

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1914

KIKUYU, CLERICAL VERACITY AND MIRACLES

Kikuyu, clerical veracity and miracles: it might seem that no three topics could bear less intrinsic relation to one another. In point of fact they are connected by very natural bonds, and it was inevitable that the controversy aroused by the publication of the Bishop of Zanzibar's open letter at the end of last year¹ should run rapidly through stages which raised successively the three issues of intercommunion, the sincerity of clerical engagements, and the supernatural origin of Christianity. The bomb-shell which Dr. Weston cast into the Anglican camp was thus like one of those fire-work bombs of Chinese concoction, which explode first into a serpent, out of which is at once extruded a noisome reptile, while from that in turn proceeds a fiery dragon. Each successive stage of the controversy cuts more deeply and uncovers more clearly the canker which lies at the root of much of our modern Church-life. The question raised in its first stage concerns only the limits of proper Christian communion; the issue in the second stage is just common honesty; while what is at stake in the third stage is the very existence of Christianity. The three issues are necessarily implicated in one another because they are only varying phases and interacting manifestations of

¹*Ecclesia Anglicana*. For what does she stand? An Open Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Edgar, Lord Bishop of St. Albans. By Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar. 1914. Some curious details as to the publication of this letter may be read in the Christmas (1913) number of *The Christian Warfare* (Talbot & Co.), the organ of the Catholic Literature Association.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS*

Recent discussion of the beginnings of Christianity have set in clearer light the intimate relation of the death of Jesus in its redemptive significance and the resurrection of Jesus. This ought never to have been obscured since it is so plainly taught in the New Testament. But the uniqueness of the resurrection and the fundamental importance attached to it by Paul for the validity of the Gospel and of Christian faith and hope, and the manifestly causal relation which it sustained in the quickening and informing of the belief of the primitive Christian community, have given it a certain isolation as an object both of attack and defense in the course of the Christian centuries. The bond of union is primarily conceptual, but ultimately, if both are true, personal, since both are predicated of Jesus. It is this fact—their relation to Jesus—that gives them their significance. Entering thus into primitive Christian faith these two facts—the death and the resurrection of Jesus—have meaning for the early Apostolic conception not only of Jesus but also of His work.

But supposing these two elements to have formed part of the primitive Apostolic conception of Jesus—and the evidence for this can not be questioned—the origin of this conception and its validity are matters of the utmost concern since the issue involves the truthfulness of Christianity in its very inception. There is no reason to doubt and there is good evidence for believing that by this conception of Jesus, including these two facts, Christianity was constituted a religion of redemption; for Jesus was for Christian faith the Saviour in and through His death and resurrection.

Whence then came this faith? Was it grounded in experience and does it lay hold upon reality? If so, its origin and adequate cause can be no other than Jesus Himself. But if not, the origin either of the whole or of part of the

*Two lectures delivered at the Princeton Seminary Summer School of Theology in June, 1914.

conception must be sought in some idea which has transformed Jesus into the person possessed of the qualities and charged with the function ascribed to Him in primitive Christian faith.

The decision of this issue is certain if the primary historical evidence—the testimony of the New Testament writings—is trustworthy. This however is frequently questioned. It is necessary therefore to analyse the evidence and consider its implications. When these have been determined, the hypothesis of transformation must be tested. If this fails to account for the origin of Christian faith, the explanation which this faith gives of its own origin ought to be accepted and with it the character of the Christian religion which this involves.

There is of course a reason for the separation of the resurrection from the death of Jesus. The resurrection plainly implicates the supernatural and can have no place in a naturalistic interpretation of the origin of Christianity. The death of Jesus may however be accepted as a fact and fitted into such a construction. But this necessitates a modification of the New Testament representation both of Jesus' person and of the significance of His death, eliminating the divine element, of His person and the redemptive meaning of His death, transferring both to the sphere of idea or belief not grounded in reality but otherwise historically occasioned, and retaining as facts only a human person and his actual death.

It is not strange therefore that even from the naturalistic point of view an interpretation of the origin of Christianity should appear which insists upon the union of the death and the resurrection in a view of Jesus in which together these two elements have significance and of which they form an essential part. Only, on this interpretation, the New Testament conception of Jesus, not in part and not in particular by the inclusion of the resurrection but in its entirety, becomes either the transformation by apotheosis of an historical individual—a man, Jesus the prophet of Nazareth—

or the creation, the origination by personification, the mythological derivation of the Gospel portraiture of an incarnate suffering and rising Saviour God.

The latter alternative—the “radical” view—has the merit of being logically consistent though at the expense of being historically absurd. The New Testament representation of Jesus is held to be entirely mythical. No such person ever existed upon earth; for the person there described is distinctly a divine person and like other representations of divine persons participating in human affairs it too owes its origin to a mythological motive. In the background lies a solar or a vegetation myth historically mediated in a pre-Christian Jesus cult.

This view has been modified by combination with the other type of the naturalistic interpretation of the origin of Christianity, the “liberal” view, and thus creates an intermediate view, well represented by Maurenbrecher.¹ Admitting the existence of Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth, and the generally trustworthy character of the account of His life and teaching in the Synoptic Gospels within the limits of a purely human experience and critically freed from the influences of the later faith, it offers a mythological instead of a personal explanation of His apotheosis in the primitive Christian community.

This is related to the resurrection and to that union of the resurrection and death of Jesus in the experience of a single person and in the faith of the primitive Christian community concerning that person and the function of which he was believed to be possessed. The two generic views of the origin and character of Christianity, the supernaturalistic and the naturalistic, alike offer an explanation of the origin of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus as embodying an idea which does or which does not truly represent reality. The two genetic theories differ in regard to validity. But the issue is broader and deeper than the single element in

¹ *Von Nazareth nach Golgatha*, 1909 and *Von Jerusalem nach Rom*, 1910.

this belief—the resurrection—since this cannot be isolated from the person of whom it is predicated. In a word, the issue concerns the truth of primitive Christian Christology and thus the truth also of Christianity as a religion of redemption.

It is generally agreed that the primitive Christian community believed in the resurrection of Jesus, or rather, in Jesus who was crucified, who rose from the dead and was exalted to the place of supreme power in the Messianic Kingdom. There is general agreement also that the belief in the resurrection—and, of course, in the precedent death of Jesus—was the characteristic and determinative element in this faith. It is admitted that this faith implicates a Messianic background of prophecy or promise and a Messianic future of expectation and hope. The Jesus of whom the resurrection was believed was believed to be the Messiah. But here also the genetic problem presses and different views give different answers. Did Jesus Himself share and inspire this belief? And whether He did or not, what is the source of the Christian conception of the Messiah? Does this have its origin in the ideas of the Old Testament, or have contributions been made to it from other sources? In particular whence came the transcendent element in the Christian conception and the equally distinctive note of suffering and the triumphant issue in the resurrection? How early did this idea in its essential features form part of the Christian faith?

These are some of the questions that are raised by an historical investigation into the origin of the early Christian belief in the resurrection of Jesus. They would not be difficult to answer if the testimony of the New Testament were accepted; but there are many objections urged against this, especially its supernatural standpoint and Christian character. It is necessary therefore to examine the evidence and test its validity.

PAUL'S FAITH

An important consideration in determining the value of the historical evidence is the element of time. The Gospels as documents are later than the earlier Epistles of Paul, though the tradition which they embody is earlier than their literary composition. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians will furnish a starting point as its date may be fixed with reasonable certainty. It was written during Paul's stay in Ephesus about the year 55. From its statements it appears that the resurrection had formed part of Paul's original proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth. This was not later than the end of the year 51 or the beginning of the year 52. From Corinth Paul had written to the Church of the Thessalonians recalling "how ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come".² In agreement with Paul's statement concerning his Gospel, Luke records in Acts that the resurrection formed an element in Paul's message to the Athenians.³ It has been maintained by Norden⁴ that this address shows the influence of a type of religious discourse which was in use in Christian circles before the resurrection of Jesus had attained the significance it has in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But this is not affirmed of Paul; and it is extremely doubtful whether the abrupt termination of the speech warrants this conclusion.

There is no letter of Paul's which records or specifically alludes to the character of his Gospel on or at the time of his first missionary journey unless it be the Epistle to the Galatians and—on Lake's hypothesis⁵—the short recension of the Epistle to the Romans. If the South Galatian destination and a date as early as the Thessalonian Epistles or ear-

² 1 Thess. i. 9 f.

³ Acts xvii. 18, 31 f.

⁴ *Agnostos Theos*, 1913, p. 5.

⁵ *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 1911, pp. 362 ff.

lier be adopted, the Epistle to the Galatians would confirm the reference to the resurrection in Luke's account of Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch.^{5a} Even apart however from this theory of the destination and early date of the Epistle, the address and the autobiographical introduction make it impossible to suppose that this element was ever wanting in Paul's Gospel. It may therefore be traced with certainty at least to the time of Paul's activity in Antioch in the forties. Did it originate there or is it still earlier?

Pfleiderer suggests pagan influence both in the practice of the Antiochan Church, and, by conformation, also upon Paul; but he can scarcely mean origination. He says:⁶

In as much as religious practices are never made of nothing, we may well suppose that the Gentile Christians of Antioch still retained the old practices with which they had formerly celebrated the death and resurrection of their Lord Adonis and now transferred them to the new Lord Christ. Thus it happened naturally that Christ seemed the Lord who by His death and resurrection wrought the salvation of His own and became the Redeemer of the world. And now the Apostle Paul came to this new community whither he had been brought from his native city Tarsus by Barnabas. Soon he was at home there and labored with good success, so that the community rapidly increased. Thus it was certainly only natural that Paul also on his part adopted the practices and the conceptions which he found existing in the Gentile Christian community of Antioch. Otherwise, how could he have worked in it effectively? And it was the more natural since all that he found there fitted admirably with the way in which he himself had come to his faith in Christ. From a fanatical persecutor of the community of the Messiah he had been converted to an Apostle of Christ by a vision in which he had seen the heavenly Christ and Son of God, whose death therefore was not that of an offender but a sacrifice to which God had given His Son for our sins that He might redeem us from this present evil world. Of the earthly life of the prophet Jesus, Paul knew very little—as little as the Antiochan Gentile Christians. It was the more natural therefore that he should agree with them in the conviction that it was just the death and resurrection of the Son of God, even Christ, that constituted the redemptive fact and the content of the new redemptive faith.

^{5a} Acts xiii. 30.

* *Religion und Religionen*, 1906, p. 223; quoted by Clemen, *Religions-geschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, 1909, p. 152, n. 3; *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, p. 196, n. 3.

Concerning the agreement of Paul and the Antiochan Church in regard to the redemptive significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus, or in a faith which included the resurrection with the death of Jesus, there need be no doubt. But of the influence of the cult of Adonis upon the practice of the Church and of Paul there is no evidence. Certain similarities are made the basis of a causal inference in support of which no proof is adduced. Certain very significant differences are neglected.⁷ We know little of the practices and convictions of the Antiochan Church at this early time save what may reasonably be inferred from its origin and

⁷ J. Weiss says (*Jesus von Nazareth, Mythos oder Geschichte?* 1910, pp. 32 f): "The earliest time gives no evidence of the mood peculiar to the Adonis and Attis cults. Where is the passionate weeping for the dead, especially of the women; where the sudden change of mood into wild orgy, which are the characteristic features of those ancient nature cults? . . . Finally have the myths of Adonis and Attis influenced in a single particular the so-called Christ myth? The death of Adonis by a boar, the mutilation of Attis,—where are the parallels? . . . In all these cults and myths the hero is the lover of a goddess—Tammuz-Ishtar, Adonis-Aphrodite, Attis-Cybele, Osiris-Isis—and the pathos of the death, the bitter loss suffered by the beloved—her sorrow, her seeking of the body—is the essential content of the drama in the experience of which the faithful share. Of this there is nothing in the Jesus-myth. Or is there? I know not whether any one has set the figure of Mary Magdalene, seeking the body of Jesus, on this religio-historical background; but it will probably be done. He who does such things may do so; but he should not expect to be taken seriously."

It is not even certain, according to Baudissin, whether the cult of Adonis at Antioch included the resurrection idea. This was not part of the Tammuz cult with which the Adonis cult of Antioch was probably connected. The mention of the resurrection idea by Origen and Jerome has reference most probably to the cult at Byblos where the presence of the idea is witnessed to by Lucian. The idea was present in the Osiris and Attis cults, in the Babylonian conception of Marduk and in the Phoenician conception of the gods Melkart and Esmun. Ammianus Marcellinus is silent about it in his reference to the cult of Adonis in Antioch at the time of the Emperor Julian's visit, and there is no trace of it in the reference to the cult in Athens in 415 B. C. A yearly resurrection seems however to be implied in the yearly death; but it does not appear that this idea formed part of the cult at Antioch. Cf. Baudissin's article "Tammuz" in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Herzog-Hauck, xix, and his *Adonis und Esmun*, 1911.

from Paul's activity there. This makes it impossible to suppose that the common faith of Paul and the Church in the resurrection of Jesus owed its origin to the belief and practices of the Adonis cult. Pfleiderer intimates that Paul was prepared by his experience to coöperate effectively in a Christian community in which this belief existed on his arrival. Its origin therefore in both cases must be sought in antecedent conditions.

Prior to his coming to Antioch Paul spent several years in Tarsus. There also he was surrounded by a pagan culture and was in contact locally with the cult of a pagan God, Sandan. Of this cult Frazer says:⁸

Thus it would appear that at Tarsus as at Boghaz-Keui there was a pair of deities, a divine Father and a divine Son, whom the Greeks identified with Zeus and Hercules respectively. If the Baal of Tarsus was a god of fertility, as his attributes clearly imply, his identification with Zeus would be natural, since it was Zeus who, in the belief of the Greeks, sent the fertilizing rain from heaven. And the identification of Sandan with Hercules would be equally natural, since the lion and the death on the pyre were features common to both. Our conclusion then is that it was the divine Son, the lion-god, who was burned in effigy or in the person of a human representative at Tarsus and perhaps at Boghaz-Keui.

The investigations of Böhlig, in which the influence of Paul's environment in Tarsus is over- rather than underestimated, reaches this conclusion:⁹

It is not surprising that an influence of the pagan popular religion is entirely lacking. . . . The figure of the Tarsian popular god Sandan presents a striking parallel to the central feature of Paul's religious thought. Even if this has in a measure determined the terminology of Paul, still the Apostle drew the content of his message of faith from the Jewish Messianic belief which he transformed in accordance with the Damascus vision. It must be regarded as certain however that this distinctive coincidence of the Jewish and the pagan conception of a Saviour exalted to God prepared Paul's way in the pagan world of Anatolia and perhaps also caused the strict concentration of his thought upon the exalted Jesus.

⁸ *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 1906, p. 60.

⁹ *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, 1913, p. 168.

It thus appears that the influences with which Paul was brought in contact in Tarsus at this time can not have contributed to his belief in the resurrection of Jesus and therefore can have had little or no significance for the origin of the more general element of transcendence involved in his conception of the exalted Jesus. We are thus carried back as Böhlig intimates to Paul's conversion, to the experience on the way to Damascus and its historical implications. And here we are possessed not only of Luke's threefold account in Acts¹⁰ but of Paul's own statements in the Epistle to the Galatians¹¹ and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.¹² As the result of this experience Paul was convinced of the exaltation of Jesus and of His identity with the Jesus of whose death and Messianic claims he must have known. To him the experience was a revelation of God's Son, that is, of Jesus as God's Son,—certainly involving His Messiahship and the whole element of transcendence by which in Paul's thought Jesus occupies with God and as God the central place in the Christian religion as object of faith and worship, Mediator of the spiritual blessings of the world to come and the supreme Lord of all things both in the sphere of nature and in the sphere of God's redemptive grace. This revelation was the source also of Paul's conviction of the resurrection of Jesus; for Paul definitely correlates his experience with the appearances of Jesus to Peter and to others by which they had already been convinced of His resurrection.¹³

Moreover there is no attenuation of the historical fact by Paul. The resurrection was for him just as concrete an event as the death of Jesus. There is no indication that Paul was consciously clothing in the form of popular conception a belief in Jesus' continued existence in the spiritual world—in the mere immortality of His soul. As He had been crucified and had died in the body, so also the same Jesus rose again from the dead in and through the organ in

¹⁰ Acts ix. 1 ff; xxii. 1 ff; xxvi. 1 ff.

¹¹ Gal. i. 15 f.

¹² I Cor. xv. 8.

¹³ I Cor. xv. 5-8.

which He had suffered. This is not affected by Paul's teaching concerning the transformation of the bodies of believers and their conformation to Christ's glorious body or by his teaching that flesh and blood can not inherit the Kingdom of God;¹⁴ for a transformed and glorious body, corruption changed to incorruption, mortality having put on immortality, the natural body become a spiritual body wholly controlled by and the perfect organ of the spirit, is still a body—the body of Christ the first fruits and then the bodies of those that are His at His coming. Paul can not rightfully be appealed to in support of a spiritual resurrection and his view contrasted with an increasing materialization of the resurrection in the Gospels. There is no trace in his writings of the modern separation of the Easter faith and the Easter message. Paul believed in the resurrection just as confidently as he believed in the death of Jesus and its atoning significance. And he believed it of the Jesus who died—that it was the same Jesus who, having suffered in His human nature, triumphed over death in and through the same nature in which also He passed to His glory. Jesus Himself thus became for Paul in the Damascus experience the responsible author of a faith in which the resurrection formed an element so fundamental that without it his message of deliverance and hope lacked validity and he himself and others who bore witness to its reality became false witnesses of God.¹⁵

Familiar as we are with Paul's Christology it is difficult to realize what a cataclysmic change, what a revolution, was thus produced in the very center of the religious conviction of a deeply religious Jew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews and strictly monotheistic. To him every thought and practice of polytheism must have been an abomination, as every tendency toward the apotheosis of a human being must have been foreign and revolting to his inmost nature. Yet the Jesus to whom Paul gave with God a place in his monotheistic faith

¹⁴ I Cor. xv. 35 ff.

¹⁵ I Cor. xv. 15.

was the same Jesus who had lived as a man and suffered a shameful death. The power that produced this conviction must have been overwhelming, dominant, irresistible. Paul never doubted that it was the divine power and in this he grounded its validity. Was he right? He was certainly right in the ground he assigned for its validity; for no other could justify as indeed it is difficult to believe that any other could have caused his faith.

In summarizing the attitude of different views toward this issue Windisch says:¹⁶

One of the weightiest of New Testament problems is involved in the question: How is it conceivable that as early as Paul the man Jesus has become the divine heavenly being, Jesus Christ. While the more conservative theology denies a wide gap on the ground that a divine self-consciousness existed in Jesus, and while on the other side the mythological radicalism avoids the gap by eliminating the figure of the historical Jesus and interpreting Paulinism as a purely syncretistic structure, the theological criticism [i. e. the "liberal" view] generally maintains that Paul, when he came to believe on Jesus, transferred to the historical Jesus the attributes of the heavenly Messiah whose figure had long been known to him from Jewish tradition.

There can be no doubt about Paul's own conviction concerning the origin of his faith; but is his claim in respect to the ground of his faith valid? This raises the question of mediation, of the causes or influences that may have been operative, consciously or unconsciously, in producing this effect. But ultimately the causal issue involved in Paul's claim must be faced, for on the supernaturalism of its origin the truth of Pauline Christianity depends.

Now this experience of Paul's was within four or five years of the death of Jesus—according to Harnack within eighteen months.¹⁷ Was Paul's faith, in substance as well as in form, an innovation; or are there indications of the existence of a similar faith in pre-Pauline Christianity involving with the note of transcendence also the belief in the

¹⁶ *Neutestamentliche Studien Heinrici dargebracht*, 1914, p. 220.

¹⁷ "Chronologische Berechnung des 'Tags von Damaskus'", *Sitzungsberichte d. kg. preus. Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, 1912 (xxxvii), pp. 673 ff.

resurrection of Jesus? And if there be such indications, how was this pre-Pauline faith grounded; and is it of Christian or pre-Christian origin?

PRE-PAULINE FAITH

The difficulties of this investigation are due to the fact that we have no documents from this early time, and to the widely prevalent distrust of the later documents. This distrust, in so far as it represents a critical attitude that insists upon a thorough examination of the evidence and an exact exposition of its historical implications, is a useful and necessary instrument of investigation. Such a method however is not primarily concerned with validity but with fact. When it passes into the sphere of values it is necessarily influenced by the differences of principle which distinguish the two generic explanations of Christianity. If the critical testing of the evidence be separated from the ultimate judgment of value upon its implications, the analysis of the documents will yield definite results. When these have been attained and their nature is known, the question of their value or truth-content must be decided in the light of all the considerations that rightfully enter into this issue. With this distinction in mind our investigation will be concerned first of all with the documents and their reasonable implications.

The documents which throw light upon the pre-Pauline Christian faith and the place of the resurrection in it are composed of two groups,—the Synoptic Gospels and Acts; and the Pauline Epistles. The witness of the latter is important not only because of the inference which it justifies: there were some things that were in debate between Paul and members of the Church in Jerusalem, but upon neither his Christology nor the place of the resurrection in it is there the slightest trace of disagreement or the least indication that he was conscious of advocating a view peculiar to himself. It is important also because of Paul's explicit statement of what he had received concerning Jesus,—His death, His burial, His resurrection the third day, and His

appearances.¹⁸ The expression δ *καὶ παρέλαβον*, "which also I received",¹⁹ can scarcely exclude human mediation even when read in the light of Paul's strong assertion in the Epistle to the Galatians in which human derivation of his Gospel is denied and its origin through the revelation of Jesus Christ is affirmed.²⁰ The two are not inconsistent. Paul may have known of the death and alleged resurrection of Jesus prior to his conversion and have learned other details concerning them afterwards, and his Gospel, his interpretation of the meaning of these facts, still have been communicated, as he firmly believed, through the revelation of Jesus. The agreement of his faith with that of the primitive Christian community would not prove its human origin, nor would the divine origin of his faith and Gospel exclude his reception of information about Jesus from sources that commended themselves to him as trustworthy. And as Paul tells in the Epistle to the Galatians of his visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion and of his intercourse with Peter and James, the Lord's brother,²¹ and refers particularly to the appearance of Jesus to these two men,²² it is not unnatural to suppose that he learned on this occasion some of the details to which the words δ *καὶ παρέλαβον* allude. Paul certainly can not have been aware of any difference between his and the primitive Christian faith in the matters thus recounted to the Corinthians and least of all in regard to the resurrection.

Heitmüller²³ has argued that, as the Hellenistic Christianity of Damascus stands between Paul and the primitive Christian community, the inference from the one to the other should be qualified by this fact; and Maurenbrecher²⁴

¹⁸ I Cor. xv. 3 ff.

¹⁹ Omitted by Marcion and certain Western Fathers, but well attested. Cf. J. Weiss, *Meyer's Kommentar*. Cf. also I Cor. xi. 23.

²⁰ Gal. i. 12; cf. i. 1.

²¹ Gal. i. 18 f.

²² I Cor. xv. 5, 7.

²³ *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1912 (xiii), pp. 326 ff.

²⁴ *Von Jerusalem nach Rom*, 1910, pp. 36 ff.

has emphasized the importance of the Hellenistic element in the Jerusalem Church for the world-mission of Christianity. Maurenbrecher however attributes to this element not the origin—this, in agreement with the “liberal” view, he assigns to the experience of Peter—but the modification of the primitive faith in the resurrection or rather in the nature of the person of whom this was believed by both elements of the Church, the Galilean and the Jerusalem Hellenistic.²⁵ Heitmüller’s contention is valuable for its positive rather than its negative elements. Historically Hellenistic Christianity mediated between the primitive community and the Gentile Church in which Paul labored; but it is not likely that Paul’s knowledge of primitive Christian faith was limited to or seriously modified by what he received through this channel. Heitmüller however does not affirm that the belief in the resurrection of Jesus was peculiar to or originated by Hellenistic Christianity. He admits that Paul’s statement²⁶ shows that the original Apostles preached the same Gospel, including the resurrection. His claim therefore regarding Paul’s derivation of the tradition recorded in the opening verses of the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians—although unlikely in any exclusive sense—does not affect the inference in regard to the existence of a similar faith in the primitive community. This Heitmüller admits, with a qualification only of emphasis; as compared with Hellenistic Christianity and with Paul, the primitive community, as the sources of the Synoptic Gospels show, had a larger interest in the life of Jesus than Paul’s summary of the content of the Gospel would suggest. Both things however are quite possible in the same community; for the summary statement does not deny the fuller historical background, and interest in the elements enumerated by Paul can scarcely have been lacking in the primitive community or have constituted the distinctive feature of Hellenistic Christianity. J. Weiss says:²⁷

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 55 f.

²⁶ I Cor. xv. 11.

²⁷ *Das Urchristentum*, 1914, p. 2.

We are apt to underestimate the fact that the primitive community fashioned essential elements in the common Christianity which, to a certain extent, were complete before Paul,—the Messiah-faith, the worship of Christ, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the tradition of the words of Jesus and the story of His life, a number of Christian formulae, and the transformation or adoption of a Jewish or an Old Testament manner of thought.

The tradition recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians in particular Weiss traces to the primitive community.²⁸

The second group of primary sources for knowledge of the pre-Pauline Christian faith concerning the resurrection of Jesus is composed of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. The other New Testament writings, with the exception of the Epistle of James, are later than most of the Epistles of Paul and have value in confirmation of the earlier evidence. This is especially true of the Gospel of John and of the first Epistle of Peter.²⁹ It is generally admitted however that the Synoptic Gospels embody a tradition that is certainly as early as Paul's Epistles and probably is earlier. It is also widely recognized that Acts, whatever its date and authorship, is based in its opening chapters on an early source and contains much that is authentic regarding the beginnings of the Church in Jerusalem. Its Lukan authorship seems well established, as does also its date of composition at the expiration of the two years with which the narrative closes,—a date recently advocated by Koch³⁰ and by Harnack³¹ and adopted by Maurenbrecher.³² This view of its authorship and date has an important bearing on the problem of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels; but it is not necessary in this connection to base an argument upon its validity. Most of those who date Acts later and two of the Synoptic Gospels after the year 70 admit that the literary sources of the

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

²⁹ Cf. I Pet. i. 3, 21; iii. 21.

³⁰ *Die Abfassungszeit des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes*, 1911.

³¹ *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien*, 1911; *The Date of the Acts and of Synoptic Gospels*, 1911.

³² *Von Nazareth nach Golgatha*, 1909, pp. 22 ff.

Synoptic Gospels are earlier and were current in the Jerusalem Church in the sixties. These sources—according to the widely current “Two-Document” hypothesis—were some form of the Gospel of Mark and “Q”—a source composed chiefly of the discourse material common to the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke. But in regard to the Gospel of Luke and especially for that section in which the passion of Jesus is recorded, this hypothesis generally posits a third source, commonly referred to by the symbol “L”. These three sources—Mk, Q, and L—had already assumed literary form in Greek prior to their embodiment in the Synoptic Gospels and in turn depend upon and reproduce an earlier oral tradition of the Jerusalem Church. There is still difference of opinion about the extent of Q. Some affirm, others deny that it included a narrative of the passion. It is not perfectly certain therefore whether on this hypothesis there are two or three sources underlying the Synoptic account of the death and resurrection of Jesus. This however does not affect the main issue; for whether of triple or of twofold derivation the Synoptic Gospels bear witness in twofold form to the belief of the early Church in the death and resurrection of Jesus. The text of the Gospel of Mark, it is true, has been transmitted in an incomplete form; but the loss concerns only the narrative of events subsequent to the resurrection and even for these a form of tradition different from that contained in the Gospel of Luke is preserved in the Gospel of Matthew.

The source used in the opening chapters of Acts bears witness to the same facts and by its account of the speeches of Peter testifies also to the conception of Jesus which obtained in the early Church as the result of the experience upon which this faith is, in this and the sources of the Synoptic Gospels, said to have rested.

But what does this represent? According to Heitmüller the sources of the Synoptic Gospels represent the view of Jesus that was current in the Jerusalem Church in the fifties

or sixties.³³ Back of this these sources do not carry us. Still, this view must have had some justification. It is given not in the form of opinion about Jesus but in the form of a narrative of His life and teaching. Moreover we can not disregard the fact that these sources had their origin in a religious community organized by a definite principle which must have served not only as a principle of differentiation but as the principle of an historical continuity which reached back certainly into the pre-Pauline period. For before his conversion Paul had made havoc of the faith and persecuted the Church of God.³⁴ This principle can have been no other than the Messiah-faith which Paul knew and attacked; and this faith from the beginning must have included the resurrection, for not only is there no trace in any of the sources that it was ever lacking; there is no indication of its subsequent introduction; and it certainly formed part of the faith to which Paul was converted within four or five years of Jesus' death. The Gospels and Acts record what was continuously believed in the Christian community to have constituted the factual basis of its organizing principle and thus to have been the cause of its faith. The implications of these documents on any reasonable view of their date fully justify the belief that the resurrection of Jesus entered into and formed part of the faith of the primitive Christian community from its inception.

But how soon was this? Certainly prior to Paul's conversion and subsequent to Jesus' death. Acts dates the first expansive movement of the Christian faith in Jerusalem from the feast of Pentecost, fifty days after the Passover at which Jesus suffered. But belief in the resurrection of Jesus had existed before this according both to Paul and to the Gospels. In both the resurrection is definitely associated with the third day after the crucifixion; and while Paul

³³ Article "Jesus Christus" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, herausgegeben von Schiele und Zscharnack, ii (1912), pp. 356 ff; reprinted in his *Jesus*, 1913, pp. 28 ff; cf. Warfield in this REVIEW, 1914 (xii), pp. 315 ff.

³⁴ Gal. i. 13, 23; cf. Acts ix. 21.

does not indicate the exact time of the first appearances, these occurred according to the Gospels on that day. The resurrection faith thus antedated the beginnings of the Church in Jerusalem, for it was in this faith that the Church was founded. This is generally admitted. What was the cause of this faith according to the historical evidence? Are the two elements—the death and the resurrection of Jesus—closely related in the Gospels and Acts and combined with the note of transcendence as they are in Paul? What explanation does the evidence in its entirety require in the sphere of values?

ORIGIN AND VALIDITY OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

The documents are explicit in describing Jesus Himself as the cause or responsible author of the belief in His resurrection. The empty grave is a fact attested by all the Gospels and formed an element in at least two of the three principal sources underlying the Synoptic Gospels, Mk, and L. But this was not the only or the chief cause of the new faith. Still, alleged analogies do not weaken its silent testimony or invalidate its positive interpretation. Gunkel says:³⁵

The history of religion teaches us that Jesus Christ is by no means the only or the first being of a divine nature in whose resurrection from the dead men have believed. The belief in the death and rising again of gods is indeed well known to the East in many places. We know it from Egypt, where it is most of all at home, but also from Babylonia, Syria and Phoenicia. In Crete a tomb of Zeus was shown—of course an empty tomb.

Paul does not mention the empty grave and his silence is thought to have peculiar significance, indicating the later introduction of this feature in the resurrection story and showing also a more spiritual conception of the resurrection itself. The mention of the burial by Paul however makes both of these inferences unlikely. But Paul too like the Gospels grounds the resurrection-faith in an activity of

³⁵ *Zum religionsgeschichtliche Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, p. 77; quoted by Moulton, *Religions and Religion*, 1913, p. 33.

Jesus. And the effect which this activity produced according to all the evidence was belief specifically in the resurrection and not simply in the continued existence of Jesus. Paul moreover does not connect the appearances of Jesus with any particular place or places; and the effort has been made to show that the first appearance occurred in Galilee. This contention is based upon the supposed divergence of two forms of Gospel tradition, the earlier localizing the appearances in Galilee, the later in Jerusalem or in both places. The evidence does not support this hypothesis;³⁶ and the hypothesis itself is important for and generally maintained in connection with a naturalistic interpretation of the appearances as visions, whether subjective or objective in form.

There is another aspect of the Gospel witness to the resurrection which has both a positive and a negative value. Jesus is represented as predicting His death and resurrection, and that not as a contingency but as a necessity laid upon Him in the discharge of the function He had voluntarily undertaken.³⁷ The thought of His suffering and of His resurrection formed part of His vocational consciousness. The two things were included not only in His knowledge of the future but in the purpose or end to the realization of which He had definitely committed Himself. On the other hand these predictions have a negative significance indicated in the attitude of the disciples to whom they were uttered. The disciples are represented as failing to understand words whose meaning was altogether alien to their conception of what the future must have in store for the Messiah.³⁸ The idea of a suffering Messiah, of a dying and rising Saviour God, was quite foreign to their thought and when concretely presented called forth vigorous protest from their leader.

The Gospels like Paul represent the resurrection of Jesus as closely associated with His death not only in fact but in

³⁶ Cf. the discussion of the "Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus" in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, 1912, pp. 307 ff.

³⁷ Mk. viii. 31 and parallels, etc.

³⁸ Mk. viii. 32 and parallels.

Jesus' own thought and in the experience of His disciples. A reference to His death is introduced in a general way in the Gospel of Mark at an early period in the Galilean ministry.³⁹ The Gospel of John, which alone recounts an earlier ministry in Jerusalem and Judea, reports a saying, the reference of which to His death and resurrection was subsequently understood by the disciples.⁴⁰ In this Gospel also a saying of John the Baptist is recorded in which, with prophetic insight, the Baptist testified to the sacrificial character of the Messiah's work.⁴¹ In the midst of the Galilean ministry the two elements appear together in the sign of Jonah in the form preserved by the Gospel of Matthew.⁴² But from the time of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, when Jesus began to instruct His disciples explicitly about His suffering, the two are frequently associated and are so related both in the passion narratives of the Gospels and in the opening chapters of Acts.

The note of transcendence, as in Paul, is not wanting in the Gospels; on the contrary, it constitutes their distinctive feature, permeates their entire structure and is present in their earliest sources. Apart from the Fourth Gospel and the infancy sections of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which only increase without changing the character of the evidence, the Gospel of Mark and the material common to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke—or the sources of the Synoptic Gospels on the basis of the narrowest definition of their content—witness explicitly to a conception of Jesus' person which transcends the bounds of human nature and partakes of the divine. In the Gospel of Mark this appears not simply in the Messianic function, endowment with the Spirit, miracles in the sphere of nature and authority in the spiritual sphere, but especially in Jesus' confession before the High Priest.⁴³ When asked, "Art thou the Christ, the

³⁹ Mk. ii. 20.

⁴⁰ Jn. ii. 19.

⁴¹ Jn. i. 29.

⁴² Mt. xii. 40.

⁴³ Mk. xiv. 62.

Son of the Blessed?" Jesus said: "I am, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven." In the Gospels of Matthew and Luke⁴⁴ there is another equally significant confession in which Jesus gives expression to His consciousness of an intimate, mutual and reciprocal knowledge of God, involving sameness not simply of ethical disposition but of being, and with this also a unique and exclusive function as the source of God's self-revelation. It is difficult to escape in these confessions the clear intimations of transcendence. In the presence of the latter Heitmüller⁴⁵ acknowledges that the consciousness there described passes beyond the limits of an ordinary human consciousness, as it does also that of the prophet, and reaches up to the supernormal. Its implications thus seem to him weird, verging on the pathological; but from this conclusion he is compelled to draw back by the evident tokens of Jesus' sanity in the Gospel account of His life and teaching. Loofs⁴⁶ also has recently argued that the Gospel portraiture of Jesus transcends the limits of mere humanity; and the "radical" criticism⁴⁷ is insistent that this element—the transcendent—is not only present and dominant in the Gospels but is utterly destructive of the human.

The two confessions have in common the reference by Jesus to Himself of designations filled with profound meaning. In the one the self-designation "Son of Man", frequently upon His lips in the Gospels, had been enriched in its Old Testament and pre-Christian usage with high ideas both of the nature and of the function of the person who should bear it in the future. These involved not only pre-existence but the exercise of the divine prerogative as judge of the world. In this sense and with particular reference to His future authority Jesus often—as He does here—used it of Himself. The other self-designation, the "Son", is used absolutely and appears by its relation to the designation of

⁴⁴ Mt. xi. 27; Lk. x. 22.

⁴⁵ *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, iii, p. 375; *Jesus*, p. 71.

⁴⁶ *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* 1913.

⁴⁷ Kalthoff, J. M. Robertson, W. B. Smith, A. Drews, P. Jensen, etc.

God as "Father"—also used absolutely—not to be a generalization from Messianic titles such as "Son of David", Son of God", or the conception of the theocratic King as the type of the Messiah, but to spring directly out of Jesus' consciousness of the immediacy and intimacy of His relation to God.

The Jesus whose resurrection was believed in by Paul and by the primitive community was thus in common believed to be a person not only charged with a certain function but particularly qualified by nature to accomplish it. The Christian Messiah-faith was of the transcendent type. Its object was Jesus, the risen Messiah, the exalted Lord. The Gospel story of the earthly life and teaching, of the death and resurrection of Jesus was written that Christians might know, in the words of Luke, the surety or factual basis of this faith. In the Gospels the historical interest is indeed more extensive but not more vital than in Paul; and the interest of value and meaning is equally central, for to each alike it is just the transcendent Jesus, the Jesus of whom not only the death but the resurrection could be truly predicated who is at once the object of Christian faith and the source of all its blessedness and hope. Both elements, the historical reality and the transcendent nature of its object, enter into Christian faith; and the elimination or modification of either is destructive of or prejudicial to it. The historical element is epitomized for Paul in its supreme moment when Jesus suffered in His human nature and rose again. Paul affirms the whole by its characteristic part; and the central place he gives to this part corresponds with the teleological trend of the Gospel narratives. Jesus' earthly life was as real for Paul as it is in the Gospels and not less intensely real because, being purposive, its end to Paul appeared realized and the whole summarized in the great and mysteriously profound experiences with which His stay upon earth terminated.

But the interests of the common Christian faith are vitally related also to the reality of the transcendent element in its apprehension and appreciation of Jesus which ex-

pressed itself through the person in the facts of His earthly experience and gave them meaning. The object of Christian faith was never a merely human Saviour. To such an one neither Paul nor the Gospels attribute this function and of such an one no resurrection story was ever told or believed in the early Church. In fact, the resurrection, by its very nature partaking as it does of both elements—the historical and the transcendent—manifests more clearly if not more vitally than the death of Jesus the inner nature of the personal object of Christian faith, upon whose reality the saving efficacy of this faith and the validity of Christianity as a religion of redemption depends. Whence then comes this element of transcendence which in Jesus' person—and manifested in His resurrection—enters so profoundly into Christian faith, conditioning the validity of this faith at its redemptive center?

The existence and influence of this element of transcendence in the faith of Paul and of the primitive Christian community being established by the historical evidence and generally admitted, the genetic inquiry is concerned not only with its form but with its truth-content; and this of necessity raises the issue of principle underlying the two generic explanations of the nature and origin of Christianity—the supernaturalistic and the naturalistic. The point of view of the historical sources is supernaturalistic; and from this point of view they ground Christian faith in the reality of its object,—in the presence in the person of Jesus of a nature corresponding to its high affirmations. This point of view is certainly possible on the theistic premise. It is not invalidated by the many spurious claims made in the name of the supernatural. The absence of true knowledge and the presence of erroneous conceptions of God do not disprove His existence or the possibility of knowing Him; and neither does the recognition of an orderly process in nature or the existence of fallacious claims of its interruption set bounds to the form in which His power may manifest itself. But if the possibility of true knowledge of God and of the manifestation of

His power immediately be admitted, then the evidence that He has revealed Himself and manifested His power in Jesus Christ is conclusive. For the evidence shows that Christian faith was caused by Jesus Himself and that He Himself was conscious of being possessed by nature of that transcendence which is the object of the element in it that gives to this faith its distinctive quality. The truth of the Christian faith on this premise is grounded in the reality personally present in Jesus Christ as represented in the New Testament,—in His possession in Himself of a nature which it truly apprehends and which is truly portrayed in the New Testament. His person—the reality which was present in Him—is thus the final explanation of the origin of Christian faith in its fundamental and distinctive elements. The formal elements in the expression of this faith, differing with different individuals, may well have had a literary history, whether we are now able to trace it in every particular or not. In the Gospels the title “Son of Man” is frequent and by its earlier usage and associations lent itself readily to the expression of an aspect of the element of transcendence in Jesus’ consciousness. The *κύριος* title, strikingly pervasive in Paul, was possessed by antecedent usage in the Old Testament of an association which rendered it appropriate and congenial to the expression of his thought of Jesus, while to many to whom he wrote an old familiar form was charged with a new and deeper meaning. But these and other titles of Jesus, whatever their history and usage, have a meaning well indicated in the New Testament and set forth, in one or another aspect, the common object of faith in fundamental agreement. In brief, from the point of view of theism—of belief in God—from which alone there is the possibility of the supernatural in history and therefore of the reality corresponding to the element of transcendence in the Christian Messiah-faith, the New Testament evidence of its actuality centers in the person of Jesus and upon the reality of this manifestation of the supernatural grounds Christianity as a religion of redemption. In this account of the origin and

nature of Christianity the resurrection of Jesus is not an isolated or incidental thing but forms with the death of Jesus an essential and necessary constituent in the reality which was present in the person of Jesus Christ for our salvation.

On the other hand, that view which denies the truth-content of the element of transcendence in the Christian faith, and with it the reality of the resurrection, explains the origin of this element in terms of precedent ideas or conceptions. Brückner⁴⁸ has done this in the case of the Pauline Christology, attempting to show that this element existed in Paul's pre-Christian Jewish conception of the Messiah, and that his Christology arose by amalgamation with this of a Christian element—the historical, especially the death of Jesus—under the influence of the Damascus vision. Windisch⁴⁹ has recently sought to enlarge the background of this view by inclusion of the "Wisdom" literature, with especial reference to the idea of preëxistence. But the criticism of Brückner by Heitmüller⁵⁰ for failure to recognize the influence of Hellenism upon Paul has perhaps best been met by Bousset.⁵¹

Bousset's discussion is significant because of its comprehensive character, for it includes not simply Paul but the primitive Christian community as well. Of the two elements in the Jewish Messianic expectation, the political and the transcendent reflected in the titles "Son of David" and "Son of Man", the latter was dominant in early Christian circles. This included the conception of preëxistence and judgeship over the world, the Christians contributing the idea of exaltation by which Jesus became possessed of this dignity. Bousset says:⁵²

The first community of Jesus' disciples regarded Him as the Messiah, consciously in part rejecting the ideal embodied in the

⁴⁸ *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie*, 1903.

⁴⁹ *Neutestamentliche Studien Heinrichi dargebracht*, pp. 220 ff.

⁵⁰ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1904 (xxix), 351 ff.

⁵¹ *Kyrios Christos*, 1913.

⁵² *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

title "Son of David" and adapting to Him the Jewish apocalyptic figure of the "Son of Man".

But when and how did this occur? Bousset continues:⁵³

After Jesus' death the Messiah-faith of the community could take no other [than the transcendent] form, and its birth in this new form must be dated from the vision-experiences in the souls of the disciples by which they were convinced that Jesus lived, by which the conviction was produced that in spite of death and apparent defeat—rather indeed by means of this—He had become the transcendent Messiah in glory, who would come again to judge the world. The factors that contributed to this result were various; the determining factor was the incomparable, powerful and indestructible impression which Jesus' personality left in the souls of the disciples and which was more powerful than open shame and death, misery and destruction. This state was intensified through the experience of the blasting of all their hopes by the unexpected overthrow and sudden collapse of their Hero and Master. It is a psychological law that such a disillusionment, involving the highest expectations, under the force of brutal fact, after a time of despair usually issues in a revulsion—or can do so—in which the human soul raises itself victoriously with a courageous "but nevertheless" to a state which makes the impossible possible. But then it is furthermore of tremendous significance that a conception of the Messiah had already been formed in the contemporaneous Apocalyptic which seemed to contain the solution for the altogether dark riddle which the disciples had experienced. The disciples of Jesus saved the hopes that had inspired them during His life time by fashioning them in higher and mightier terms. They cast about their Master this ready-made royal mantle, put upon His head the most magnificent crown available and made confession of Jesus, the Son of Man, who through suffering and death had passed into glory.

And again Bousset says:⁵⁴

It was only by placing behind the Gospel [-message] of Jesus the figure of the heavenly Son of Man, the ruler and judge of the world whose glory, but half hidden and concealed, shone transparently through the story of His life,—only by placing Him in a great divine process of redemption of which He appeared as the crown and completion, that the community made effective the portraiture of Jesus of Nazareth. For the purely historical is never of itself effective but only the living symbol in which, transformed, an actual religious conviction is presented. And a

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 20 ff. The first part of the quotation is a summary and not an exact translation; but it reproduces the thought.

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 91 f.

time which was by no means animated solely by simple ethical or simple religious ideas but by all kinds of more or less fantastical eschatological expectations, by belief in miracle and prophecy, in a near, unprecedented, special intervention of God in the course of nature and history, in manifold means of salvation and Messiahs, in devil and demons, and the approaching triumph of God over hostile powers,—such a time needed just the portraiture of Jesus that the first disciples made, and received its eternal truth in the many-colored garment that formed its temporal clothing.

In agreement with Heitnüller, Bousset conceives of the Hellenistic communities of Antioch, Damascus and Tarsus as mediating between Paul and the primitive Christian community. Paul's Christology also is essentially transcendent but its form was influenced by the place and title which Jesus held in these communities. This is indicated primarily by the *κύριος* title, and the influence of Hellenism may be traced especially in Paul's Pneumatology which stands in intimate relation with his Christology. The tradition which Paul repeats in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians was derived from the Antiochan Church and only indirectly from the Jerusalem Church.

The sufficiency of Bousset's explanation of the origin of the Christian faith is primarily conditioned by its naturalistic principle. This underlies the whole argument and finds incidental but clear expression in the remark with which the treatment of the origin of the belief in the resurrection on the third day is introduced. Bousset says:⁵⁵

In as much as every explanation of this period of time by means of an event that happened on Easter Sunday and was known to the Apostle is excluded in a critical consideration of the tradition of the resurrection in Paul, we are confronted with the problem of its derivation from some other source.

Even Brückner, from the same naturalistic premise, points out the inconclusiveness of Bousset's psychological explanation of the origin of the new faith. Brückner says:⁵⁶

The manner of the impression of Jesus on His disciples should have been more accurately defined. In particular, the offense of

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁵⁶ *Theologische Rundschau*, 1914 (xvii), p. 173.

Jesus' death on the cross can not have been removed by such psychological experiences.

And with this reference to the death of Jesus, Brückner indicates another weakness in Bousset's theory. Brückner says:⁵⁷

It is certain that the idea of the suffering Messiah of later Judaism can not be shown to have existed at that time; and it is an unsolved enigma that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah appears as its Scriptural proof so seldom and so late. . . . Moreover the definite dogmatic statement that the resurrection occurred on the third day or after three days can scarcely have developed, as Bousset thinks, from the common popular belief that the soul of a dead person remained near the body for three days. Certainly underlying this is the general dogmatic datum that the dying Hero rises on the third day or after three days.

Brückner in his criticism of Bousset thus approaches the view of Maurenbrecher,—or a position intermediate between the "liberal" and the "mythological" interpretations. This view has the advantage which comes from combining the real and the ideal, the personal and the dogmatic, the actual and the mythological. Maurenbrecher insists that the impression of the historical Jesus does not explain the character of the faith which followed the vision-experiences of Peter and the other disciples. These visions must have had in them the element which distinguishes the resultant faith, and this is the transcendent conception of the Messiah in which Jewish and mythological ideas were combined. The Jewish alone will not explain the resultant faith, for this involved the ideas of death and resurrection, both of which are foreign to the Jewish and characteristic of the mythological conception. And it is just this combination of ideas and their application to the historical Jesus that supplied the motive power which differentiated Christianity from other religions of the time, qualified it for its world-mission and resulted in its ultimate triumph. Maurenbrecher also adds to the psychological derivation of the resurrection by antecedent influence of this combination of ideas a historico-

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

national factor. In agreement with Bousset and Brückner he insists that the cause of this faith must have been implicit in the disciple's consciousness prior to its origin. He supplements the impressionistic memory-motive of Bousset's acting upon the Jewish apocalyptic conception of the Messiah not only by the mythological idea of the dying and rising God but also by the hypothesis of a special disposition in the mental inheritance of Jesus' disciples wrought in them through the national experiences of the people to which they belonged. Of the disciples confronted by the overwhelming fact of Jesus's death he says:⁵⁸

At this point it appears that [the mental disposition of] these men was determined by the development of the people from which they had sprung. For centuries this people had been trained in the ability to take from every disillusionment new hope and new illusions. How frequently in the last eight centuries had the great "Now" [of God's intervention] sounded in its history. The appearance of Jesus in Capernaum and the hour of exaltation on the Mount of Olives were not new in the background of its experience. They corresponded with a view which both before and afterward influenced hundreds of men. Without this discipline of their instincts, the recovery of the disciples after Jesus' death would not have happened. But since the recovery from illusion was a commonplace thing among this people, so now from the terrible catastrophe hope was quickened again and all the more exultantly. What the disciples experienced in the appearances of the risen [Lord] was thus no individual occurrence that might have happened anywhere and at any time. It was the product of the history of this people under whose influence these individuals had been formed. This century-long training of the feeling and volition characteristic of the individual constitutes the necessary condition precedent upon which the very possibility of the experience of the appearances of the risen [Lord] by the Galilean Sea was contingent.

The multiplication of causes to account for the faith of the disciples is indicative of the insufficiency of the separate elements of the theory; and their combination is neither adequately grounded nor possessed of any unifying principle in the conditions precedent to the result to be explained. Memory of Jesus there was; and the impression of His person

⁵⁸ *Von Nazareth nach Golgatha*, 1909, p. 262.

upon His disciples during His earthly life was undoubtedly profound. But this alone will not explain the triumph of their faith nor its form. Apocalyptic Messianism, which was also a condition precedent, fails equally to account for the element of suffering or explain the form of the new faith. The pagan idea of the dying and rising God is non-Messianic, anti-historical, and there is not only no evidence of its influence but rather of the absence of influence upon the thought of the disciples prior to Jesus' death. Those therefore are more consistent who seek to escape the difficulties of this explanation of the resurrection-faith by eliminating not simply the resurrection but the death, and thus the person, of Jesus from the sphere of history. But this view, like the myth which it substitutes for historical fact, is—not partially but consistently—anti-historical, and is by the evidence condemned as untrue.

But if the "liberal" impressionistic theory, with the help of the pre-Christian Jewish transcendental Messiah conception, fails to explain the element of suffering and resurrection in the Christian faith; and the intermediate theory of Maurenbrecher, with the help of a historico-national psychology and the mythological motive, fails to ground the mediation of the idea of the dying and rising God in the circles in which Christian faith arose—and Maurenbrecher offers no evidence of its influence but bases his whole contention on the possibility of its presence in the semi-pagan circles of Galilee—there are but two alternatives; the mythological or "radical" theory which eliminates the historical element in Christian faith by transforming Jesus Himself into a pre-Christian myth; and the view of the New Testament which combines the two elements, the historical and the transcendent, and grounds them in the reality which was manifest in the person of Jesus Christ. The "radical" view is disproven by substantial evidence, and serves a useful purpose by exhibiting in concrete form the *reductio ad absurdum* of the naturalistic theories. The other—the New Testament view—is frankly supernaturalistic and ex-

plains Christian faith and the course and vitality of the Christian religion in terms of the reality of its object. To this object both faith and worship are due because the high predicate of transcendence is grounded in His divine nature; and of this personal object of faith and worship the resurrection is believed upon the same grounds upon which His transcendence and the atoning significance of His death are believed.

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.