

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume XIV.

MAY—SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Number 5.

Notes Editorial and Critical

The Western Recorder, of Louisville, a leading Baptist paper, puts the matter thus, most strongly and wisely, under the heading, "Heresy at Others' Expense":

"The Presbyterian General Assembly suspended a heretical D.D., and said in effect that he was at liberty to preach what he pleased, but not to demand that the Presbyterian Church furnish him with a platform and pay him a salary to preach heresy. This is another illustration of the fact that the men who cry "liberty" are invariably men in positions where others pay them salaries. And what they mean by their cry is the liberty to require other men to pay them to teach or preach what those men consider false things".

*"Liberal"
Liberty*

* * * * *

It is a remarkable and interesting fact that the very first use to which the discovery of

*Bible First
Printed Book*

printing was applied was the production of the Holy Bible. This was accomplished at Mentz, between the years 1450 and 1455. Guttenberg was the inventor of the art, and Faust, a goldsmith, furnished the necessary funds.

The Bible was in two folio volumes, which have been justly praised for the strength and beauty of the

paper, the exactness of the register, and the luster of the ink. The work contained 1,282 pages, and—being the first ever printed—of course involved a long period of time and an immense amount of mental, manual and mechanical labor; and yet, for a long time after it had been finished and offered for sale, not a human being, save the artists themselves, knew how it had been accomplished.

* * * * *

History is like an arch in a building. It can bear whatever is made to

rest upon it if its proper keystone is in place. Without the keystone, properly shaped and placed as it should be, the arch is merely a collection of blocks which support nothing but have to be supported against imminent collapse. The strenuous effort made by some writers in these days to construct from the Bible a history of the Hebrews that shall depend upon evolution as its keystone is doomed to failure. The stone does not fit. Re-adjusting every day or two does not help the matter. Evolution can not be made to hold up the arch. The Sunday School Times recently pointed out in a little editorial note the essential fact of Hebrew history:

After the long seven years' struggle of our war for independence, it would have been absurd for Washington to surrender to Cornwallis at Yorktown. After the long four years' struggle of our Civil War, it would have been absurd for Grant to surrender to Lee at Appomattox. And it will be treachery to Christ, and base ingratitude for us now, to give up the principles for which we have so long contended. We have triumphed in the past, and we shall triumph in the future, only as we enter into the plan of God by being a judging, suffering and saving church.

God forbid that we should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ! The recognition of this supreme sacrificial event is essential to the existence of a true missionary church. The greatest need of the hour is a fresh and forcible expression of the sacrificial spirit of Christ by the church, His spiritual body on earth. As Christ's sacrificial suffering for man's redemption was the crowning characteristic of His earthly ministry, in like manner must the Church, by its sacrificial service for the world's salvation, justify its claim to be the true Church of Christ. Its best talent should be put at the disposal of Him who emptied Himself of honor and became obedient to the death of the Cross. This sacrificial spirit among business men should express itself in large

offerings to Him who for our sakes became poor that we through His poverty might be made rich. Let this great central truth of the gospel get firm hold upon the men to whom God has given worldly treasure, and then, under the constraining love of Christ, millions will be forthcoming for all our great missionary enterprises, and the church herself will attain to a position of moral dignity and power unparalleled in her history.

This is my last public address, and I am glad that I can make it before the General Convention of the Baptists of North America. It is my Confession of Faith, and I hope that it expresses the faith of the great body which we represent. In Christ and His Cross we have a unifying principle deeper than life itself, a principle that can stand the shock of time, a principle that can bind together in one all these nations that are hurrying to our shores. May Christ Himself be our guide and our inspiration in our deliberations; may He point out to us lines of co-operative service by which we may further His great plans; may He prosper the work of our hands in each of our several provinces and fields of labor; and may he enable us each individually at the last to say with the apostle, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith".

Jesus in German Theology in the First Decade of the Twentieth Century*

PROF. HENRY E. DOSKER, D.D., LL.D., OF THE PRESBYTERIAN SEMINARY OF KENTUCKY, LOUISVILLE, KY.

The influence of the modern trend of thought is appreciable in every direction, but nowhere more so than in the sphere of religion. The boundary lines between the various phases of Protestant Church life are fast fading out; a decided spirit of union is in the air. This phenomenon of the history of recent Protestant movements may in part be explained by the lib-

eralizing tendency of thought, which minimizes all dogmatic differentiations of the common faith. But may not another and more optimistic explanation lie in the consciousness of the need of combining the common forces of Protestantism, for the defense of the common faith against a common foe?

And the marshalling of the clans for defense, if such it be, comes none too soon, for the past has taught us a lesson. With almost passive indifference and with scarcely a serious effort at defense, Pro-

* Delivered at Presbyterian Seminary of Kentucky, McCormick Theological Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary.

Professor Dosker has recently spent a year abroad in the special study of this subject.—*Editor*.

testantism allowed the enemy, both from within and from without, to undermine her defenses and thus to imperil the very foundations of her faith. And whilst this destructive process was going on, the various divisions of Protestantism were engaged in a mutually destructive internecine war. Thus in the latter half of the 19th century the assault on the Mosaic books, and on the history of Israel in general, led to a practical reconstruction in radical scholastic circles of the traditional views of the Pentateuch and of the historical records of the Old Testament. And even in circles, where the results of these destructive and reconstructive historico-critical studies of the Old Testament literature were officially rejected with scorn, there were not a few men who, silently or openly, revised their beliefs, and who were captivated by the marvelous industry and scholarship displayed by this Criticism. From the Old Testament sphere the battle was transferred to that of the New Testament. The closing years of the 19th century witnessed this change. It is true the historico-critical examination of the Old Testament literature went on, but these efforts were now overshadowed by a mightier struggle of far deeper significance. The one all-absorbing question of the first decade of the 20th century has come to be—"What think ye of the Christ?"

"The close of the 19th and the opening of the 20th century confront us with the

astonishing fact of an occupation with the figure of Christ, more universal and more extensive than ever before".¹ Whoever is at all conversant with the literature of the subject will admit this fact without discussion. The presses of Germany and of the world are literally groaning under the burden of "Jesus-literature." The attack on the Christ of the Gospels has been far more bitter and has been driven home with far greater celerity than was the case in the Pentateuchal struggle. The moat of the royal castle of the Redeemer has been filled, the palisades have been torn down, the walls have been breached, the door of the citadel has been battered down and the battle now rages in the very throne-room of the King and about his own sacred person. A great crisis is upon us, a crisis which is only comparable with the Gnostic and Arian controversies of the distant past. The great mass of the new controversial Christological literature appears in Germany, and only an infinitesimal portion of it, through translations, percolates to our American life. But here and there voices are raised among us, which indicate that the most aggressive German views of the new Christ are eagerly accepted. This consideration has led me to the treatment of my topic:

"Christ in German Theology in the First Decade of the 20th Century."

¹ Gruetzmacher. "Ist das Liberale Jesusbild mo-

Part I. What is the New German Christology?

I. The Modern Christology in Contrast with the Old

In order to appreciate the essential difference between the Old and the Modern Christology, we will have to sketch the development of the latter in a few bold strokes of the pen. It will also be necessary to indicate, at least in part, the literature of the subject, to show how extensive and intensive has been the movement.

But first of all let us ask what sense we are to affix to the term "modern". On the lips of one, it conveys a sense of inspiration; whilst to others the very term is

abhorrent. The one finds in it a glorious battle-flag that leads the way to complete victory; whilst another sees in it a mere collective noun which indicates everything that ought to be combatted in the field of morals and religion. We will use it in its broadest, that is, in its *historical sense*. By Modern German Christology we mean, therefore *the type, which is most prominently in evidence in German theology to-day*.

The remotest origin of this new Christology lies in the 18th century, in the work

of Reimarus, as has been shown by Dr. A. Schweitzer in his epoch-making book—*"From Reimarus to Wrede, 1906"*. The new Jesus can scarcely be understood without reference to the two celebrated "Lives of Jesus", which appeared in the last century, viz. that of David Friedrich Strauss, in 1835, and that of Renan, in 1863. They were pioneers in a new field and the traditional Gospel view of the Life of Christ was subverted by both; but generally speaking they were far in advance of their day.

This statement must be qualified, for Bruno Bauer went far beyond Strauss, when in 1840 he declared Christ to be a wholly mythical character, and, in the face of the practically unanimous testimony of the Fathers, placed the dates of the Gospels in the second and third centuries.² In his unreasoning onslaught, he shattered and scattered far and wide the entire New Testament literature, not even the four major epistles of Paul escaping the mad fury of the attack; and from the ruins thus created, Bauer endeavored to build up a mythical theory of the life of Christ in a fashion which for recklessness and abandon has never seen its equal in the history of New Testament investigation. The very violence of the attack proved its undoing, and the tide ebbed quickly and carried everything back, practically to the place from which it had been removed. Here and there a voice was raised in approval, but the Mythical school did not succeed in making a permanent impression. In the Netherlands the Christ of the "Moderns" approached very closely to the picture of Strauss and Renan; but in the main the 19th century viewed with little sympathy any strikingly revolutionary conception of the Christ of the Gospels.

The foundations for the change of aspect were laid by one of the disciples of the Ritschlian school, Prof. Hermann of Marburg.

It was recognized as never before that the statement made by Tischendorf in 1870 was fundamentally correct. "Christianity does not, strictly speaking, rest on the moral teaching of Jesus, however sub-

lime that is, but it rests on his person only".³ Therefore in the opening years of the new century well nigh the whole struggle between faith and rationalism was centred upon Him. And the development of the new Christology has been so rapid that it has attained its full growth, and has seen the beginning of a sharp reaction, since the first year of the century.⁴

First of all, in order of this new development, stands Dr. Harnack's celebrated *"Essence of Christianity"* 1900, followed the next year by Wrede's *"Messiah-problem in the Gospels"*. In 1903 the Socialists Kalthoff and Naumann began the discussion of the new ideas concerning Christ. The year 1904 saw the full development of the movement, when Wernle furnished its literary basis in his *"Sources of the Life of Jesus"*. Rosenau and Naumann continued the Socialistic propaganda, and Kalthoff completed the breach between the old views and the new.

But of the greatest interest unquestionably were Bousset's two contributions—*"Jesus"* and *"What do we know about Jesus"*. From this time on no doubt was possible as to the tendency and the ultimate outcome of the New Christology. The two following years 1905-06 produced a turbulent stream of "Jesus-literature" which seemed to engulf the Christ of the Gospels and to carry him hopelessly away. The extremest views were presented by Schmiedel in his—*"The person of Jesus in the battle of present opinions"*, by Jensen in his—*"Gilgames Epic in the World's Literature"*, and by Smith's—*"The Pre-Christian Jesus"*. The latter's work is the more remarkable because he is an American professor of science in Tulane University, and has been eagerly received and introduced to the German circle of Christological iconoclasts by Professor Schmiedel of Zurich. Under this group we may also name Mehlhorn's—*"Truth and Fiction in the Life of Jesus"*. The men however who impressed not only Germany, but the whole Protestant as well as the Catholic Church, with the gravity of the situation, were the great leaders:

³ "When were our Gospels written?" 40. London Tract Society. 1870.

² Bruno Bauer. "Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes"; Bremen, 1840. "Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker"; Leipzig, 1841-42.

⁴ See statement of H. R. Mackintosh, on the authority of Hermann of Marburg, in "British Weekly", October 21, 1909.

Wellhausen with his "Introduction to the First Three Gospels", Harnack with his "Credibility of the Gospel Story", Pfleiderer with his "Origin of Christianity", Otto with his "Life and Works of Jesus in accordance with the Historico-Critical Conception", and Von Hartmann with his "Christianity of the New Testament".

Of inestimable value for the understanding of the entire movement are Von Schnehen's "Modern Jesus Cult" and Schweitzer's "From Reimarus to Wrede. In 1907 the most important contribution to the modern "Jesus-literature" was Weinel's *Jesus in the 19th Century*", and in 1909 Juelicher's "The Religion of Jesus in the

Culture of the Present". Meanwhile the Socialists, Lozinsky and Kautsky had dealt with the subject in a most radical way from their own standpoint, and a host of smaller and larger pamphlets had flooded the market in defense or rejection of the new theories.

In this partial sketch of the modern "Jesus-literature", as is observed, I make no mention of publications on the subject by other continental, British, Scottish, Dutch and American authors. I confine myself wholly to Germany, because there the New Jesus-Cult arose and thence the New Christology has permeated the whole world.

II. The Characteristics of the New Christology

It is now in order to ask—*What Characterizes the New Christology?*

The answer is *It presents an utterly New Christ*. Through all the ages of its history, Christianity was never attacked in as deadly a fashion as in this movement. With the exception of passing attempts operative only in limited spheres of influence, the picture of Christ presented by the Gospels had hitherto been left untouched and unimpeached. True enough, the fourth Gospel has for many decades, in liberal circles, been considered as an idealization of the life and words of Christ; but the Synoptic Gospels were generally viewed as a true picture of the living Christ, naturally with slight differences according to the underlying sources of the three Gospels. But the new historico-critical method of which Harnack is unquestionably the originator, changed the whole aspect of things. Hermann of Marburg, following the subjective Ritschlian method, holds "that the historical greatness of the person of Jesus, in its central content, in its inner life, may be apprehended independently of historical tradition and its criticism". With him the certainty of the Christian faith depends on two things: the impression of the historical greatness of Jesus which confronts us in history; and his ethical demands which, once understood by us, may be apprehended through their eternal truth. A subjective valuation therefore of the life and ethics of Christ, independent of all historical data, is all

that is necessary for the maintenance of Christianity. As we see, the objective reality of the truth is here wholly subordinated to its subjective valuation. But the question stands entirely differently with Harnack and Bousset. Both hold that the "Jesus-image which satisfies faith can only be found in the way of historical criticism". The process must be thorough and fearless and the ultimately resulting *historical image* of Jesus must be wholly determined by the selection of trustworthy sources.

But Where are We to find these Trustworthy Sources?

The modern historico-critical method presupposes that the Gospels, as we have them, are wholly unreliable, since they are evidently colored with the dogmatic consciousness of the early Church. In other words, the gospel records, as we have them, do not draw the picture of Christ as he was, but as the early Church believed or wished him to have been.

The earliest Christian literature, the chief Pauline epistles, are of no value whatever; since—"these, historically the oldest witnesses, are the scantiest possible sources for our knowledge of Jesus".⁵ John of course is ruled out entirely.⁶

⁵ Wernle. "Die Quellen des Leben Jesu", 5.

⁶ Idem, 12. The question of the Fourth Gospel seems to loom up again. Dr. Herman Jordan of Erlangen openly avows his belief in the authenticity of the Gospel. "Jesus und die modernen Jesusbilder", 1909 (21, 99). Nay, the position has been taken again and again of late that John's Gospel is not only authentic, but is also the oldest of all the gospels. (Fr. Barth. "Das Johannes Evangelium und die Synoptischen Parallelen".)

The Synoptics then?

Alas, "here we are not yet at the end of our way".⁷ But certainly Mark remains, the source on which the critics, in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, staked all? Not at all. Even this Gospel has to bear the accusation that "its historical image of Christ is strongly overdrawn, so that the person of Christ has been changed into something grotesque and fantastic".⁸ Both Mathew and Mark, we are told, show everywhere traces of the transfiguring hand of the dogmatician of the early Church. To know the true Christ *we must therefore go back of the Gospels and search in a new source*, which the critics find in a so-called "Q" Gospel, derived from a comparative study of the Synoptic Gospels. But even there Wernle believes that the dreaded taint is to be surmised of the subjective coloring of the faith of the early Church. No one, he admits, knows this earliest gospel in a satisfactory way.⁹

And yet it is the task of the critic, even in this mysterious unknown Gospel, to separate the chaff from the wheat.

But how pray? By what means is this stupendous task to be accomplished? The answer is ready.

Harnack tells us that all that is needed is "a clear apprehension of life and a true estimate of what is really great".¹⁰ Pfeid-erer demands "healthy eyes and a sober, honest love of the truth".¹¹ Bousset bids us accept "all that can be psychologically apprehended".¹² But there is one supreme test of reality and veracity in the Gospel picture of Jesus, according to Bousset and Mehlhorn. Grasp it well! We can, they tell us, be absolutely sure of everything, only which is contradicted or antagonized by the later faith of the Church, and which therefore has not been retouched by it.¹³ Nay Bousset goes even one step further and bids us "use our imagination when the tradition of the Gospels does not suffice".¹⁴

The foundation of the New Christology

7 Wernle. "Quellen des Leben Jesus", 54.

8 Wernle. "Quellen des Leben Jesu", 60.

9 Idem 59.

10 "Wesen des Christentums", 9, 16.

11 "Entstehung des Christentums", 12, 15.

12 "Was wissen wir von Jesus?", 56, 60.

13 "Was wissen wir von Jesus?", 57 (Bousset).

14 "Wahrheit und Dichtung", 15 (Mehlhorn).

15 "Jesus", 30.

is therefore *the subjective application of the historico-critical test*. To know Christ we must cut loose from the text of the Gospels. And when we look at the portrait of Christ, evolved by the herculean labors of all these master minds, we may wail with Mary, at the empty tomb "They have taken my Lord away and I know not where they have laid him"; or we may apply to it, in a literal sense, the words of Isa. liii—"When we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him". He is one of us, only quantitatively removed from us in holiness. The picture, which Bousset, Wernle and others draw of him, is of one, who "full of doubt cried to his God for the knowledge of his will and for peace". Nay, Frenssen tells us, in the most widely read novel the German press has ever produced, and which is focussed in a small life of Jesus contained in it, "he groaned by the rock-side, a poor lonely man, in direct distress, torn by fearful doubts". And again—"Jesus stood there as a man. A man he was. There are abundant proofs for it. (1) He said it himself. (2) In his thinking he was a child of his time. (3) He bore a specific character. (4) He was developed. (5) His nature was not wholly free from evil. And (6) He erred especially in his fine, hot, childish faith: he did not come again, neither did the Kingdom of God come. He was a man, however marvelously good and wise and clear eyed and courageous. In no deed, in no thought, does he exceed the measure of a man. He was a man and no more. True, till the last he had a faint hope that his Father in heaven would spare him the dregs of the bitter cup; but no ten thousand angels came. Not a single one came. Of all his faithful ones and relatives not a single one was present. He died after he had hung there, stertorously breathing, a few hours, from loss of blood and asphyxiation. That was his life and that was his death. He was the most beautiful of the children of men".¹⁵

What boldness and arrogance; what insufferable juggling with the text of the Gospels!

The New Christ of the critics is then a mere man; he makes many mistakes, as,

15 "Hilligenlei", 50, 569. "Das Leben des Heilands", 84, 101.

e.g., in regard to the speedy advent of the Kingdom of God,¹⁶ in regard to his attitude to the Law;¹⁷ nay, he is not even without sin.¹⁸

But the iconoclastic spirit of Criticism, once it was aroused, went far beyond this point. Celsus, the arch enemy of Christianity, in the second century, had declared Christ "an idiotic character", "a man lacking in mentality". But as the centuries passed, that charge was further left unspoken. Of recent years Paul has been repeatedly declared *non compos mentis*, through epileptic attacks, and recently even Luther has been adjudged a neurasthenic¹⁹, but till now the question of Christ's mentality was left untouched. The very idea of the discussion of the psychological health or illness of the Master, a decade ago, would have shaken the Christian world from center to circumference; it would have been considered absolute blasphemy.

What happened? In 1905, Dr. G. Lomer of Neustadt, superintendent of a lunatic-asylum in Holstein, issued a pamphlet, entitled "*Jesus Christ from the Standpoint of the alienist. A Critical Study for professional Men and intelligent Laymen*".²⁰ Apparently dreading the storm that might be aroused, he assumed the nom de plume "Dr. De Lossten". As the event proved, there was no need at all of this precaution, although he declared without reservation, Christ to have been a lunatic.

He was followed in the new path, in the same year, by Dr. Emil Rasmussen, a Danish theologian, in a treatise, entitled—"*Jesus, a Comparative Psycho-Pathological Study*".²¹ This author concludes that Christ was an epileptic, with diseased mental powers; and his work was enthusiastically endorsed by his translator, Dr. Arthur Rothenberg.²²

¹⁶ "Jesus", 35.

¹⁷ *Ibidem* 60.

¹⁸ "Hilligenlei", 587.

¹⁹ "Hausrath", "Luther's Leben". Berlin, 1904.

²⁰ "Jesus Christus vom Standpunkt des Psychiaters". "Eine kritische Studie fuer Fachleute und gebildete Laien", 1905.

²¹ "Jesus. Eine vergleichende Psycho-Pathologische Studie". 1905.

²² The translator of Rasmussen's work is Arthur Rothenberg, who has this to say: "Jesus shows all the symptoms of the old and the new prophets. He is incomparably anxious, becomes violent in the incident of the cleansing of the temple and suffers hallucinations. His life is described as abnormal. He encourages the folly of faith in the redemptive power of his death. His self-deception of the *Parousia* has fully failed. He was a true and worthy man, whose tragic fate deserves our heartfelt sympathy".

The great leaders of German thought, and therefore of the world's thinking, lifted no hand in defense. Almost without exception Vergil's words apply to them.

"Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant".

No thrill of indignation passed through Germany, no mighty voices were raised in protest. Had not the great leaders opened the way of submitting Christ to the keenest critical scrutiny, and is not science free and fearless? Instead of condemning this blasphemous attack on the person of Jesus, all Germany devoured Gustav Frenssen's "Hilligenlei", a novel with a purpose, quoted above. In this book, according to the author, are contained *all the newest ideas concerning Christ, which are taught by the great teachers in the great German Universities*. Frenssen sought to popularize these ideas, to strip them of the technicalities of the schools and to bring them within reach of the masses. And in this sketch of the Life of Jesus, Frenssen practically acknowledges the correctness of the results of the above quoted psycho-pathological studies in the Life of Jesus; since he allows Kai Jans to say that—"Christ went to the very verge of that which is human, even to the borderline of excited dementation".²³

No book of late years has moved Germany as has this novel. And its reception reflects the attitude of the intelligent masses toward Christianity. As to the teachers, to whom Frenssen claims to be indebted for his Christology, and whom he names one by one in the epilogue of the edition, printed at Berlin in 1905—Holtzmann, Julicher, Wernle, Weinel, Wrede, Grimm, Otto, Meyer, O. Holtzmann, Traub, Bousset, Harnack, Von Soden, Hollmann and Troeltsch—they have tried in vain to shirk the burden of responsibility, by claiming that the author has "misunderstood them". They have failed at least to make clear wherein their teachings radically differ from the picture of Christ drawn by Kai Jans.

This assault on the psychological condition of Christ has been splendidly met by Dr. Hermann Werner, an emeritus pastor, at Audernach am Rhein, in his book—

²³ "Hilligenlei. Roman von Gustav Frenssen. Siebenundneunzig Tausend. Berlin. G. Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung". 1905.

let—"The Physical Health of Christ".²⁴

The New Christology, where it still holds to Christ, as the great religious leader, presents therefore not only a *New Christ* but also a *New Gospel*. This gospel is, in its final aspect "Personality and Religion", i. e., a universal religion, most powerfully, and therefore also in the most exemplary way, realized in the person of Christ.²⁵ Or as Dr. Gruetzmacher of Rostock expresses it "God, virtue and immortality".²⁶ We thus come back to the old Kantian position. Jesus may be called "Savior"; because he has fully realized the moral religion of humanity in his own person, and on this account He remains the leader of all times and of all nations, both as regards God and man. According to the critics, Christ has modified the religion of Israel in certain points and has purified it in certain particulars; but in Him the universal religion, viz—*faith in God, immortality and virtue*, has reached its climax in a peculiarly strong and singular way. And thus, but thus only, we may call him our mediator because he leads the way to God.

But what he thought of himself we may never know, because the faith of his early followers ascribed acts to him and laid words on his lips which are utterly unhistorical and hence untrue. At certain times of his life and under certain conditions, he considered himself the "son of man", whatever that may have meant on his lips, and the Messiah; but in reality he never exceeded the human sphere of existence.

This then is the final verdict of historical criticism in Germany concerning Christ and his Gospel!

Small wonder that in our day, in which the social question looms up so large and in which Socialism is so extensively studied and makes so wide a propaganda, the leaders of the *Social Democracy* should have found in this merely human Christ, a man after their own heart, *the leader of the proletariat of his day*.

It is only fair to say that one wing of the German Socialists utterly rejects Christ. Thus Lozinsky declares him—"a decadent, a tired, unenergetic Nazarene", a man with an open eye for the future only and a dead sense of present injury. As to

the early Church, yes, it was Socialistic, it consisted mostly of the proletariat. And such a proletariat! The author declares the early Christians to have been a "*Lumpen-Proletariat*", mere rag-bags and social parasites.²⁷

But the other wing looks more favorably on Christ. Prof. Deissman saw in him an out and out Socialist. Naumann called him, in 1904,—"an imposing social figure, a man of the people, a reorganizer of society, who as such has even in our day much to say to our people". Later on, however, after his Asiatic tour, Naumann considerably modified these favorable views, without however taking Lozinsky's radical standpoint.²⁸

But Karl Kautsky, the literary leader of the present day Social Democracy, has fully developed the theory in his book "*The Origin of Christianity*", 1909.²⁹ As he sees it, Christianity grew wholly out of the social conditions of its environment. Jesus was, in the fullest sense, one of the leaders of the proletariat. He says, "Jesus can be historically understood only if looked upon in this light. Not much that we know of him is historically reliable; but from Luke xx. we can learn with considerable certainty that, on the occasion of the great religious festival in Jerusalem, Jesus of Nazareth started an agitation which ended in a fiasco, because he was betrayed, and Jesus then died the death of an ordinary rebel. The movement, which he intended to inaugurate, had really very little in common with what later on is known as Christianity. The Christian movement of history is really almost entirely independent of the person of Jesus. It was through the agitation of Jesus and his immediate followers that the suppressed proletariat tried to rid itself of its hard lot. But Christianity afterward transferred all its ideals to its martyr-hero Jesus, until he was finally changed into the unhistorical Jesus of the New Testament. The fact that Christianity was originally such a communistic and social-democratic agitation is proved by the opening chapters of Acts, and a number of passages in Luke".

²⁷ Lozinsky. "Was Jesus Gott, Mensch oder Uebermensch?" 1906. "Was haben die Armen dem Christentum zu verdanken?" 24.

²⁸ "Jesus als Volksmann". 1904.

²⁹ "Die Entstehung des Christentums" 1906.

²⁴ "Die Psychische Gesundheit Jesu". 1909.

²⁵ Harnack. "Wesen des Christentums", 75.

²⁶ "Ist das liberale Jesusbild modern?" 1907, 19.

Thus the historical criticism of the Gospels, in the first decade of the 20th century, has robbed Christ of all for which he has stood throughout the ages. The radicals revamp the old theories of Bruno Bauer, and flatly deny his historical existence.³⁰ The Social Democrats claim him as one of their heroes, if they do not reject him with scorn. The more sober minded critics deny his Virgin birth, i.e., his deity, his miracles, the scope of his teachings, as we find them in the Gospels; the vicarious meaning and value of his death; the actuality of his resurrection and ascension, as well as his own great doctrine, later on so strongly developed by St. Paul, *his ever impending Parousia*. According to the well nigh unanimous verdict of the leading critics, the entire Gospel picture of Christ is a falsification of the historic Jesus, a fantastic portrait created and colored by the dogmatic consciousness of the early Church.

Such then is the Modern Christ!

Do we wonder that honest men among the liberals demand, with Von Schnehen, that the new principle be carried to its ul-

³⁰ "Der vorchristliche Jesus", 1906. "Das Giltamosepos in die Weltliteratur", 1906.

timate and logical consequences, and that an effort be made to substitute something new for time-worn Christianity?

Men of sober judgment must see, and are seeing, that the true historical Christ; the founder of a new civilization; the pathfinder of modern history; the one to whom all the ages since his advent turn back; the one who has rejuvenated the old dying world and saved it from itself; the one who changed, for countless hosts of martyrs, the gate of death into a gate of glory as they died for him; the one who for nineteen centuries inspired the hearts of thousands of preachers of his Gospel with unquenchable zeal; the one who enabled suffering believers to patiently bear their cross after him, and who made burden-bearing a joy; the one who is altogether lovely for those who love him—and trust in him—that this mighty Savior is not and never can be the poor, attenuated, devitalized, truly pitiable "historical" figure in which the modern critics would have us believe, but the Christ of the Gospels as we have them.

[NOTE.—Part II. will appear in the next issue.—*Editor.*]

Immanence, Transcendence and Natural Law

L. E. LINCOLN, ROSLINDALE, MASS.

People who deny the authority of the Bible, the possibility of miracles and insist upon the immutability of natural law are usually believers in the existence of God. They readily admit his immanence, but deny his transcendence.

The question naturally occurs how he can be either without being both immanent and transcendent. As a Spirit he is either active in the universe or passive. If passive he is under the sway of Law and Law is sovereign. If he is God he must be supreme—the law giver and its executive—that is, active in the promulga-

tion and application of law. If God is the author of law, we may not suppose that his power to invent or change or modify is circumscribed by anything but his own will.

That the laws of mind and spirit are not fully understood is obvious. The action and interaction of mind and spirit can not be fully comprehended, yet can not be denied. If under favorable conditions one mind may affect and influence other minds, why doubt that God who is immanent may in an even greater degree influence human spirits whom he pervades? If I can hypnotize another and make my will

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume XIV.

OCTOBER, 1911, TO FEBRUARY, 1912.

Numbers 6-7

Notes Editorial and Critical

The New York *Evening Post* says the professors have been admitting that they do not teach. This must have been the professors

What is the Matter? in the big universities. They consider their salaries pensions to enable them to spend their time in writing books and pursuing their own studies. That is one of the chief reasons why the smaller colleges are doing so much the best work. The professors teach.

* * * * *

Prof. de Cyon, the great Russian scientist says: "What psychological truth or what historical fact has ever been demonstrated

Solid Basis of Bible Faith by proofs approaching even at a distance those which demonstrate the divine origin of the gospel revelations"? None. The advantage seems to be on the side of the Christian public which has hitherto been admonished that it must bring its beliefs into line with the results of modern science.

* * * * *

A woman writing to the *British Weekly* about women speaking in meetings says, "The only reason for this denial is a Pauline quotation, those urging it being apparently willing to forget that the Apostle Paul was subconsciously voicing Jewish opinion". Verily she has a great and new inspiration to know what was in Paul's subconsciousness.

On which the Recorder has this to say: "We know what was in his consciousness for he tells us. He thought he was voicing the will of God, for he says in regard to that very command to silence. 'If any man be a spiritual person or a prophet let him acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are the commandments of God'".

* * * * *

One of the preachers at Cornell University, who had formerly been a pastor in Boston, on a recent Sabbath in outlining the progress of the Kingdom of Christ, spoke to an audience that overflowed by many score Sage Chapel, reported the results of a late investigation to the Christian Intelligencer, over the initials "W. C. I."

Contrasting the situation of a century ago, when deistic societies were so numerous in American colleges, he declared that he knew

Thomas Paine not of the existence

After a Century of a single Thomas Paine Society, "unless it be in idiosyncratic Boston". Being in the capital of Massachusetts a few weeks ago, the city of a former pastorate, and wishing for the sake of absolute accuracy and to "verify your references", in the original manuscript or, at least, first edition, I called in upon the authorities of "the Paine Memorial Building", not far from my former pastoral charge. Instead of an assembly hall, propaganda bureau, book store, etc., with which the enterprise was inaugurated, with many a trum-

Jesus in German Theology in the First Decade of the Twentieth Century*

PROF. HENRY E. DOSKER, D.D., LL.D., OF THE PRESBYTERIAN SEMINARY OF KENTUCKY, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Part II. What, Then, is to be Our Attitude to this New Christology?

The answer is a foregone conclusion.

As to the motive underlying the entire movement, there are evidently *two distinct tendencies*.

On the one hand, it would be foolish to believe that many of these historical critics are not actuated by the purest motives. In their innermost consciousness they are searchers after the truth.

On the other hand, I cannot forbear to quote a word of Prof. Hermann Jordan of Erlangen. Says he: "In these critical efforts there is so much of denial, so much twisting of the simple and obvious words of Christ, that one may easily see that more has been at work here than histor-

ical criticism from the standpoint of a different view of life and of the world. Whilst the modern theology has not escaped the fault of endeavoring to modernize Christ, to make him more acceptable to our modern perceptions, we recognize here in general the effort, even when the attempt is not made to lay him aside in hatred, to describe him as so antiquated in his views of life and of the world, that, in any case, he does not enter into the problems of our modern time".³¹ As a lurid example of this "bitter hatred", I may refer to Friedrich Nietzsche, although his "Antichrist" was written five years before the opening of our century.

* Delivered at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky, McCormick Theological Seminary, and Princeton Theological Seminary.

³¹ "Jesus und die modernen Jesusbilder", 1907, 57.

This Modern Christology Neither "Scientific" Nor Common Sense

But whatever the motives of this recent criticism may have been, or may be to-day, I do not hesitate to say that this modern Christology appeals neither to an earnest scientific searcher after the truth nor to common sense.

Gruetzmacher's Criticism—"One of the most stimulating contributions to the current German Jesus-literature is a pamphlet written by Prof. Richard H. Gruetzmacher of Rostock, quoted before,—"*Ist das Liberale Jesus-bild Modern?*" 1907. Also another work of the same general tenor, issued only this year—"*Jesus und die Modernen Jesusbilder*", by Jordan of Erlangen, 1910.

The question propounded by Gruetzmacher is this—"Does this modern image of Jesus satisfy the scientific modern man?"

In answering this question the author sets aside the traditional faith of the Church, as a workable basis of discussion. And naturally so, for this process of reasoning would be utterly outside of the pale of that of the modern critics of the life of Christ. To meet them one must seek them on their own ground. A discussion, in which the faith of the Church would be placed over against the results of the historico-critical researches of the great German scholars engaged in this work, would satisfy neither party. For the liberals freely admit that their Christ is utterly different from the Christ of the Church and her creeds. He differs even from Paul's Christ and from John's Christ, and from the Christ depicted in the Synoptics; because, as the critics claim, all these early pictures

of Christ are vitiated by the very faith, with which the Church would meet the critics. The dogmatic consciousness of the early Church, they claim, has been at work in these pictures and has guided the brush which laid on the colors. The liberals therefore rejoice in the self-imposed task of tearing to tatters the flimsy ornamental stuff with which they claim that the Church has adorned her Christ, and of showing him to the world in the naked outlines of his own true and simple figure. How pathetic that Christ is, as he finally escapes their hands, we have seen above!

But in the present-day battle, the old apologetic methods avail not. The entire line of attack and therefore of defense has changed. Gruetzmacher has therefore laid aside the older arguments, and avails himself, in meeting the enemy on his own ground, of the criteria of "Logic, Psychology, scientific method and the universally recognized essence of religion"; and he has made the "modern man" arbiter of the debate.⁸³

And no one can lay aside this brilliant study without feeling that the reconstructed Christ of the critics is, like the body of Nebuchadnezzar's image, mixed of gold and silver and brass and iron and clay and that he is as dead as this image.

No one can wade through even a small portion of the modern German literature concerning Christ, without admiring the marvelous industry and scientific research of the great scholars who have grappled with this problem; nor without being amazed at the recklessness of their scientific method, at the bewildering differences in their approach to the subject, at the naive assurance, with which they view the result of their labors, and at the wide difference of opinion between them in their final conclusions. Looking with the utmost candor and freedom from bias at the results of all these efforts to present us with a new historical Christ, we are sure of our ground when we affirm that they are unsatisfactory both to common sense and to an unprejudiced scientific mind.

Where is the Ariadne who can give to the bewildered Theseus the guiding thread in this Cretan labyrinth of the critics?

⁸³ "Ist das liberale Jesusbild modern?" 6.

Various Schemes. — When Harnack points out the way of solving the problem of the Christ, by the demand for "an open eye for what is living and a true appreciation of the truly great";⁸⁴ when Pfeleiderer suggests "healthy eyes and a sober, honest love for the truth";⁸⁵ when Bousset stipulates that the thing to be believed must be "psychologically intelligible";⁸⁶ *they all apply tests and appoint means which are wholly subjective and therefore manifestly unscientific.* One may know how to distinguish the dead from the living, and the truly great from the small and mediocre, and yet measure with a subjective standard which makes all his work nugatory and causes him to lose himself hopelessly in the labyrinth of historical criticism; and in this bewilderment neither "healthy eyes" nor "love of the truth" will avail him anything. When the foundation is unsound, the entire superstructure is to be condemned; when the premises are at fault, the conclusions can not stand. In a matter so weighty as that of the undoing of the faith of the ages, we want something stronger and more trust-compelling than mere hypotheses or subjective valuations.

And who, in our day of Psychological riddles and widely differing drifts of opinion, would dare to make his own psychological intelligence the final arbiter of what he shall accept or reject, in the traditional Christ-picture? What seems psychologically acceptable to one, appears the very opposite to another. Fixed data are lacking for our judgement. The terms "normal" and "abnormal" are wholly subjective and not in vain does Dr. Hermann Jordan warn us to remember that the spiritual contents of one mind are wholly different from those of another. If this be not kept in mind he says—"we will finally come to the point that the materialist will consider the deeply religious mind abnormal; and that reversely the latter will look upon the consequent materialist as a pathological subject and that in this way we will mutually thrust each other into the insane asylum".⁸⁶

⁸³ "Wesen des Christentums", 9, 16.

⁸⁴ "Die Entstehung des Christentums", 12, 15.

⁸⁵ "Was wissen wir von Jesus?" 56.

⁸⁶ "Jesus und die modernen Jesusbilder", 45.

Finally, think of the main test of the acceptance or rejection of the Gospel narrative concerning Christ, laid down by Bousset and Mehlhorn,⁸⁷ that "all matter should especially be considered genuine, which contradicts the later faith of the Church and is evidently retouched by it"; and who can doubt whether here a criterion is applied which of itself is evidently false to the core.

A Gratuitous Assumption.—The whole investigation starts with the gratuitous presupposition that the faith of the early Church has colored the portrait of Christ found in the Gospels, and from this hypothetical principle, which to most people would seem to be the very thing in debate, deductions are made as if it were an axiomatic truth!

What is this dogmatic faith of the early Church and where do we find a satisfactory statement of it? There were no creeds in those early days of the Church, there was no definitely expressed consensus of opinion. The application of this criterion depends, therefore, on the subjective attitude of the critic himself.

Oh, this dogmatic consciousness of the early Church, what is not charged up to it!

It has colored the Pauline literature, all the synoptic writings, nay, even that mysterious Gospel behind the Gospels, for which the critics are hunting in vain. For even in that land of mystery and low hanging vapors, we are told that "We still have to sift the chaff from the wheat".

But now look for a moment somewhat more closely at this critical hypothesis and where do we find ourselves?

The great Pauline epistles were all written between 52 and 63 A. D. Matthew speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem as something future, and his gospel was therefore written before 70 A.D. The date of Luke is placed approximately at the same time, whilst that of Mark precedes them by a decade more or less. Harnack, who formerly placed Mark later, has confessed that the researches of Sir William Ramsay and the literary work of Sir John Hawkins have caused him to review the date,

which he now places at about the seventh decade of the first century. The whole of this literature is therefore comprised within the bounds of little more than one generation after the death of Christ.⁸⁸

Can anyone who is conversant with the slow and laborious evolution of the dogma of the Christ believe for a moment, that the early Church in this brief period had been able to elaborate a "dogmatic consciousness", which was able definitely to crystalize a universally adopted dogma of Christ, which could be strong enough to color all the details of the life of Christ, and thus to vitiate the many historical traditions which were evidently floating about everywhere in the early Christian Church?

Let him believe it who can!

Luke tells us "that many have taken in hand to set in order a declaration of those things, which are most surely believed among us". There is evidently no reference here to a dogmatic consensus of opinion, but rather to a deep conviction of the *actuality* of the things reported, the *historicity* of the Christ-picture standing boldly outlined against the background of the faith of the early Church. There was as yet no possibility of a *dogmatic consensus* of opinion concerning Christ. It was the historical consensus which underlies the efforts of all the early records of the life of Christ, of which Luke "has a perfect understanding from the very first" (Luke i. 3). And this understanding animates him to write his Gospel, with the aim of giving to Theophilus—"certainty of the things, in which he has been instructed" (i. 4). But there is a definite check on his narrative and this check lies in those men, who "from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the word" (i. 2). Hagenbach points out the subjective difference between the view points of the apostles.⁸⁹ In John we find the "internal and contemplative attitude", in Paul "the practico-dialectic"; but both are viewing the same historical Christ.

In a crushing criticism of the methods adopted by the critics of the last decade, Heinrich Weinel in his—"Ist das 'liberale' Jesusbild wiederlegt",—himself an out and out liberal, has this to say of Paul:—

⁸⁷ "Was wissen wir von Jesus?" 57. "Wahrheit und Dichtung", 15.

(Vol. xiv.—22)

⁸⁸ Harnack. "Luke the Physician".

⁸⁹ "History of Doctrine", I. 36.

"I also have formerly put the matter in a false light. What Paul offers us of Jesus and his words, is little, when one applies the test of a gospel; little also, when one demands that Paul should prove all his ideas by words of Jesus. But not only is it sufficient to find the existence of Jesus proved in the Pauline epistles, but, in every point of importance, the words of Jesus resound in Paul, and not only are a considerable number of incidents, which he knows and transmits to us, preserved for us by Paul, but also all the distinctive characteristics of the preaching of Jesus" (p. 16).

Says Neander "as long as they lived and while an appeal might be made to them in all cases of uncertainty, their oral tradition might be justly regarded as the prime source of Christian knowledge".⁴⁰ And in the post-apostolic age their disciples became the chief witnesses. Thus Justin Martyr speaks of the "*apomnemonemata*" of the apostles.⁴¹ The tradition which underlies our gospels, then, was wholly of apostolic origin. For the united testimony of all the Ante-Nicene Fathers throws the entire New Testament literature, the gospels included, back into the second half of the first century.

The Apostles and this "Dogmatic Consciousness".—The modern Jesus-cult then is perfectly correct when it charges the apostles themselves with the responsibility of the distortion of the figure of Jesus. If it was distorted at all it must have been distorted by them. The word "dogmatic consciousness" can therefore ultimately only mean apostolic dogmatic consciousness. But this theory that the apostles themselves remodelled the historical Christ, invented his miracles and largely his words, that they imagined his resurrection and then raised the superstructure of the Church of the ages on this nonexistent foundation, is utterly inconsistent with the character they bear in the Gospels and the manifestly different temperaments they represent.

Far be it from us to represent the apostles and the early chroniclers of the life of Christ as a set of modern historical critics who weighed and tested all the evidence with modern critical acumen. But still further be it from us to accept the fact that they were a packed jury, whose aim was the falsification of the true record

of the life of Christ, to bring it into harmony with certain theories or ideas which they held in common concerning the person, and life, and death, and resurrection of their crucified Lord. It is self-evident that the "dogmatic consciousness" of the early Church—if such a thing existed at all—is not the thing which has created the Gospels of Christ as we have them; but has been created by them as a matter of course. In creating the new critical hypothesis, the German critics have simply harnessed the horse behind the wagon.

To quote Sir William Ramsay, "Whenever anything occurs that savors of the marvelous in the estimation of the polished and courteous scholar, sitting in his well-ordered library and contemplating the world through its windows, it must be forthwith set aside as unworthy of attention and as mere delusion". And later on, "If you have ever lived in Asia, you know that a great religion does not establish itself without some unusual accompaniments. The marvellous result is not achieved without some marvellous preliminaries".⁴² We are deeply indebted to Sir William for these words.

The apostles called themselves "witnesses", and their testimony will stand a far more serious shock than that to which this new German Christology has subjected it. The Gospels and the Pauline literature seemed well nigh wrecked at the hands of Bruno Bauer and his radical school in the middle of the last century. But the floodtide was succeeded by an ebbtide, and as the waters receded, lo, the towers and ramparts, which were deemed to be crushed and overwhelmed, lifted their heads from the receding waters unbroken and unchanged! The entire New Testament literature was found to be practically intact. And thus, we are fully persuaded, it will be when this attack has worn itself out.

And the signs of the times are full of comfort in this direction. The Jonah's gourd seems to be withering as quickly as it has grown. The radicals are noisy enough. But they are not the soberminded thinkers, who make history. That sort of men, as Gruetzmacher says—"ever appear in the same way; they were loud in

⁴⁰ "History of Christian Dogma", I. 74.

⁴¹ *Apol.* I. 66.

⁴² "Luke the Physician", 8.

their welcome of the old rationalism, they applauded David Strausz, they were deeply stirred by Renan, and their unchanged souls swing in a timeless way, when the voices of present day rationalism call them. But it is an unbreakable law in the

history of the intellect that a view then becomes most popular when its collapse is nigh. In the depths there is still much movement and noise, when the waves on the surface are beginning to flatten out.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ "Ist das liberale Jesusbild modern?" 23.

II. Apparent Beginnings of a Reaction

To proceed with the liberals, means to deny the living potency of that which has left its ineradicable impression on the history of the last nineteen centuries. If the Christ of the Gospels is *not* the historical Christ, the whole fabric and structure of the Christian Church is a phantom, historically suspended in midair. And a deep consciousness of this fact has laid hold on the hearts of numbers of mostly young German scholars, whose labors to-day make the Christ-literature of Germany an endless stream.

Perhaps not wholly orthodox, as measured by our sterner standards, they are deeply and devoutly evangelical and are endeavoring to reassure the faith of the Church of the twentieth century in the living Christ. Such topics as "The resurrection of Christ", "*The miracles of Christ*", "*The Virgin-birth*", "*The sinlessness of Christ*", "*The knowledge and wisdom of Jesus*", "*The self-consciousness of Christ*", "*The need of Christ as a mediator*", "*The new message in the doctrine of Christ*"—are eagerly and learnedly discussed by these younger Germans, in defiance of the great historical critics, who in some cases were their teachers.

And these books and essays sell by the thousands; and men begin to see again the inherent beauty and strength of the ethical and religious ideals of the Scriptures, in the way indicated by Jesus himself, when he said, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself". I believe that the crest of the wave of negation has passed, that the storm-center is shifting from Germany to spheres where less initiative is coupled with slavish adulation of the great German master minds. "As Rome does so does the world". "As Germany thinks so thinks the world. If

the younger Germans, the men of to-morrow, therefore, resolutely turn away from the New Christology, we may look for a revival of the old faith in Christ in so-called scientific circles.

But, whether so or otherwise, the true Church of the Living God will ever adore Christ as her only teacher and savior, her "Lord and her God". And she will devoutly repeat after Peter, "*Whom having not seen we love, in whom though now we see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of our faith even the salvation of our souls*".

When in April of last year the Evangelicals of Berlin desired to find out where they stood with the masses, they placarded the city with invitations for all men, who believed in the "Living Christ", to meet April 19, in the "Circus Busch", a building with a seating capacity of some fifteen or twenty thousand. It was apparently a forlorn hope!

Measure their amazement, when on that morning every avenue leading to the Circus, was crowded with throngs of men and women, thousands upon thousands. Generals and Admirals, professors and students, officials of every kind, young and old, the rich and the poor, were there. And when the building was crowded to its fullest capacity, and when the thousands waiting without, were unable to find another meeting-place, they wended their way, with one impulse to the great cathedral and there sang Luther's battle hymn of the Reformation—"Ein feste Burg". The same thing was repeated in some fifty of the larger cities of the Empire.

No, Germany is not all Liberal! Luther's land has not utterly denied Luther's Christ! What a challenge to us in America, who love Christ, to be up and doing. The battle is at our door, shall we coward-

ly strike the flag, or boldly advance on the enemy?

As this matter goes to the printer, our attention is attracted by an article in the *Literary Digest*, February 25, 1911, on the "Failure of Liberal Theology", which consists of quotations from a paper in the *Christliche Welt* by Dr. Rittelmeyer. We are tempted to give the quotations, as they stand there:

"Let us ask honestly what results modern theology has attained practically. As far as the great masses of workmen are concerned practically nothing has been gained. They either do not understand it or they distrust it. All the public discussions and popularization of modern critical views have not found any echo or sympathy among the ranks of the laboring people.

"And how about the educated classes? It has long since been the boast and hobby of advanced theology that it and it alone will satisfy the religious longings of the educated man who has broken with the traditional dogma and doctrines of orthodox Christianity. But what are the actual facts in the case? It is a fact that there are a considerable number among the educated who thankfully confess that they can accept Christianity only in the form in which it is taught by the advanced theologian. But how exceedingly small this number is! A periodical like the *Christliche Welt*, the only paper of its kind, has not been able to secure more than five thousand subscribers, altho its contributors are the most brilliant in the land of scholars and thinkers; while periodicals that are exponents of the older views are read by tens and even hundreds of thousands. There are whole classes of society among the educated who are antagonistic to liberal tendencies in religion. Among these are the officers in the army and the navy, practitioners of the technical arts and of engineering, and almost to a man the whole world of business. It is foolish to close our eyes to these facts".

What is the matter? asks this writer. What is the weakness of liberal and advanced theological thought? These are some of the answers:

"One trouble is that modern theology has entirely grown out of criticism. Its weakness is intellectualism; it is a negative movement. We can understand the cry of the orthodox, that advanced theology is eliminating one thing after the other from our religious thought, and then asks, What is left? True, we answer, God is left. But is it not the case that the modern God-Father faith is generally a very weak, and attenuated faith in a Providence and nothing more? And on this subject too we quarrel among ourselves, whether a God-Father troubles himself about little things only or about great things too, such as the forgiveness of sins. We do the same thing with Jesus. We speak of him as of a unique personality, as the highest revelation of the Father, and the like, but always connected with a certain skeptical undercurrent of thought; but we do not appreciate him in his deepest soul and in the great motives of his life. He is not for modern theology what he is for orthodoxy, the Savior of the world and the Redeemer of mankind".

Quite naturally this open confession of a pronounced liberal attracts more than ordinary attention. The liberal papers, including the *Christliche Welt* itself, pass it by without further comment, but the conservatives speak out boldly. Representative of the latter is the *Evangelische Lutherrische Kirchenzeitung* of Leipzig, which says:

"The psychological and spiritual solution of Rittelmeyer's problem is not so hard to find. The soul of man can not live on negations. To stir the soul there must be positive principles and epoch-making historical facts, such as are offered by the scriptural teachings of Christ and his words. There can be religious life only where there is faith in him who is the truth and the life. Liberal theology has failed because it has nothing to offer".

Some of the Recent Literature Bearing on the Subject

1900. Harnack. "Wesen des Christentums".
 1901. Wrede. "Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien".
 1903. Kalthoff. "Das Christusproblem. Grundlinien zu einer Social Theologie".
 Naumann. "Briefe ueber Religion".
 Naumann. "Asia."

1904. Bousset. "Jesus".
 Bousset. "Was wissen wir von Jesus".
 Kalthoff. "Die Entstehung des Christentums. Neue Beiträge zum Christusproblem".
 Rosenau. "Wider die Pfaffenherrschaft".
 Wernle. "Quellen des Leben Jesu".
 Naumann. "Jesus als Volksmann".
1905. Harnack. "Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelischen Geschichte".
 Barth. "Das Johannes Evangelium und die Synoptischen Parallelen".
 Wellhausen. "Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien".
 Otto. "Leben und Wirken Jesu, nach historisch kritischer Auffassung".
 Von Hartmann. "Das Christentum des Neuen Testaments".
 Pfeiderer. "Die Entstehung des Christentums".
1906. Von Schnehen. "Die moderne Jesuscultus".
 Lozinsky. "War Jesus Gott, Mensch oder Uebermensch?"
 Lozinsky. "Das Wahnchristentum als Feind von Kunst und Wissenschaften".
 Mehlhorn. "Wahrheit und Dichtung im Leben Jesu".
 Schweitzer. "Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte des Leben Jesu Forschung".
 Jensen. "Das Gilgamossepos in die Weltliteratur".
 Drew. "Religion als Bewusstsein Gottes".
 Smith. "Der Vorchristliche Jesus".
1907. Schmiedel. "Die Person Jesu im Streite der Meinungen der Gegenwart".
 Grützmacher. "Ist das liberale Jesusbild Modern".
 Lozinsky. "Waren die Urchristen wirklich Sozialisten?"
 Weinel. "Jesus im 19ten Jahrhundert".
 Lozinsky. "Was haben die Armen dem Christentum zu verdanken".
1908. Kautsky. "Der Ursprung des Christentums".
1909. Juellicher. "Die Religion Jesu im Kultur der Gegenwart".
 Jordan. "Jesus und die Modernen Jesusbilder".
1910. Weinel. "Ist des 'liberale' Jesusbild widerlegt?"

A New Estimate of the Theological Situation *

PROFESSOR OLIN A. CURTIS, S.T.D., LL.D., DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
 MADISON, N. J.

I. The Theological Situation as Presented in 1896

* This paper appeared in The Methodist Quarterly Review, October, 1910. It is reprinted by permission of the author, who is the head of the Department of Systematic Theology in Drew Seminary, and acknowledged to be one of the ablest of American theologians. The discussion evinces a first-hand mastery of the subject, and is in every way sound, scientific, judicial and conclusive.

The first part of the paper is a resume of an article on the subject, written fifteen years before; the second brings the discussion of the lapse in Theology down to date. No teacher or preacher can afford to leave it unread.—*Editor*.

In 1896 I made a study of our entire

modern theological situation, gathering up the results in a comprehensive analysis. Recently it occurred to me that it would be worth while, now after almost fifteen years, to make a new study and a new estimate, using my old analysis as a starting point, indicating the most significant changes which have taken place, and thus finding perhaps a fresh message for the Christian preacher.

The Moral Situation as Noted at That Time.

To understand thoroughly the theological situation, I began with the moral situation, and I discovered its root-peculiarity to be a failing sense of personal responsi-

bility for character. Quickly I admitted that there was a fine emphasis upon duty, but in that emphasis I pointed out serious utilitarian and fatalistic flaws. "Duty is