be maintained in its integrity and given a theological formulation which shall render it intelligible to the "modern consciousness"—whatever that may be. The leaders of this movement are General Superintendent Theodor Kaftan, and Professors Seeberg of Berlin, Grützmacher of Rostock, and Beth of Vienna.

In order to understand this movement it is necessary to take a brief survey of the theological situation in Germany.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>On this subject *vid.* F. Traub, *Aus der dogmatischen Arbeit der Gegenwart, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche XVI*, pp. 429-483; also E. Troeltsch, *Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theol. Wissenschaft, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jahrg. 51, N. F. 16, Heft 2, pp. 97-135.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS  
AND  
HISTORICAL CRITICISM.\*

The primary documentary evidence for the resurrection of Jesus is contained in the writings of the New Testament. As there described, the resurrection is a miracle — that is, an effect in the sphere of nature accomplished immediately by the power of God.<sup>1</sup> The Biblical conception of miracle is indeed a broad one, including events in the ordinary course of nature which excite the wonder or arouse the admiration of man.<sup>2</sup> But beside this conception there is a higher and narrower view in which the miracle is conceived as an event in nature wrought by the immediate efficiency of God.<sup>3</sup>

The premises of this view are the Biblical conception of God as the infinite, free, personal Spirit, the Creator and Governor of the universe; and a well established and in itself generally uniform natural order.<sup>4</sup> The Biblical writers did not possess the modern scientific knowledge of the orderly structure and regular procedure in nature; but they were not without a broad conception of the regularity of nature. The Biblical doctrine of creation and of the transcendence of God made possible the religious interpretation of nature,

\* An address delivered (in substance) before the Ninth Council of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, New York, N. Y., June 21st, 1909; *cf.*, *Proceedings*, edited by Rev. G. D. Mathews, D.D., LL.D., London, 1909, pp. 202-210. By a strange typographical error in the *Proceedings*, p. 204, par. 3, line 4, 1 Corinthians xv is not classed as it should be with the four Gospels as part of the primary documentary evidence for the resurrection; *cf.* below, p. 255, line 4.

<sup>1</sup> On the definition of miracle, *cf.* C. M. Mead, *Supernatural Revelation*, 2d ed., 1893, pp. 97ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. lxxxix. 6ff.; xcvi. 3ff.; xcvi. 1; cvii. 8f.; cxviii. 23; cxxxvi. 4ff.; Job v. 9ff.

<sup>3</sup> The common view in the New Testament.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. viii. 22; Jer. xxxi. 35f.; Ps. cxlviii. 5f.

but excluded the confusion of God with the work of His wisdom and power.

But, however limited the Biblical writers' knowledge of the order of nature may have been, the miraculous character of the resurrection of Jesus as described in the New Testament, judged in the light of the modern knowledge of nature, is not lessened but enhanced. For the miracle of the resurrection is not a subjective miracle due to inadequate knowledge of the efficiency of natural causes. Modern natural science has discovered no force in nature adequate to produce it; on the contrary, its careful study of nature has only confirmed the New Testament representation of the resurrection as an event not wrought by causes or forces ordinarily operative in nature. Whatever disposition, therefore, the Biblical writers may have had to interpret nature religiously and by omitting natural causes to ascribe an event to the direct efficiency of God, the character of the resurrection excludes the theory of mere "poetic description". If, then, the resurrection be a fact, its cause must be sought outside the forces in nature of which natural science takes cognizance. This raises the fundamental premise of the Biblical conception of a miracle, namely, the Biblical conception of God. The possibility of miracle depends on the existence of an adequate cause independent of nature and yet free to produce in it effects which are inexplicable by natural forces. If the Biblical idea of God be valid, there is no theoretical ground for denying the possibility of miracle; but if this idea be surrendered for a philosophy which excludes God from free and immediate action in nature,<sup>5</sup> or for an agnosticism which either con-

<sup>5</sup> Spinoza's denial of the possibility of miracle follows from his conception of God. He says (*Benedicti De Spinoza Opera*, recog. J. Van Vloten et J. P. N. Land, Hagae, 1882, vol. 1, p. 449): "Si quid igitur in Natura fieret, quod ex ipsius legibus non sequeretur, id necessario ordini, quem Deus in æternum per leges Naturæ universales in Natura statuit, repugnaret, adeoque id contra Naturam ejusque leges esset, et consequenter ejus fides nos de omnibus dubitare faceret, et ad Atheismum duceret." Likewise Strauss (*Das Leben Jesu*, 4te Aufl., 1840, 1te Band, p. 83) says: "Wenn hienach der Begriff Gottes eine unmittelbare,

ceives of nature and its forces as exhausting reality or limits our knowledge of cause to the forces inherent in nature, miracle must be denied or transformed.

The occurrence of a miracle, admitting its possibility, must be determined by evidence. Hume emphasized the necessity of sufficient and Huxley the importance of competent evidence. The evidence must, indeed, upon careful examination, be found good and trustworthy; but not necessarily of a kind to stamp unbelief with the stigma of being miraculous,<sup>6</sup> or even expert in character.<sup>7</sup> For the miraculous

der der Welt aber eine bloss mittelbare Einwirkung Gottes erheischt; Beides aber sich nicht durch Annahme eines Wechsels zwischen beiden Wirkungsweisen vereinigen lässt: so bleibt nichts Anderes übrig, als beide sich stetig und bleibend vereinigt zu denken, so dass also die Wirksamkeit Gottes auf die Welt immer und überall beides, sowohl eine unmittelbare wäre als eine mittelbare; was freilich auch wieder so viel heisst, dass sie keines von beiden ist, oder diese Unterscheidung ihre Gültigkeit verliert. Fragt es sich, wie diess der Vorstellung näher zu bringen sei, so ist, wenn man vom Begriffe Gottes ausgeht, von welchem aus die Forderung eines unmittelbaren Wirkens auf die Welt entstand, für Gott die Welt jederzeit als Ganzes da; umgekehrt, vom Standpunkte des Endlichen, der Welt, ausgegangen, ist diese wesentlich ein Getheiltes, Vereinzelttes, und von hier aus ist uns die Forderung eines bloss mittelbaren Eingreifens Gottes entstanden; so dass man sagen muss: auf die Welt als Ganzes wirkt Gott unmittelbar, auf jedes Einzelne in ihr aber nur durch Vermittelung seiner Wirksamkeit auf alles andere Einzelne, d. h. vermittelst der Naturgestze."

<sup>6</sup> Hume says (*Essays, Moral, Political and Literary*, edited by T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, 1875, vol. ii, p. 94): "The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), that no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish: And even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior." In concluding his essay on "Miracles" Hume says (*Ibid.*, p. 108): "So that, upon the whole, we may conclude that the Christian Religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by any reasonable person without one. Mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its verity: and whoever is moved by Faith to assent to it, is conscious of a continued miracle in his own person, which subverts all the principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to custom and experience."

<sup>7</sup> In criticising Hume's argument, Huxley admits the possibility of a

character of an event depends not on the evidence,—which establishes simply the occurrence of the event, or on the opinion expressed in the evidence,—which may be erroneous, but on the causal judgment.<sup>8</sup>

But although the possibility of miracle be admitted and a reasonable view of the character of the evidence necessary to accredit it be held, still our knowledge of miracle is not experiential but is based upon the experience of others. To us the course of nature appears uniform and the splendid structure of modern science is built upon this hypothesis. Lotze says:<sup>9</sup> "It is only to the modern conception of Nature

miracle as "a conceivable event", but changes its nature by resting in agnosticism regarding any cause which transcends nature. He says (*Collected Essays*, vol. vi, *Hume, with Helps to the Study of Berkeley*, 1894, p. 157): "To sum up, the definition of a miracle as a suspension or a contravention of the order of Nature is self-contradictory, because all we know of the order of Nature is derived from our observation of the course of events of which the so-called miracle is a part. On the other hand, no conceivable event, however extraordinary, is impossible; and therefore, if by the term miracles we mean only 'extremely wonderful events', there can be no just ground for denying the possibility of their occurrence." In order to prove the occurrence of a miracle Huxley insists upon competent or expert testimony (*Ibid.*, p. 163).

<sup>8</sup> If it could be shown that an event established by adequate historical evidence and described as a miracle was really explicable by purely natural causes, it would cease to be a miracle. Spinoza sought to interpret the Biblical miracles as poetic descriptions in which the second causes were omitted (*op. cit.*, pp. 453f.: "ostendi enim, Scripturam res non docere per proximas suas causas, sed tantum res eo ordine iisque phrasibus narrare, quibus maxime homines, et præcipue plebem, ad devotionem movere potest; et hac de causa de Deo et de rebus admodum improprie loquitur, quia nimirum non Rationem convincere, sed hominum phantasiam et imaginationem afficere et occupare studet. Si enim Scriptura vastationem alicujus imperii, ut historici politici solent, narraret, id plebem nihil commoveret; at contra maxime, si omnia poëtice depingat et ad Deum referat, quod facere solet."). On the relation of the evidence for miracle and the causal judgment, cf. B. B. Warfield in *Bible Student*, vol. vii, April, 1903, p. 194, and Rothe, quoted by C. M. Mead, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

<sup>9</sup> *Microcosmus*. Translated from the German by E. Hamilton and E. E. Constance Jones, 1885, vol. ii, pp. 478f. Wernle says (*Einführung in das theologische Studium*, 1908, p. 38): "Was das Wort Gesetz naturwissenschaftlich bedeutet, darüber muss einer klar sein ein für



that a miracle seems really miraculous, for this conception recognizes no impulse of which the result does not follow necessarily and according to general laws from a pre-existing collocation of conditions. At the same time, those who hold this view of Nature are in a position to admit the general possibility of miracles in as far as the idea corresponds to a mental need, although they may lack faith to believe in them as recorded in Scripture. For to them, too, the whole course of Nature becomes intelligible only by supposing the continual concourse of God, who alone mediates the action and reaction going on between different parts of the world. It is only as long as this concourse takes place in similar ways that it (being then a constant condition in the course of events) does not appear as a condition of change; and as long as this is so the course of nature seems

allemaal. Es gilt alles Metaphysische daraus zu verbannen: das Gesetz erklärt nichts, es wirkt nichts, es ist eine beschreibende Formel, mit der wir eine Anzahl konstant übereinstimmender Beobachtungen auf den kürzesten Ausdruck bringen. Aber diese Beschreibung beansprucht lückenlos zu gelten, wo immer dieselben Bedingungen vorhanden sind. Der Astronom kann mit dem Gesetz Jahrtausende vorwärts und rückwärts die Bahnen der Planeten berechnen mit absoluter Sicherheit. Es kann die Wirkung einer Kraft durchkreuzt, kompensiert werden durch eine andere Kraft, aber dann ist das Ergebnis bloss die Resultante beider Kraftwirkungen und keine Aufhebung, sondern die Bestätigung des Gesetzes. Das gilt im ganzen Bereich der Körperwelt, von den Himmelskörpern bis zu den physikalischen und chemischen Vorgängen der allerkleinsten Lebewesen. Und nun kommt hinzu die weitgehende Uebereinstimmung, ja Identität der höchsten aufgefundenen Gesetze, und die durch die Erforschung bestätigte Aufstellung des Grundgesetzes der Erhaltung der Materie und der Erhaltung der Kraft. Kein Wunder, dass dieses Naturgesetz die Stelle Gottes sich erobert hat und der Versuch gewagt wurde, von ihm aus eine Metaphysik der Gesamtwelt zu entwerfen. Strenge Wissenschaft hat damit nichts zu tun, sie weiss, dass jede gewonnene Erkenntnis ihr neue Aufgaben und Rätsel stellt und dass das Unbegrenzte ihr Feld ist. Aber was sie exakt leistet, ist gerade genug, um den Theologen einzuprägen, was für ein dem Urchristentum samt Jesus gänzlich unbekanntes Erkenntnisgebiet uns hier erschlossen ist, das für jede Weltanschauung und so auch die religiöse, ernste Würdigung verlangt. Das alte Weltbild von Wunder und Willkur, mit dem der christliche Glaube aufwuchs, ist für immer zerbrochen." And again (*Ibid.*, p. 276): "Erst durch die allgemeine Klarstellung der starren Naturge-

to be a self-contained whole, that does not need, nor experience, nor admit interference from without. But any view which admits a divine life that is not fixed in rigid immutability, will also be able to understand the eternal divine course as a variable quantity, the transforming influence of which becomes prominent at particular times, showing that the course of nature is not independent. And this being the case, the completely conditioning causes of miracles will be found in God and Nature together, and in that eternal action and reaction between them, which is not simply ordered according to general laws; it is this idea only, and not the idea of complete fortuitousness and arbitrariness, which the mind frames of a miracle when it would see in it an object of reverence. But the recognition of this general thought does

setzlichkeit mit ihrer erdrückenden Allgewalt wird der hohle Aufklärungsoptimismus und Monismus erschüttert, die Sehnsucht nach Freiheit und Erlösung, nach realem Gotteserlebnis erweckt, und der Durchgang geöffnet nach der Ewigkeitsseite. Gerade der historische Relativismus muss dazu dienen, die Menschheit nach bleibender Wahrheit und ewigen Werten schreien zu machen, und ihr die Augen zu öffnen für die Herrlichkeit des Glaubens und des in ihm begründeten, frohen, festen Kindesgehorsams." And again, reversing his order (*Ibid.*, p. 272): "Nicht Materialismus—das ist selbst ein Rest alter Metaphysik—sondern Positivismus, strikte Beschränkung auf das Erfahrungswissen mit höchstens hypothetischem Vorausgreifen, ist ihre [die Naturforschung] Signatur. Der oberste Eindruck aber dieses Erfahrungswissens, der unwillkürlich zur Weltanschauung treibt, ist derjenige der absoluten Gesetzmässigkeit, des lückenlosen Kausalnexus von Ursache und Wirkung nach dem Gesetz der Erhaltung der Energie und des Stoffes. Dadurch ist nicht der Gottesgedanke in irgendwelchem Sinn ausgeschlossen, wohl aber der Glaube an irgend ein Freies, Schöpferisches, Erlösendes, und damit das Geheimnis der Religion. Und wo nicht klare philosophische Ueberlegung sich einstellt, dass ja diese ganze Naturerkenntnis die Realität des erkennenden Bewusstseins, also des Geistes, voraussetzt, da schwindet notwendig auch der idealistische Glaube und ist die Wirkung des naturwissenschaftlichen Positivismus derjenigen des Materialismus gleich; auch der in der Psychologie eine Zeitlang offiziell gewordene psychophysische Parallelismus läuft auf eine strikte Naturalisierung des Geisteslebens hinaus, die jedes Freie und Neue zu blossem Schein eines solchen herabdrückt. Also nicht um biblische Wundergeschichten, . . . handelt es sich heute . . . sondern um die Realität des Geistes und die Möglichkeit und Wirklichkeit freien, realen und erlösenden Verkehrs zwischen Gottes Geist und unserem Geist."

not suffice to lead Natural Science to a recognition of the reality of miracles in the form in which religion generally demands it. So immeasurably preponderant is the weight of all experience in favour of a steady development of all natural occurrences, each step preparing the way for that which succeeds it, that even this general admission prepares the mind to believe only in a noiseless, ceaseless working of God in Nature, not in sudden interruptions of the established order by occasional interferences of divine power. Such a belief could only arise if the ideal significance of miracles in the system of the universe were sufficiently clear and important to cause us to regard them as a turning point in history, for which the efficient forces of the universe had always been preparing unperceived."

Rightly to understand the miracle it must be viewed in its relation to an order of which it forms a part. As an effect in the external world wrought immediately by the power of God, it is not less rational than the order of nature. It is, therefore, improperly described as "arbitrary" and "fortuitous", as a "sudden interruption of the established order by occasional interferences of divine power". Equally with the order of nature, the order of grace has its origin, stability and efficiency in the wisdom and power of God. But the order of grace is manifested in the order of nature because the purpose of the one includes the other. For the order of grace is related to the ethical and religious welfare of man, and man has part in the order of nature. The deepest principle of miracle,—that in which its purpose and significance, its ultimate reason, appears, is the saving will of God. This principle gives to miracle its ideal significance; it unifies the Biblical miracles and constitutes the ground of their preëminent claim on the attention of men; and as the highest expression of it, the resurrection of Jesus is just "the turning point in history for which the efficient forces of the universe had always been preparing".<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Leibnitz, as quoted by A. Campbell Frazer in *Philosophy of Theism*, 2d ed., 1899, p. 303, says: "I hold that when God works



Historical Criticism cannot avoid the principal question in regard to the possibility of miracle. If Historical Criticism be defined as a science and its principles be thought inadequate to solve the question, adequate principles must be sought in some philosophy of history. These will determine the point of view from which the investigation of the evidence for any miracle must be conducted. If this point of view be fixed by a philosophy based upon the Biblical conception of God, Historical Criticism must admit the possibility of miracle. The occurrence of any particular miracle must then be decided by the evidence. In this sense Lotze's view that God and nature are the two conditioning elements in the miracle is true: for only on a theistic view of the universe can the possibility of miracle be maintained, and only by evidence for the occurrence of such an event in nature can the reality of the miracle be established.

In studying the origin of Christianity, Historical Criticism has to investigate and pass judgment upon the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus. The results of this investigation will differ necessarily as the underlying philosophy differs. But even if the validity of the theistic point of view be admitted, there may still be difference of opinion in regard to the sufficiency of the evidence either in quantity or in quality. For the possibility of miracle may be admitted as a reasonable, or as a highly improbable, or, in respect of its relation to Christian faith of today, as an altogether unimportant hypothesis;—and the issues at this point concern just the nature of Christianity or what is commonly called the “essence of Christianity”.<sup>11</sup>

miracles He does it, not in order to supply the wants of *nature* but those of *grace*.” Dr. A. Kuyper also says (*Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology*, translated from the Dutch by J. H. De Vries, 1898, p. 428): “Creation and re-creation, nature and grace, separate, so far as the concrete appearance in the practical application is concerned, but both in the counsel of God and in the potentialities of being they have one root.”

<sup>11</sup> What was and what is the object of Christian faith? What the efficient cause of Christianity? What significance has historical fact for doctrine? What the relation of doctrine to fact and what the value

There is little difference of opinion about the extent of the documentary evidence for the resurrection and there is general agreement in regard to the inferior quality of the extra-canonical.<sup>12</sup> I Cor. xv and the four Gospels constitute the primary evidence.

The New Testament writings, from the earliest epistles of Paul, witness pervasively to the belief of the primitive Church in the resurrection of Jesus.<sup>13</sup> The fact underlying this belief was regarded as so certain that Paul made its admission the premise of his argument against those who denied the resurrection of believers (I Cor. xv. 12ff). In respect of this fact there is no trace of any difference of opinion between Paul and the original Apostles or the Jerusalem Church. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, written about 55 A. D., Paul reminds the Corinthians that this fact constituted an element in his preaching and in their faith when he was first with them, and that even at that time his preaching of it was the expression not merely of a conviction

of each for Christian life? These are some of the fundamental questions involved in the issue. On this subject, *cf.* especially: W. Herrmann, *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschichtlicher Thatsachen?* 1892; M. Kähler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*, 1896; R. A. Lipsius, "Die Bedeutung des Historischen im Christentum" in *Glauben und Wissen*, 1897, pp. 111ff.; A. Harnack, "Christentum und Geschichte", 1896, in *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1904, 2te Band, pp. 1ff., and *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 56 bis 60. Tausend, 1908, especially Neunte Vorlesung, pp. 96ff.; M. Reischle, "Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens auf den 'geschichtlichen' Jesus Christus", in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 1897, pp. 171ff.; Th. Häring, "Gehört die Auferstehung Jesu zum Glaubensgrund?" etc., *Ibid.*, pp. 332ff.; Th. Häring and M. Reischle, "Glaubensgrund und Auferstehung", *Ibid.*, 1898, pp. 129ff.; G. Vos, "Christian Faith and the Truthfulness of Bible History" in *THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, 1906, pp. 289ff.; C. W. Hodge, "Fact and Theory" in *Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, i, pp. 562ff.

<sup>12</sup> On the extra-canonical evidence *cf.* A. Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905, pp. 59ff.

<sup>13</sup> I Thess. i. 10; iv. 14; Gal. i. 1; I Cor. vi. 14; xv. 4ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 14; v. 15; Rom. i. 4; iv. 24f.; vi. 4f.; viii. 11; x. 9; Phil. iii. 10; Col. ii. 12; Eph. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 8; I Pet. i. 3, 21; iii. 21; Acts i. 22; ii. 24, 32; iii. 15, 26; iv. 10, 33; v. 30; x. 40f.; xiii. 30, 33f., 37; xvii. 31; Matt. xxviii. 1ff.; Mk. xvi. 1ff.; Lk. xxiv. 1ff.; Jno. xx. 1ff.; xxi. 1ff.

grounded in his personal experience, but also of a tradition which he had received. There is no reason to doubt that Paul received this tradition from the Jerusalem Church through its leaders.<sup>14</sup> He was acquainted with the Christian movement before his conversion and had been present three years afterwards in Jerusalem, where he had associated with Peter and had seen James, the brother of the Lord,—the two men whose names appear in his report of this tradition (I Cor. xv. 5ff; cf. Gal. i. 18f).

The four canonical Gospels contain accounts of the resurrection. The Synoptic Gospels were written not later than 70-80 A. D., and probably about 60-70 A. D. They embody a still older tradition, and it is impossible by literary criticism to get back of them to a source containing an account of Jesus' death without an account of His resurrection.<sup>15</sup> Whatever may be the literary relations of the Synoptic Gospels in other sections, in these sections the form of the resurrection narratives makes the theory of direct dependence or dependence on a common source extremely improbable. The Fourth Gospel, though written toward the close of the first century, contains a supplementary tradition coming from the Apostle John. All the Gospels, beside their testimony to the fact of the resurrection, witness also to the fact that His resurrection as well as His death entered into Jesus' conception of His Messianic work.<sup>16</sup>

The original ending of the Gospel of Mark has been lost.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup>This is maintained by Weizsäcker, who, however, argues from Paul's silence against the primitive character of the Gospel narratives (*Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 2te Aufl., 1892, pp. 4ff.).

<sup>15</sup>Ramsay's view that "the lost common source of Luke and Matthew" [Q] "was written while Christ was still living" (*Expositor*, 1907, i, p. 424), as well as Harnack's view that this source did not contain an account of the passion (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 1907), seem to me untenable. Cf. Burkitt in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1906-7, p. 454.

<sup>16</sup>Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 21; xvii. 9, 22; xxi. 32; Mk. viii. 31; ix. 9, 31; x. 34; xiv. 28; Lk. ix. 22; xviii. 33; Jno. ii. 19, 22.

<sup>17</sup>The phenomena of the transmitted text are opposed to the view of Rohrbach (*Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums*, 1894; *Die Berichte*

The Gospel ends abruptly after the account of the resurrection and the appearance of the angel to the women. Two other endings have been transmitted. The longer ending, preserved in a double form, is composite in character, dependent on Luke and John, and was added (in its more primitive form) to the Gospel early in the second century. The shorter ending was added at a later time. The Gospel of Peter, after a docetic description of the resurrection, breaks off in the midst of an account of the disciples preparing to go fishing. The Gospel according to the Hebrews describes an appearance to James, the Lord's brother (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 6). The Syriac Didascalia (c. 300)<sup>18</sup> recounts an appearance to the disciples in the house of Levi. The Christian recension of the Ascension of Isaiah (2nd cent.)<sup>19</sup> iii. 13ff., gives an account of the resurrection similar in some respects to that of the Gospel of Peter. A Coptic Gospel (2nd cent.)<sup>20</sup> narrates an appearance to Mary and Martha at the sepulchre and, like the longer ending of the Gospel of Mark, emphasizes the unbelief of the disciples and Jesus' rebuke,—Peter and Andrew sharing with Thomas the distinction of receiving from Jesus tangible evidence of the reality of His resurrection-body.<sup>21</sup>

über die Auferstehung Jesu, 1898) and Harnack (*Gesch. d. altchr. Lit.* ii, *Die Chronologie*, i, p. 696), that the original ending of the Gospel was intentionally removed. Cf. Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 1908, pp. 28f.

<sup>18</sup> Achelis und Flemming, *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, Zweites Buch. "Die syrische Didaskalia" in Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F., x. B. H. 2, 1904, Cap. xxi, pp. 107ff; cf. A. Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905, p. 76; Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 1904, pp. 292ff.

<sup>19</sup> Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 1900, pp. 18ff.; cf. A. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

<sup>20</sup> C. Schmidt, "Eine bisher unbekannte altchristliche Schrift in koptischer Sprache" in *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1895, pp. 705ff.; Harnack, "Ein jüngst entdeckten Auferstehungsbericht" in *Theologische Studien B. Weiss dargebracht*, 1897, pp. 1ff.; Hennecke, *op. cit.*, pp. 38f.; A. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 81ff.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also the reading in the old Latin MS. k in Mk. xvi. 4 in

There is little difference of opinion about the relative value of this evidence. The genuineness of I Corinthians is generally admitted and its date is fixed approximately. The primacy of its witness is widely recognized. The early date of the other New Testament writings and the fact that the Synoptic Gospels embody a still earlier tradition is also generally admitted. In comparison with these the Apocryphal Gospels possess only secondary value,—reflecting ideas of the second century or later, their character also making it extremely improbable that any elements of primitive tradition which they may contain have escaped distortion.

The Gospels contain prophetic announcements by Jesus of His resurrection on the third day; and all the primary evidence is agreed in representing Jesus as put to death by crucifixion, as buried, as rising on the third day, and as appearing to various persons and bearing witness to His resurrection. The Gospels mention the empty grave and the book of Acts a period of forty days<sup>22</sup> between the resurrection and the ascension. The disciples, though at first doubting, were convinced of the resurrection and, in confident faith in Jesus as the risen Messiah, founded a Messianic community in Jerusalem which, recognizing Jesus as Lord, looked to Him for the forgiveness of their sins and the glorious consummation of the Messianic kingdom.

The documentary evidence for the resurrection is the same in kind as that by which the mode of Jesus' death is witnessed.<sup>23</sup> Both events belong to the order of grace and the

---

Tischendorf, *Nov. Test. Gr. ed. viii crit. mai.*, cited by A. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

<sup>22</sup> Acts i. 3.

<sup>23</sup> In respect of the Gospels, it is impossible to get back to a source which contained an account of the death without an account of the resurrection of Jesus, whatever may be thought of the content of Q. Lake, writing on "The Date of Q" in the *Expositor* for June, 1909, pp. 494ff., argues that this source (or sources) of Matthew and Luke comes from a time when the resurrection had little if any personal importance for Christians. He seems to favor a date before 1 Corinthians, but hesitates about a definite date because of the uncertainty concerning Q's relation to Pauline ideas. He definitely rejects Ramsay's view (p. 502; see above, note 14), but thinks it theoretically



totality of evidence that supports the reality of God's revealing and redemptive intervention on man's behalf in the establishment of true religion in the world raises a strong presumption in favor of the reality of the resurrection. The Old Testament conception of religion as an ethical relation between God and man grounded in God's own gracious act, and the Messianic ideas prophetic of a future in which God would manifest His saving power, entered into the thought of Jesus in the work that He did in introducing the kingdom of God. Equally with the Pauline and Johannine conceptions, the portraiture of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels is not marred but only completed by the resurrection. As the culmination of the progressive revelation of God's saving will, the resurrection is the fact on the basis of which the Gospel message of God's redemptive love began its course in the Christian Church. This fact alone brings to its triumphant conclusion the death of Jesus for men; it alone adequately explains the origin and character of the primitive Christian faith and message; and it alone makes possible a consistent account of the early Christian literature, in which it is so firmly embedded.<sup>24</sup>

possible that Q might have been written on the day of the resurrection (p. 503). He is not certain that Q contained no account of the passion including the resurrection, but constructs his view of its date on this hypothesis (p. 498). Yet he admits that Q implies knowledge of and belief in the death and resurrection (p. 502); only it represents a stage of thought when the resurrection was not a matter of importance,—a very early stage. During this time the thought of the early Christians was dominated by the expectation of the coming of the Messiah in glory. The duration of this period cannot have been long, if there ever was such a period. The thought of the resurrection of believers was expounded to the Thessalonians very shortly after the founding of the Church there. Apparently Lake thinks a much longer interval elapsed in Jerusalem, although he appeals to the Thessalonian Epistles in support of his general hypothesis.

<sup>24</sup> Writing on "The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism", F. H. Chase says (*Cambridge Theological Essays*, 1905, p. 401): "If we seriously believe in the Resurrection, we regard it as an event in which the ultimate realities of the world and of life are involved; it is a reconciliation of the antitheses of spirit and matter.

"Of two further considerations historical criticism is bound, if it

The faith of the disciples in Jesus as the Messiah was the principle which differentiated early Christianity from Judaism. This faith rested ultimately upon the self-revelation of Jesus. It included a firm conviction respecting two facts,—the death and the resurrection of Jesus. The different forms of Historical Criticism which do not deny the existence of Jesus generally agree that the fact of Jesus' death lies at the basis of one of these elements of primitive Christian faith; but in respect to the factual basis of the other equally distinctive and equally primitive element they reach divergent results.<sup>25</sup>

faces the whole position, to take account. It cannot overlook the fact that the Lord was morally no ordinary man; that He claimed to be in a unique relation to God and to men, and to reveal God to men. And in the second place it must take into account the sequel of the Resurrection. The Resurrection is the one explanation of the existence of the Christian Church. On the basis of a belief in the Resurrection the Christian Society arose and has lived, at times seeming to sin against its first principles, yet surviving; again and again in the hour of its apparent decrepitude renewing its youth, proving itself a moral power able to regenerate men of every type, of every race, of every age. The Resurrection cannot be separated from the effects which have flowed from it through all the Christian centuries.

"The whole historical evidence for the Resurrection of our Lord, critically examined, is, I solemnly believe, adequate. But no historical evidence can compel men to believe that an alleged event in the past actually took place. From the nature of the case such evidence can only establish its probability. If the alleged event belongs to the sphere of religion, when historical criticism has done its work, the result becomes the material on which religious faith works. Faith in the living God alone enables us to discern the congruity of the Resurrection, to realise it, and to know in our lives its power."

<sup>25</sup> Wernle says (*Einführung in das theologische Studium*, 1908, p. 159): "Aber zur äusseren Geschichte werden von vielen Wunderfrage und Auferstehungsproblem gerechnet, da es sich hier um Facta, nicht um Glaubensgedanken handle. Nun, gerade das ist die Frage. Was nämlich im Kampf um die Geschichtlichkeit aller dieser Wunder, die Auferstehung eingerechnet, als ausschlaggebendes Material vorliegt, sind ja nie und nirgends jene wunderbare Facta selbst, sondern immer nur der Wunderglaube, der aus den Zeugnissen redet. Darüber sollte man sich allmählich von beiden Seiten klar werden: nicht die Facta selbst, sondern spätere Zeugnisse gläubiger Schriftsteller darüber sind uns gegeben. Diese Zeugnisse von den Wundern, diesen Wunderglauben soll die Forschung zu erklären suchen. Die konservative

The fundamental point at which the two generic forms of Historical Criticism diverge is not the belief of the early disciples in the resurrection or even the cause of that belief, but the truth of the belief,—its correspondence with reality. The positive theories agree with certain forms of the negative theories that Jesus was Himself the efficient cause of the disciples' belief, but they differ in respect to the validity of the form of this belief.<sup>26</sup>

Forschung glaubt, zu dieser Erklärung genüge der Rekurs auf die Wahrhaftigkeit der Zeugen und dementsprechend auf wunderbare Facta, die der Bericht wahrheitsgetreu wiedergebe, während die Kritik eine Menge anderer Faktoren: die wundergläubige Disposition, die Möglichkeit der Verschiebung des Tatbestandes von einem Bericht zum andern, den Einfluss fertiger Wunderbilder aus AT und anderen Religionen, überhaupt die verschiedensten Formen der Täuschung und Entstellung mit in Betracht will gezogen haben, welche die Geschichtsforschung für jedes andere Gebiet selbstverständlich in Rechnung zieht. Darüber ist nun ein Jahrhundert lang gestritten worden und wird auch künftig gestritten werden, da auf beiden Seiten dogmatische oder philosophische Axiome sich gegenüberstehen."

<sup>26</sup>The theory of objective visions permits a causal relation between the activity of Jesus within the sphere of supersensible, spiritual realities and the faith of the disciples in the resurrection, but it explains the reality underlying this faith in terms of immortality. Wernle says (*Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, 2te Aufl., 1904, p. 82): "Das Urteil über diese Erscheinungen [*i. e.*, "zuerst in Galiläa, dann in Jerusalem", *Ibid.*, p. 81; but *cf.*, on the place of the appearances, *THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, 1907, *iff.*] hängt ab vom Zutrauen zu Paulus und seinem Berichterstatter, mehr noch vom philosophischen und religiösen Standort, vom 'Glauben' des Beurteilers. Rein wissenschaftliche Erwägungen können da nicht entscheiden, wo es sich um das Ja oder Nein der unsichtbaren Welt und die Möglichkeit des Verkehrs mit Geistern handelt. Daüber sind auch alle Erklärungsversuche, deren Grundlage das Axiom bildet, dass unsere sinnenfällige Welt die einzige Realität ist, notwendig und überzeugend nur für den Erklärer selbst. Der christliche Glaube rechnet immer mit der Realität des Jenseits, das unser Ziel ist; es macht daher für den Christen gar keine Schwierigkeit, das wirkliche, durch eine Vision vermittelte Hineinragen Jesu in unsere Welt für den Grund des Auferstehungsglaubens anzunehmen.

"Aus einem anderen Grund kann sich der Historiker mit dieser Annahme, selbst wenn er sie billigt, nicht begnügen. Der bloße Glaube an dieses Wunder macht die Entstehung des Christentums von einem Zufall abhängig, als wäre ohne diese Geschichte die Sache Jesu untergegangen. Aber in der Person Jesu war eine so gewaltige, siegesmächtige

The negative theories seek by means of certain methods of Historical Criticism to get back of the witness of the primary documentary evidence to a more primitive tradition and back of this to its factual basis. And as the factual basis of primitive Christian faith is dissolved, the difficulties of accounting for Christianity and the literary documentation of its faith are increased. Help is sought on every hand. The older theories of fraud or swoon soon gave place to the theory of visions, subjective or objective; and the theory of legendary origin from Old Testament influences is now being enriched from the treasures of oriental mythology.

The regressive methods of this form of Historical Criticism are exemplified by P. W. Schmiedel in the articles on the "Gospels" and on the "Resurrection- and Ascension-Narratives" in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, and by Arnold Meyer and Kirsopp Lake in their recent books on the resurrection.<sup>27</sup> The competency of these methods to validate

tige Erlöserkraft, die durch den schmachvollen Tod doch auf keine Weise zu vernichten war. . . . Mag er [i. e., Jesus] daher auch durch Erscheinungen zur Sammlung [i. e., der Jünger] geholfen haben,—dass diese Erscheinungen wirkten, war die Folge des früheren erlösenden Eindrucks, der durch den Tod nicht zu zerstören war. Der Auferstehungsglaube ist die Frucht der Erlösung durch Jesus."

<sup>27</sup> Arnold Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, 1905. Kirsopp Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1907. The distinguishing feature of Lake's book is the attempt to solve the problems of Historical Criticism by means of the eminently sound methods which characterize the work of Westcott and Hort in Textual Criticism. These methods, however, are subjected to some modification and in their application in another sphere by Lake they escape the numerous objective tests which made them productive of such valuable results in the reconstruction of the text of the New Testament. For the determination of the traditional and intrinsic probability of different historical traditions coming from different sources is a much more subjective process than the determination of the transcriptional and intrinsic probability of divergent texts, descended from a common original by ordinary transmission and represented in numerous manuscripts, versions, etc. Transcriptional probability is based upon a wide induction of scribal methods; and intrinsic probability upon a careful study of an author's thought and expression. In its application this method passes from readings to manuscripts and then to groups and all this is supplemented by genealogical evidence, the final decision

the results of the negative theories must be tested in their concrete application.

The negative theories cannot and do not rest simply in the judgment that the evidence is insufficient to establish the fact of the resurrection. They seek also to explain the origin of Christian faith and of its literary embodiment. In this constructive work they endeavor to disclose an adequate cause for an admitted effect. In doing so they have to show not merely a possible but an actual, or, at least, a highly probable relation of cause and effect. The insufficiency of the subjective vision hypothesis to explain the faith of the disciples is partially overcome by the hypothesis of objective visions. But this does not explain all the elements in the documentary evidence and fails to account for the form of the disciples' belief. The mythological theories are now seeking the origin of Christian faith in some pre-Christian sketch of Jesus,<sup>28</sup> in the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic,<sup>29</sup> in the solar myth of Bel or Marduk,<sup>30</sup> or generally in the syncretism of pre-Christian Judaism.<sup>31</sup>

in each case being reached only as the result of a testing which seeks to establish both the general character and the particular value of each witness to any variant from a supposedly common and homogeneous original.

<sup>28</sup> Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 1904, p. 128; cf. W. B. Smith, *Der Vorchristliche Jesus*, 1906, pp. 1ff., and Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, p. 93.

<sup>29</sup> Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, 1906, especially pp. 1024ff. Jensen says (*Ibid.*, p. 1029): "Ja, Jesus von Nazareth, an den, als an Gottes Sohn und Erlöser der Welt, wenigstens seit bald zwei Jahrtausenden, aber vielleicht schon viel länger, eine Christenheit glaubt, und in dem auch die fortgeschrittenste Wissenschaft unserer Tage wenigstens noch einen grossen Menschen sieht, der einmal als ein hohes Vorbild auf Erden wandelte und starb, dieser Jesus hat niemals auf Erden gewandelt, ist niemals auf Erden gestorben, weil er ja Nichts wie ein israelitischer Gilgamesch ist, Nichts wie ein Seitenstück zu Abraham, zu Moses und zu unzähligen anderen Gestalten der Sage."

<sup>30</sup> Zimmern-Winckler-Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das alte Testament*, 3te Aufl., 1903, pp. 377ff. H. Radau, *Bel, The Christ of Ancient Times*, 1908, pp. 31ff.

<sup>31</sup> Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, pp. 76ff.



And these theories are supposed not to impoverish but to enrich Christianity. Gunkel says:<sup>32</sup> "Christianity is a syncretistic religion. Powerful religious influences, which had come from foreign sources, are preserved in it and transfigured, both oriental and Hellenistic. For the characteristic, we may even say, the providential thing about Christianity is the fact that it experienced its classical period in the world-historical hour when it passed from the oriental to the Hellenic world. . . . Immediately after the death of Jesus these foreign religious influences must have streamed into the Christian community. . . . The Christianity that was destined to be preached to many peoples was not itself the product of one people only, but grew out of a great and extremely complex history of many peoples. 'Judaism was the retort in which the different elements were collected.' If, therefore, Christianity 'is recognized as the necessary product of the evolution of the re-

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95ff. "Das Christentum ist eine synkretistische Religion. Starke religiöse Motive, die aus der Fremde gekommen waren, sind in ihm enthalten und zur Verklärung gediehen, orientalische und hellenistische. Denn das ist das Charakteristische, wir dürfen sagen, das Providentielle am Christentum, dass es seine klassische Zeit in der weltgeschichtlichen Stunde erlebt hat, als es aus dem Orient in das Griechentum übertrat. . . . Unmittelbar nach Jesu Tode müssen diese fremden religiösen Motive in die Gemeinde Jesu eingeströmt sein. . . . Das Christentum, das bestimmt war, vielen Völkern gepredigt zu werden, war selber nicht von einem Volke erzeugt worden, sondern war aus einer grossen und vielverschlungenen Geschichte vieler Völker erwachsen. 'Das Judentum aber war die Retorte, in welcher die verschiedenen Elemente gesammelt wurden' (Bousset, *Religion des Judentums* s. 493). Wenn demnach das Christentum 'erkannt wird als das notwendige Entwicklungsprodukt des religiösen Geistes unserer Gattung, auf dessen Bildung die ganze Geschichte der alten Welt hinstrebte, in dessen Ausgestaltung alle geistigen Erträge des Orients und Occidents ihre Verwertung und zugleich Veredelung und Harmonisierung gefunden haben: dann ist das', so sagen wir mit Pfeiderer (*Urchristentum* 2te Aufl. i. s. vii), 'die grossartigste und solideste Apologie des Christentums, die sich [auf geschichtlichen Standpunkt] denken lässt'. Dann sieht man, dass es kein Zufall gewesen ist, wenn dieser Glaube die Welt überwunden und eine neue Epoche in der Geschichte der Menschheit heraufgeführt hat, sondern dass sich darin eine höhere geschichtliche Notwendigkeit offenbart".

ligious spirit of our race, toward the forming of which the whole history of the ancient world was striving, in the shaping of which all the spiritual attainments of the orient and occident have been made useful and at the same time ennobled and harmonized; then that is,' so say we with Pfeid-erer, 'the grandest and most solid apology for Christianity that can be conceived [from the historical standpoint]'. For we can see that it was not mere chance that this faith overcame the world and brought in a new epoch in the history of mankind, but that therein was revealed a higher historical necessity".

To those who conceive of Christianity as "the necessary product of the evolution of the religious spirit of our race" there is much that is attractive in this theory of the universal origin of what was destined to become universal in effect. But the theory does not enrich,—it simply changes the New Testament conception both of the origin and of the nature of Christianity. And this is the ultimate issue in the question concerning the resurrection of Jesus. The evolutionary conception of Christianity changes the nature of Christianity from a supernatural to a natural religion, from a religion grounded in the revealing and saving activity of God to a religion which is the expression of human thought and aspiration accompanying man's sense of dependence on a higher power. And it does this not by liberating Christianity from a hurtful association of the "eternal truths of reason" with "accidental truths of history", or by freeing it from an antiquated view of God's relation to the order of nature, but—in the historical sphere—primarily by changing the Christian conception of the person and work of Jesus and of the ground of Christian faith.

In the New Testament conception of Jesus' person and work the resurrection forms an essential element. If this element be eliminated the whole conception must be transformed. In reviewing recent results in the Historical Criti-

cism of the Gospels Jülicher says:<sup>33</sup> "All of our tradition about Jesus, Mark and Q not excepted, shows primitive history and new faith in inseparable union: the portraiture of Jesus in our Gospels not only manifests painful gaps; it is throughout covered with a varnish that here and there no longer permits the original features to appear." Under critical examination "the difference between Mark and his two successors has been astonishingly diminished".<sup>34</sup> "A great gulf separates not only the Johannine writings from the Synoptic Gospels, . . . but also the Synoptic from the real history of Jesus".<sup>35</sup> According to Harnack even Mark "has made of Jesus almost a divine ghost, or had found such a view already in existence".<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *Neue Linien in der Kritik der evangelischen Überlieferung*, 1906, pp. 70ff. "Alle unsre Überlieferung über Jesus, Marcus und Q nicht ausgenommen, zeigt alte Geschichte und neuen Glauben in unlösbarer Vereinigung: das Jesusbild unserer Evangelien weist nicht bloss schmerzliche Lücken auf, es ist durchweg von einem Firnis überzogen, der stellenweise von dem Ursprünglichen gar nichts mehr durchscheinen lässt." Cf. also F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909, pp. 140f.: "At best, perhaps, we can only hope to see Jesus, as it were, through the mist, ever thickening, of the opinions which the second and third generations of his followers formed of him. Between ourselves and him intervenes—earliest of our sources in point of time—Paul, with his apocalyptic preconceptions of what a Messiah had to be, with his turbid, swirling flood of obscure fancies, his epileptic ecstasy and private revelations. Next after him in order of time we have the non-Markan document, in which, as we have seen, we have almost certainly echoes, perhaps more than echoes, of his teaching. Nearly contemporary with this must be the saner parts of Mark's Gospel, for the greater part of that Gospel is the work of someone who was by instinct and predilection a miracle-monger. Finally, we have the Fourth Gospel, hardly less fabulous than the apocryphal rigmroles of the second and third century."

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69f. "Mit einigem Staunen sieht man, wie die Forschung der Neuesten den Abstand zwischen Marcus und seinem beiden Nachfolgern vermindert."

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70. ". . . ein tiefer Graben dagegen trennt nicht bloss, was noch im 19. Jahrhundert ausreichend erwiesen war, die Johannesschriftstellerei von der synoptischen, sondern nicht minder die synoptische Geschichte Jesu von der wirklichen."

<sup>36</sup> Quoted by Jülicher, *ibid.*, p. 70. ". . . er [Marcus] schon hat aus Jesus nahezu ein göttliches Gespenst gemacht oder eine solche Auffassung schon vorgefunden. . . ."

Thus the critical analysis of the Gospels discovers traces of the influence of Christian faith on the Gospel portraiture of Jesus—or, in other words, the existence of elements of the Christian conception of Jesus—in the earliest sources of Gospel tradition. But it insists that the real Jesus was different. Whence then came this Christian view? F. C. Conybeare finds its origin in the ecstatic visions of Paul;<sup>37</sup> others in the religious enthusiasm of the early Christian community in Jerusalem; others in pre-Christian mythological influences. When the effects of this view have been removed from the Gospel portraiture of Jesus, what is the nature of the real historical Jesus? According to Wellhausen, he was a Jewish rabbi, limited by the thought of his time; according to Schweitzer, a religious enthusiast, dominated by an erroneous dogmatic conception received from Jewish apocalyptic sources;<sup>38</sup> according to Kalthoff, this critically reconstructed Jesus has no reality, and the origin of the Gospel conception of Jesus is explained as the personification of religious ideals engendered by the hardships of social experience,—ideals which were pre-Christian in their beginnings, but especially wide-spread among the lower classes of the Graeco-Roman world and definitely formulated on Roman soil in the first and second centuries.<sup>39</sup> Even Wellhausen admits that the real historical Jesus of his own critical construction is an altogether inadequate cause of the Christian religion.<sup>40</sup> For the Jesus thus reached is merely a human Jesus,—a Jewish teacher. He did not even proclaim the Gospel of the Gospels; much less afford in himself a sufficient ground for the Gospel of the Epistles; for the Gospel means Christianity, and Jesus was not a Christian but a Jew. Yet while he was not free from the limitations of his time, he so far transcended them that the human in him was

<sup>37</sup> *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, 1909. Cf. *Expository Times*, 1908-9, vol. xx, no. 9, pp. 390f.

<sup>38</sup> *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906, especially pp. 327ff.

<sup>39</sup> *Das Christus-Problem*, 2te Aufl., 1903; *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1904; and *Was wissen wir von Jesus*, 1904.

<sup>40</sup> *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905, pp. 108ff.

more characteristic than the Jew. His person indeed made more impression than his teaching; but it was his martyrdom that made him historical. Nevertheless, it is quite impossible to understand Jesus apart from the historical effect which he produced, however little of this may have formed part of his intention. "Whence comes the faith that Jesus is the religious ideal except from Christianity? . . . Without the Gospel and without Paul, Judaism still clings to Jesus. . . . We cannot go back to him even though we would. . . . For that which we lose in giving up the Gospel, the historical Jesus regarded as the foundation of religion is a very doubtful and insufficient substitute. . . . The impression made by his career rests on the fact that it was not terminated, but rudely interrupted when it had scarcely begun."<sup>41</sup>

Manifestly the real creative force of Christianity was either such a person as the Gospels describe or the idea of such a person which had its origin in some other source.

Does the resurrection of Jesus enter then into the ground of Christian faith, or is it only a more or less indifferent element in the content of faith,—a part of that conception of Jesus which indeed made Christianity, but is itself of doubtful origin and certainly untrue of the so-called historical Jesus?

In this issue the central principle of Christianity is in-

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 114f. "Der historische Jesus wird, nicht erst seit gestern, zum religiösen Princip erhoben und gegen das Christentum ausgespielt. Reichlicher Anlass dazu, seine Absicht von seiner Wirkung zu unterscheiden, ist allerdings vorhanden. Trotzdem kann man ihn nicht ohne seine geschichtliche Wirkung begreifen, und wenn man ihn davon ablöst, wird man seiner Bedeutung schwerlich gerecht. Woher stammt überhaupt der Glaube, dass er das religiöse Ideal sei, anders als aus dem Christentum? . . . Ohne das Evangelium und ohne Paulus bleibt doch auch das Judentum an Jesus haften, an dem er festhielt, obwol er ihm entwachsen war. Wir können nicht zurück zu ihm, auch wenn wir wollten. . . . Für das was mit dem Evangelium verloren geht, ist der historische Jesus, als Grundlage der Religion, ein sehr zweifelhafter und ungenügender Ersatz. Ohne seinen Tod wäre er überhaupt nicht historisch geworden. Der Eindruck seiner Laufbahn beruht darauf, dass sie nicht abgeschlossen, sondern jäh unterbrochen wurde, nachdem sie kaum begonnen hatte."



volved. This principle has its source in the saving purpose of God; its occasion in the sinfulness of man; its revelation in the order of grace; and its realization in the life and work of Jesus. The final purpose of the life which was laid down on Calvary was the salvation of men. For Jesus came to seek and to save that which was lost and to give His life a ransom for many. In His triumph over death, the work which He did for our salvation was completed. Henceforth repentance and remission of sins were preached in His name. The resurrection of Jesus stands with His death in the center of the Gospel of salvation by grace. The "Easter faith" in the immortality of Jesus without the "Easter message" of His resurrection rests upon a different conception of the purpose of Jesus' life and work.<sup>42</sup> He came indeed to teach men the love of their heavenly Father; but he did not manifest in himself the power of that love to save. God alone is Saviour; and faith, stimulated by Jesus' message and life and faithfulness in death, lays hold upon God in the hope of His mercy and goodness. But faith in the risen Jesus receives Him as Saviour in the confidence that God's saving love was perfectly manifested in Him. The object of this faith is Jesus as a personal Saviour and all that belongs to Him as Saviour is part of the ground of faith. The resurrection cannot be separated from the spiritual benefits of this faith as a merely formal help to primitive Christianity or treated with indifference as a fact of some uncertainty and therefore to be excluded from the ground of Christian faith and certitude. The psychological genesis of faith in the individual may be differently occasioned, the content also of individual faith may differ, and it is not claimed that mere assent to an historical fact is Christian faith; but objectively considered, in respect of the realities lying at its basis and constituting its adequate grounding, not only the death but also the resurrection of Jesus belongs to the very essence of Christian faith.

<sup>42</sup>Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 56. bis 60. Tausend, 1908, pp. 101ff.

If Christ be not raised, then is Christian faith vain and for the sin of the world there is no message of peace. But now is Christ risen and become the author of spiritual life to those who receive Him as Saviour in simple faith.<sup>43</sup>

*Princeton.*

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

---

<sup>43</sup> Dr. James Denney's, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 1909, reached me after the preparation of this address; but reference may here be made to its discussion of the resurrection (pp. 98-143) and to its contribution to the subjects indicated in foot-note 11.