

West, there to disband Major-General Massey's brigades." * * * "Divers of the disbanded came from very remote countries, and had passes, some for Egypt, others for Mesopotamia and Ethiopia." This paragraph, Carlyle thinks, is some of Joshua's wit.

"This work was no sooner over but it pleased God to visit the general with a sore fit of the stone. Saint Paul needed a thorn in the flesh; and by thirst and lack of water, Samson might know himself to be a man. This fit continued on him for many days together. So soon as he was recovered he made a journey to London. This was the first time of his visiting London since he marched forth with the army, having a small desire to see that place till he could bring an olive branch in his mouth, choosing rather to hasten peace than spin out the war; which made an humble tent more acceptable to him until he had obtained his end, than a glorious city," etc., etc.

He arrived in London Nov. 12, 1646, and the volume is concluded with the speeches upon that occasion, a character of the army, a list of all its officers, and a journal of every day's march.

ARTICLE VIII.

DORNER'S HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

By Professor Henry B. Smith, Amherst College.

Die Lehre von der Person Christi geschichtlich und biblisch-dogmatisch dargestellt von Dr. J. A. Dorner. In drei Theilen. Erster Theil. Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi in der ersten vier Jahrhunderten: Stuttgart, 1845. [The Doctrine of the Person of Christ by Dr. J. A. Dorner. In three Parts. Part First; The History of the Development of the Doctrine in the first four centuries, pp. xxx. and 1129.]

THIS work of Dr. Dorner is one of the ripest products of German scholarship in the department of doctrinal history. The way in which it has grown up to its present form is an illustration of the historical thoroughness and philosophical method of that scholarship, as well as of the conflicts to which the orthodox faith is exposed in Germany,

and the mode in which it repels its assailants and maintains its integrity.

Two articles in the "Tübinger Zeitschrift" for the years 1835 and 1836 formed the basis of the present work. These were written with such command over the subject-matter, and were, besides, so adapted to the controversy about fundamental facts and doctrines of Christianity, which was then at its height in Germany, that they at once attracted the highest attention and admiration. Some extracts from the preface to these articles may serve to give an idea of the spirit of the circumstances in which they were composed. Beginning with the motto: *Descendit deus, et assurgamus*, the author proceeds: "In the long conflict between Christianity and reason, it is a matter of congratulation that that point is gradually coming to be universally and distinctly understood, which is of the very first importance, if the controversy is ever to be decided. All the energies of the two conflicting parties are collecting themselves more and more around the Person of Christ, as the central point where the matter must be determined; and this is a great advance towards an adjustment of the hard strife; for when the question is rightly put, the answer is already half found. It is also easy to see, that in this case everything depends upon the question, whether there need have been, and really has existed, such a Christ as we find in the sense, if not always in the words, of the church — that is, a being in whom the personal and perfect union of divinity and humanity is truly consummated and historically made manifest. For if we suppose, on the one hand, that philosophy could incontrovertibly prove that the person of Christ in this sense is a self-contradicting notion, and therefore an impossibility, there would then no longer be any conflict between Christian theology and philosophy. With the overthrow of this doctrine, Christian theology and the Christian church would cease to have an existence in any legitimate sense of the word Christian; as with the capitulation of the metropolis the whole land falls to the enemy. There would then be peace between the parties. And, on the other hand, if, as some maintain, the idea of a Christ who is both human and divine can be proved on philosophical grounds to be rational and necessary, then, too, it is equally clear that philosophy and theology would be essentially reconciled with each other, and would ever after have a common labor, or rather would have really become one; and philosophy would then not have lost, but strengthened its claims to existence. Hence, in the great battle which is fighting between the greatest powers in the world, Christianity and reason, it is well for both

parties, that the contest should centre more and more around the point where alone all is to be won and all is to be lost."

The allusions made in the above extract are to the great parties which at that time divided, and which still divide, the German theological public. There was the extreme, destructive party, taking as its foundation the pantheistic interpretation of Hegel's system, and the attempted critical demolition of the historical basis of Christianity in Strauss's *Life of Jesus*: this maintained that the doctrine of the Person of Christ was by historical criticism proved to be mythical, and on philosophical principles shown to involve contradictions. There were, on the other hand, those who asserted, that they could show, on speculative grounds, the necessity of such a manifestation of the Godhead as that which the church, on other grounds, believed to be consummated in the person of its Redeemer. Besides these two philosophical parties, there was a third, which declared that all attempts to give a philosophical view of the doctrine were wholly vain and fruitless. This last position, the author says, cannot be admitted, unless we assume that there is a great gulf fixed between reason and faith, so that they which would pass from hence cannot, neither can they pass over that would come from thence: "For he that holds Christianity to be reasonable, must also assume that there is a constant upholding and strengthening of reason by means of Christianity itself, so that no limits can be assigned to its progress. If Christ, as theology must be convinced, is indeed the key to the world's history, as well as to the solution of all the great problems of our existence, it is not humility but wilful inactivity, not to be constantly learning to use this key better in the opening of the mysteries."

Such being the position of the different parties, Dr. Dorner proposed a twofold purpose in giving his historical exposition of this central doctrine of the Christian faith. On the one hand he would show, that the acts were not yet closed; that is, that philosophy had been precipitate in affirming, either that the doctrine involved irreconcilable contradictions, or that it had been demonstrated as necessary by an "a priori construction." On the other hand, from what has already been achieved for the understanding of this doctrine, he would draw the inference, that the attempt is not so fruitless as many maintain. In addressing himself to this work, he leaves out of view the history of our Saviour's life, and also his atoning work, and confines himself exclusively to a history of the doctrine of the Person, that is, of the Two Natures of Christ, as this has been unfolded in the progress and controversies of the Christian Church.

The two treatises which were written to carry out this view were expanded, some four years afterwards, into an octavo volume of about 550 pages, published in 1839. In the Introduction to this book he repudiates the notion that any one could give a true exhibition of the history of a doctrine without any doctrinal basis;¹ and sets forth as the leading idea of his work, that Christ is of importance, not merely as a historical personage, nor yet alone in an ideal or metaphysical point of view, (as the pantheist maintains,) but that both the historical and ideal, the divine and the human, are absolutely one in his perfected person; and that he is the head of the race, which race is not a mass, but an organism. And he propounds the "idea of the God-man Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who is man and the Head of the church, as the word which alone can solve the enigma that weighs upon German Christianity." This work established the reputation of its author. It is perhaps the most finished example, in historical theology, of the clear and masterly unfolding of the history of a doctrine in its successive stages. It is both critical and comprehensive. It unites, in rare proportion, historical accuracy and philosophical insight with a firm faith in the substantial truth of the orthodox doctrine respecting the Person of Christ. It is dictated by, and it serves to illustrate the wholesome influence of a firm conviction in the harmony and ultimate reconciliation of reason and faith, of Christianity and philosophy. One of the chief excellences of the work in this first edition, is its special criticism upon the later Christological controversies in Germany. We do not know where there is to be found so lucid an account of the bearing of the later philosophical and theological systems of Germany upon the great doctrines that centre in Christ, as is contained in the latter half of this volume. The respective influence and positions of the schools of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel are clearly presented and thoroughly criticised. The Christology of Schleiermacher closes the series; and from this long research and review the author looks forward with earnest faith to the time of a rich harvest in which the

¹ For this position he is somewhat severely taken to task by Baur in his *History of the Trinity*. It is the claim of Baur, as of Strauss, that he goes to the study of history without any preconceived opinion; although it would not be difficult to show, that he goes there, assuming the essential truth of the pantheistic interpretation of the doctrine. So Strauss interprets the life of Christ without any previous bias — only he denies the possibility of a miracle. Dörner, in the continuation of the above sentence, implies the true reason for his seeming assumption — and that is, his personal faith in Christ on the ground of the testimony of the Scriptures.

ripest fruits of the past shall all be gathered. "And as Ethiopia and Arabia, after bowing down to the prophet, are to bring their loyal tribute to the Lord, so shall the middle ages with their scholasticism, and the later philosophy also, so shall the whole religious history of the world, both before and after the advent of Christ, be seen to congregate around that One; all shall lay down their best gifts before Him, who first gave them the key by which they could understand themselves, and who also makes them worthy to contribute to his honor; and by their labors the glories of his Person shall be displayed in ever-increasing lustre, and imbibed with conscious love by the human race." (p. 529.)

We should be glad to dwell more in detail upon Dr. Dorner's exposition of the German systems, but we must leave this part of his work, of which a second edition has not yet been published, that we may give a more full view of the book which stands at the head of this Article. This is the first volume of a new edition, which is to be comprised in three octavos. This volume was issued in three parts during the years 1845 and 1846, and makes a book of more than eleven hundred pages, fitted out with those admirable indices, which the Germans understand the art of making so well. The second volume, which is to comprise the remainder of the history, was promised for the year 1846, but it has not yet made its appearance.¹ The third vol. of the new edition is to be wholly new; it will contain a full biblical and doctrinal treatise upon the subject; to be published as soon as the leisure of the author will permit."

From the ability which has been displayed in his criticisms upon the opinions of others, and from his thorough acquaintance with all the forms in which the doctrine has been held, we are warranted in indulging the highest expectations of the value of this concluding essay. The partial obscurity which seems to us to hang around his own views of the doctrine, so far as these can be inferred from the principles on which his criticism is conducted, and from incidental

¹ At the time Dr. Dorner published the first edition of his book he was professor of theology at Tübingen; in the second edition he appears as professor at Königsberg; and in a German catalogue of Books for 1847, we find the title of a pamphlet on the "Relation of Church and State," which is said to be his Inaugural Discourse on assuming a theological chair at the University of Bonn. These rapid changes, taken in connection with the more rapid political changes of his country, may account for the delay in the completion of his work. The only other book of his we have seen, is an able and critical Latin treatise *De Oratione Christi Eschatologica*, (Matt. xxiv. 1—36. Luc. xxi. 5—36. Marc. xiii. 1—32.) Asservata, published in 1844, to celebrate the tri-centennial festivities of the University of Königsberg.

hints and phrases, will then, perhaps, be wholly dissipated. While the whole course and plan of his work prove him to be in harmony with the main current of orthodox belief, yet he also shows that he is not wholly satisfied with the terms in which this belief has been generally expressed. The increased interest in our own country in discussions respecting the nature of Christ, will also lead some minds to turn with interest to a volume written after so thorough a preparation. The present enlargement of the original work promises to make it more thoroughly scientific—a sort of arsenal for all the armory; but the first edition will still remain of independent value, and to the general reader, who does not wish to be embarrassed with the elaborate details of controversy and speculation, will perhaps be more attractive than the fuller and final exposition. The general plan, the leading divisions, and the fundamental views remain the same.

But that portion of the history which is contained in the present volume has been enlarged eleven-fold, from less than one hundred to more than eleven hundred pages. It embraces the first four centuries of the Christian era; and it may be considered as in some respects an independent treatise upon this most important period of the history of this doctrine, down to the council of Constantinople, when the elements of the humanity of Christ were ecclesiastically set forth and sanctioned. In no subsequent centuries have the Trinitarian and Christological controversies assumed anything like the same degree of importance; and their decisions have been received with general acquiescence by the great body of Christendom ever since. The Anglican discussions of the times of Bull and Waterland were not more thorough; the German discussions of these later years have not been so minute, nor more philosophical. In our New England contests we have not made more, though we have made more exclusive, use of the biblical arguments. The period traversed by this volume is, then, one of the deepest interest; it is, also, one most familiar to British and American research. And we think it may be safely said, that for the scholar who wishes to penetrate into the recesses of the thoughts of those wonderful centuries of the Christian church, when thinking minds and believing hearts were earnestly striving to elucidate the highest problems respecting the Godhead, and the relation between divinity and humanity, there is no work which will afford him so thorough aid, or be a more skilful and critical guide. The work of the Jesuit Petavius, *De Theologicis Dogmatibus*, is the one with which it would be most fitly compared, in its comprehensiveness

and apparent impartiality. The fourth volume of this treatise of Petavius, published at Paris in 1650, is devoted to the Incarnation; and it is a vast store-house of materials, well arranged, and skilfully used to enhance the necessity of authoritative decisions by Pope or council upon subjects where the fathers of the church were found to be at variance. But though this work is the most eminent example of doctrinal history which the Roman Catholic church has produced, and though it is more liberal in its tone and more free in its criticisms than most of the works of the theologians of this church, yet it is restricted to the elucidation of a few great points in respect to the Two Natures of Christ. Its learning, though vast, is cumbrous; and it does not sufficiently mark the progress of doctrinal discussion. It is also suspected of having yielded too ready an assent to the position, that Arianism was prevalent in the church long before the time of Arius.¹ It was this concession, in part, which lead Bishop Bull to

¹ This learned Jesuit is one of the few theologians whom Gibbon praises, yet not without a sneer. He confesses his indebtedness to him, and adds: "His learning is copious and correct, his Latinity is pure, his method clear, his argument profound and well connected; but he is the slave of the fathers, the scourge of heretics, and the enemy of truth and candor, as often as they are inimical to the Catholic cause." His whole work is in four folio volumes; of which the second is devoted to the Trinity, and the fourth to the Incarnation, under which he includes the work as well as the nature of Christ. In this volume, the first book gives an account of all the heresies; the second relates to the causes of the incarnation, "especially that which is called the final;" the third is upon the "conjunctio sive unio" of the two natures; the fourth treats of those general "affections" of the two natures which resulted from this union; and the fifth speaks of the two natures separately. While Bull defends Petavius against the charge of being an Arian, Van Mildert, in his *Life of Waterland*, (p. 28,) seems strangely to imply that he was a Socinian.

Another large work on the History of Doctrines, written near the same period is less known than its merits deserve — the *Instructiones Historico-theologicæ* of John Forbesius, à Corse, a Scotch author, who composed it while residing in Holland, where it was published at Amsterdam, in 1645. He had previously been professor of divinity at Aberdeen. His work is polemical against the Romanists, and seems to have been drawn up at the request of the synod of Aberdeen, to "give them a taste of theological history," and to refute the exclusive pretensions of the Romanists to the possession of the verdict of the ancient church. The second book is upon "the mystery of the incarnation." Four chapters of it are devoted to as many kinds of heresies. The fifth gives an "orthodox antithesis, set forth in a metrical compend, against the various heresies and errors in the argument concerning the mystery of the incarnation." We give a few lines of this theological curiosity.

Verus homo, verusque Deus de Virgine Christus,
 Persona inæqualis naturis una duabus

compose his defence of the Nicene Faith, (1685,) a work which was written years before it was printed, since no bookseller could be found to undertake its publication; but which (in connection with his *Judicium*, published in 1694) has long been of standard authority in the English church for the opinions of the early centuries in respect to the person of Christ. His chief object in these works is to defend the consistency as well as the authority of the fathers of the church, which were fast coming into disrepute even among the orthodox. He maintains their authority against the Socinians, who declared it to be of no value; and their orthodoxy, against the Arians, who pressed them into their service. The three points which he chiefly insists upon are, that the preëxistence, the eternity, and the consubstantiality of the Son were held in the early church, by general consent; and this being gained, he not only allows, but indicates, a certain subordination, or derivation of the Son, which he conceives to be consistent with these positions. Valuable as are the works of bishop Bull in a historical point of view, yet they neither do away with the difficulties which encompass his statement of the relation of the Son to the Father, as was abundantly shown by the subsequent English controversies; nor do they furnish a full view of the proper history of the doctrine even up to the Council of Nice. They contributed more to increase respect for the fathers and belief in their harmony, than to exhibit the real nature of their differences, or to signalize the *stadia* of the doctrinal discussion, or to free the doctrine from philosophical objections.¹ Be-

Nascitur, Immanuel, Deus incarnatus, ut idem
Sit quod erat, fiat quod non erat, et sit utrumque
Virgo beata Deum peperit: Deus est homo natus.

The remaining chapters of this book give important documents and extracts relating to the history of the doctrine.

¹ Bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith was written to counteract the influence of three continental authors, viz. Petavius, Sandius (in his *Nucleus Hist. Eccl.* 1669, who was an Arian), and Zuicker, a physician of Dantzic, whose works were making a decided impression in England. His *Judicium Eccl. Cath.*, published in 1694, was also directed against foreign authors, viz. Episcopius and his disciple Curcellæus, and is devoted to the proof of the position that the Nicene fathers held the belief of the true and proper divinity of Christ to be indispensable. It was also intended, incidentally, to uphold the authority of the fathers against the reproaches of Episcopius and others. He goes so far that Bossuet (*Hist. des Var.*) claims that he holds to the infallibility of the council of Nice. A third and smaller treatise, *Primitive and Apostolical Tradition* (1703), is a continuation of the former, and is directed against the position that the doctrines of Christ's divinity, incarnation, and preëxistence were introduced into the church from heathen or heretical sources. In the controversy between the two parties, called at the time Tritheists and Nominalists, the former of whom was represented by Dr. Sherlock (father of the bishop

fore the appearance of Dorner's work, Martini's *Pragmatic History of the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, in the first four Centuries* (1800), was the only considerable monograph which the Germans had on this subject; but while this work shows thorough study of the sources, it is incomplete, not coming down even to the Council of Nice, and it is not adapted to the present state of historical research.¹

In comparison with these leading works, and with others of less importance which might be named, the volume of our author stands on an equality with any of them in point of general ability, and it is superior in its plan, its exhibition of the views of the leading fathers, and its discernment of their differences as well as agreement. It is composed under the full pressure and advantages of the present enthusiastic study of doctrinal history in Germany; and it is up to the very highest requisitions which their finished scholarship imposes.

The voluminous expansion which the investigation of these first centuries has received in this second edition, is owing to several causes. It was perhaps too cursorily treated at first, partly because there were, at the time of its publication, a more general agreement in the views of German scholars respecting this period, and partly because it was written with direct reference to the current speculations upon Christ, which had been raised by the Hegelian philosophy. But in the mean time, the school of Baur in Tübingen had advanced some positions in regard to the views of the earliest church, which, if true, undermined the whole of Dorner's work, as well as the whole historical basis of the Christian faith. We will give, in a few words, the substance of Dr. Baur's views. The original Christian church was strictly Jewish; all the first Christians were Ebionites. Christ was, to them, only the

of the same name), and the latter by Wallis and South, he did not take any direct part. But after his death a work which he wrote for the satisfaction of lord Arundell, who was perplexed by this controversy, appeared under the title, "Discourse on the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, for the first three Ages of Christianity, concerning the Trinity, in opposition to Tritheism and Sabellianism." Bishop Van Mildert, in his *Life of Waterland*, gives us the best sketch we have seen of these early English Trinitarian discussions.

¹ The *Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, by G. S. Faber, 2 vols. London, 1832, is a most pains-taking collection of passages from the fathers, up to the Council of Nice, beginning with the last first, "to prove the bare historical fact, that the catholic church which flourished in the age and under the immediate teaching of the apostles themselves, received and maintained, on the avowed and express ground of apostolical authority, the doctrine of the holy Trinity, with the dependent doctrine of the theanthropic character of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." It is an array of testimony to prove a particular point, and includes an articulate refutation of objections, given in numerical order. To anything like the character of a history, it makes no pretensions. It does not unfold a doctrine, but proves a position.

Jewish Messiah. Of his higher nature neither Christ nor his first apostles had any conception. The Ebionites, instead of being heretics, were really the first Christians; they became heretics only after Christianity itself had been changed. The first division in the early church was occasioned by the question of circumcision. Paul was the chief means of bringing about this change, which was done by denying the absolute necessity of obeying the law, and asserting the doctrine of justification by faith. Thus a great division was formed in the church between the Jews and their opponents; Peter and Paul are assumed as the representatives of the two parties. That of Paul, to which the heathen Christians chiefly attached themselves, at length obtained the supremacy. His authority as an apostle was recognized; and his writings became the foundation of the new Christianity. But this was not all. The Ebionites were also at war with the Alexandrian Gnostics. The conflict of these two introduced another element into the new church, which gave it its chief impulse. This was the doctrine of the Logos, which is chiefly exhibited in the writings ascribed to John, and came into the church *about the middle of the second century*. In this doctrine the vacillating views respecting the person of Christ came to a fixed expression. The Ebionites held that Christ was essentially only man; Paul himself, though he allowed that in Christ there was something divine, that is, the Spirit (*πνεῦμα*), still held that in his own nature Christ was only man. But the doctrine of the Logos, as contained in John's writings, and as derived from the Alexandrian philosophy, produced a total revolution, and a higher form of Christianity, by asserting that Christ, in his real nature, was not a mere man, but was divine. This was the turning point of Christianity, made about a century and a half after Christ appeared; and around this idea of the Logos, combined and interchanged as it was with the expression "Son of God," the whole subsequent doctrinal disputes about the nature of Christ revolved. Neither Jesus, nor his immediate followers, knew anything of this article of faith; the genuine epistles of Paul do not contain it, (or, in other words, those epistles ascribed to Paul, which indicate that he had a higher view of Christ's nature, are not genuine); of course the doctrine is not historically true as applicable to Christ's person—it is an *idea*, the highest to which Christianity has led, introducing the highest form of Christianity, yet an idea not realized in the person of Christ, as the church has always held, but realized only (this is probably Baur's view¹) in the human race as a whole.

¹ For Baur's view, see his *Lehrbuch d. Dogmengeschichte*, s. 60, 71, 85, 93; his *Lehre von d. Dreieinigkeit*, Vol. I; and his work, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845. It differs from the Socinian view in considering the original form of

The predominant notion in this entire re-construction of the early history of the church, is to detach the Christian system from its indissoluble connection with the person of Christ. Neither the philosophical nor the historical sense of the advocates of this scheme, would be satisfied with the position that the leading doctrines, always held by the church, are without some substance of truth. They are true, only not in the sense and application which Christianity has given to them. It is one of the striking peculiarities and advantages of the Christian system, that it makes facts, and historical facts, the basis of its chief doctrines. Thus, the atonement is not an abstract truth about the reconciliation of God with man; but, as a doctrine, it is based upon an act of Christ, upon something which he did and suffered for the redemption of the race. So, too, the doctrine of the person of Christ, that in him there is a union of humanity with divinity, rests, in the first instance, upon the fact that that union was really manifested, historically revealed, in the incarnation of our Lord. But if, now, it were possible for historical criticism to show, that this view of the person of Christ was unknown to Christ himself and to the early Christians, that it was introduced into the church one hundred and fifty years after Christ; then the whole historical basis of our faith would be subverted, and philosophy would triumph over Christianity; and all that could remain true, or could be proved to be so, in the Christian system, would be, certain very abstract principles, which have no more direct relation to Christ and his work, than they have to any other man and his work.

This virtual revival of Gnosticism is indeed a daring attempt; but then it is less daring and impious than the straight-forward course of others, who say outright that Jesus, by his own declarations, gave the impulse to such elevated faith in his power and nature, but that Jesus was an enthusiast, and that his disciples were most credulous. This is the most consistent scheme, and, in addition to supreme trust in

Christianity, the Humanitarian, as the lowest and undeveloped form; the subsequent form, instead of being a corruption, is a purification and progress of the faith. But still he agrees with the Socinian in denying the reality of the union of the human and divine in the person of Christ. He differs from the Socinian, still further, in giving this construction of the early Christian history a systematic and philosophical form; and his criticism upon the Scriptures is marked by the endeavor to prove, not that the obstinate texts will bear other constructions, but that the works in which they appear are of later origin. Thus, the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, are not Paul's, since they indicate a higher view of Christ's nature. There are some striking points of similarity between this scheme and what seems to be Gibbon's view of the rise of the doctrine of the Incarnation, in the 47th chapter of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

one's own individual notions, it only needs supreme distrust in every body and every thing else, even in the possibility of a revelation, to make it perfectly satisfactory. It indeed makes Christ to be the greatest of impostors, the most daring of the sons of earth; for it makes him claim that he alone was sinless, while all others were sinful; when this claim itself, if he were like them, would prove him to be a greater sinner than they all. But then, as a recompense for the loss of belief in his virtue, it gives the most unqualified faith in the infallibility of one's own reason. It is content to assume that the whole race of man has hitherto been in error, if it may only maintain that one man is, at last, right. It will gladly abandon all trust in a revelation from God through Christ, if it may only trust in the revelations of one's own spirit. This is a more consistent theory; but it is so rebellious against history, so irreverent to Christ, so distrustful of God, that a philosophical mind would gladly be spared the pain, if not the reproach, of being its advocate. And therefore we have such theories as that of Dr. Baur.

Against these subversive views, the work of Dr. Dörner is chiefly directed. It maintains that Christianity was not originally a theory; that its beginning was not in the announcement of any abstract notion; but that its basis was laid in facts. The manifestation of God in the flesh, in the person of Jesus, is the historical and real basis of Christianity. "He that knows religion, knows that the chief thing in it is a divine act, which is intended to reconcile the whole man with God." The person of Christ is the centre and life of this revelation. Who that person is, what are the elements of his nature, is historically recorded. We know, on sure testimony, what Christ declared himself to be; we know what his early disciples believed him to be. That higher view of the nature of Christ, which makes him to be essentially divine, is not a phantastic and unaccountable product of a subsequent age; but was held by the earliest church, and this can be historically proved. And not only in the first century, but in the others, without any hiatus, is this truth set forth. This is surely an elevated conception of history, through all its strifes and conflicts, to trace the gradual and victorious progress of the sublimest truths of the Christian faith; and see them emerging with added lustre, in immortal youth and matured vigor from every fresh assault. And no Christian man who reads how the author has performed this office for the first centuries can fail to say, with him, that "like the astronomer gazing into unimagined worlds, he has often, in the contemplation of this sublime history, been overwhelmed by the feeling of adoring wonder."

In proceeding, now, to give a more full account of the way in which the history of this doctrine is here presented, our limits will oblige us

to confine ourselves to the introductory portion. This is of special value, as exhibiting the relation in which the Christian doctrine stands to those religious opinions prevalent in the ancient world which might, upon a superficial inspection, be considered as identical with it. The basis of the whole argument of the work, the general principles upon which it is conducted, and the true foundation and method of doctrinal history are also here insisted upon. The introduction closes with giving the great general epochs of the history itself. Though we shall be obliged to confine ourselves to a mere abstract, and thus obscure that excellency of the original which is found in its copious details, we shall still hope to transfer to our pages some reflected image of those elevated conceptions, which this history shows us have met in the person of our Saviour, as their luminous centre.

It is perhaps hardly worth while to remark, that even where we do not wholly agree with the author in his philosophical statements, we have not thought it advisable to interpose any criticisms; believing as we do, that the work as a whole will justify itself, and that on so difficult a subject it is often desirable to see a variety of expositions.

The great idea which lies at the foundation of the Christian revelation, the idea of a union of divinity and humanity, of a God-man, is not restricted to this religion alone; the elements of it are to be found in all creeds, so far as they are religious, and because they are religious. The difference between the various forms of religion, will be rather found to consist in the mode in which this union is conceived or attempted to be realized. The ideal of human life must always be, that it be not human only, but in some way connected with and influenced by what is divine. As soon as man thinks of himself in his relation to God, he cannot conceive of a holy life in any other form than as a union in some sense of divine and human life. And when, on the other hand, we think of God in his relation to man, our highest conception of a revelation will always be that of a manifestation of God, not merely in outward signs and wonders, nor yet in nature which is blind and dumb, but in the form of a being who may know him and be known of him.

This is not anthropomorphism. If it were, then it would be inexplicable that religion and science, as they advance, always employ themselves more and more about this great problem; that their constant tendency is to bring the divine and the human to a closer union. To think of God as wholly abstracted from the world and all that is

finite, is an easy and an empty task. If all that is needed in forming a conception of God, is to do away with all vital relations between the divine and the human, this work has long since been achieved, and the result is, mere abstract being, a notion only one remove from nonentity. An absolutely hidden, unrevealed Deity, is no God at all for us. Atheism would be the next step. And, further, it involves a contradiction to speak of God as absolute, and at the same time to assert that he has no intimate connection with what is finite; for if he have nothing to do with the finite, then the finite exists independently of him, and consequently he is not absolute; he is not absolute, unless the finite be a revelation of himself.

But while all religions necessarily embrace this idea of the union of the human with the divine, the peculiarity of the Christian religion consists in the form in which it is there presented. It is the universal belief of the Christian church, that in Jesus of Nazareth alone, this union of divinity and humanity has appeared in a personal form. It was manifested in him as a *fact*, a reality; not as a doctrine, but as a person. A common mode of attack against Christianity has been to deny the originality of its doctrines, and to derive them all from heathen or Jewish sources. The attack was plausible only so long as Christianity was considered as a set of doctrines, rather than as a series of divine acts. The real defence against such objections is to show the exact relation of the Christian religion to the antecedent ones; its differences from them as well as its agreement with them. And if it can be proved, that what other religions were striving after in an imperfect or disfigured form, is realized in Christianity in a new and perfect way; if in its fundamental idea of a God-man, we find the key by which we can read more clearly the enigmas and understand the perversions of other forms of faith, then will its true relation to them be detected, and its vindication made triumphant. This we will attempt to do by showing, in the first place, that the fundamental idea of Christianity, the idea of the God-man, cannot be explained as derived either from heathenism or from the Jewish system, while at the same time it is that which they both are seeking after. In the second place, it will be shown that this fundamental idea is original and essential to Christianity, though its full development in all its relations was reserved for subsequent centuries.

Can we then ascribe to the heathen religions, the origin of this idea of the union of the human and divine in one person? It is said that we must look for it there rather than in the Jewish system, because the latter from its strict monotheism was strongly prejudiced against any such dogma, as is proved by the extensive influence of the Ebion-

ites in the early church, by the slight recognition of this doctrine (even if it be found at all) in those books of the New Testament which were composed under Hebrew influences, and by the fact that those apostles who insisted most upon the divinity of Jesus were undeniably most concerned with paganism. Did this idea, then, come from paganism? In answering this question it will be necessary to distinguish between the oriental and the occidental heathenism. As the representation of the former, we will take the Indian religion; of the latter, the Greek. Both confound God and the world; yet in doing this they proceed from opposite extremes. The orient starts from the divine, the occident from the human, and both seek after the union of the two. In the Greek religion men become gods; they rise to Olympus. This is not the idea of Christianity; it is opposed to it. The early disciples of Christ knew nothing of such an apotheosis; man does not rise to God, God descends to man. It was first advocated in the Christian church by Paul of Samosata, and viewed with such abhorrence, that the council of Nice ordered its advocates to be re-baptized. May it not then be found in the *theogony* of the Greeks, if not in their apotheoses? Still less; for here was polytheism, here the gods are finite, they are national, and above them is a threatening destiny, the only and obscure vestige of monotheism; nor are these many gods essentially united with this all-embracing Fate. But Christianity from the very first was sternly monotheistic; its followers abhorred all polytheism; the God-man stands alone and is not national, and he is in the closest union with the Father.

But if the Greek faith will not give us this idea, may it not be derived from the dreamy and fantastic Orient? There we have the incarnation of the second member of the Trimarti; Vishnu becomes man, God descends to man. But this incarnation is not a real one; it is not a union of the divine and human; for Krishnu lays aside his humanity and returns to heaven. There is a complete and unreconciled dualism, and not a union. The finite and infinite are in an eternal and irreconcilable opposition. No sooner are the two united than one is lost. The finite is swallowed up in the infinite. Matter, too, is evil; the ethical and physical are confounded. So unreconciled are the two extremes, that this religion has been perpetually playing between pantheism and materialism—the elements of both of which it contains. In its latest form, that of Buddhism in the Chinese nation, it is wholly material; this world is all in all, the Chinese empire is also the kingdom of heaven.

But though these religions have not attained the true idea of the

God-man, yet it is that which they are seeking after. The Orient, starting from the notion of universal life is ever striving to realize the personality and presence of God; but its essential dualism prevents this, and it remains hovering in a region of perpetual uncertainty. The Greek religion made the desperate attempt to raise man to the gods, to produce the divine from the human; but when it had reached the highest point to which even philosophy could carry it, it found it had only a world without a God; or, as in New Platonism, only an abstract divine substance, in comparison with which all that is finite is but an illusion. Thus the Greek who began with such proud consciousness of human power, ended in the same abstraction with which the Oriental began, and found in it his grave. And since he began, when the Oriental ended, the whole circle of the heathen world is completed; it returns in the end to its empty and unsatisfying beginning. It was not able to grasp the problem which it was trying to solve; and history has written the judgment of its religions. The originality of the idea of the God-man, as this appears in Christianity, is not impeached by any of the conceptions to which these heathen religions attained.

One of the main hindrances in the way of these pagan attempts to reconcile the human and the divine, which made them perpetually sink down into an extreme they were always striving to avoid, was their defective views in respect to the moral character of the supreme being, universal deficiency, and their want of a sense of God's perfect justice. Where the moral element is wanting in our conceptions of God, it is difficult to realize his personality, it is easier to confound him with the world. And any idea of the union of the human and divine, which does not save the personality of God, and which does not recognize the moral element as essential to this union, must be incomplete. The Persians presented in a bolder relief than any other pagan people, the intense antagonism between right and wrong; but with them it is a perpetual strife between two elements without any reconciliation. Evil is a substance—fixed in nature.

In the Hebrew religion we have for the first time the full distinction between God and the world openly revealed; and we have also the moral element in the divine nature clearly set forth. In both these points it stands far above all the Gentile superstitions; and it may in these respects be considered as the disclosure of a mystery which weighed upon the whole of the ancient world. Other claims, and deeper mysteries than are those of paganism, it indeed has; but the enigmas of the ancient world on these points it has fully solved.¹

¹ The best view of the heathen religions which has been published, is probably *Stuhr's Religionsformen der heidnischen Völker*. Berlin, 1836, 2. 8vo.

Before the union of divinity and humanity could be clearly seen, the distinction between the two must be clearly seen ; and before the distinction of the divine and the human can be held fast, we must have a definite view of the moral attributes of God, especially as a God of justice, (without which love is not love). Neither of these heathenism had, both of these the Hebrew faith possessed ; and this faith, therefore, made one step in advance towards the solution of the problem. It remains to be asked, whether this religion had the true idea of the union of the divine and the human in such a form that the Christian doctrine could be directly derived from it.

The Hebrew religion stands alone among the ancient systems in making a broad distinction between God and the world ; and in its recognition of the personality of Jehovah. God is so elevated above the world, stands so alone in his spirituality and holiness ; the difference between God and man is made so vast, that little is said of any other than a moral union between the two ; — of a relation between the human and divine nature or essence, which is necessary to the idea of the God-man, we find no traces. And it is, besides, a characteristic of this people, that they had little to do with metaphysical questions. To raise them above and keep them separate from all Gentile polytheism, it seemed necessary that they should have such a view of the relation of God to man, as would be most remote from that which lies at the basis of the doctrine of the incarnation. This is not inconsistent with the fact that God revealed himself in various ways to his people ; nor with the office which is ascribed to the Angel of Jehovah in many parts of the Old Testament. But this angel is not always represented as a definite person, nor are all revelations made through him ; and there is no hint of a union of the human and divine in him. Such passages as Ps. 103: 20. 148: 2. 34: 8. 91: 11, where the angel appears to have a very intimate connection with the world, and to be less restricted to the theocracy, are probably to be interpreted as personifications, or, if not so, as referring to created beings. And it is worthy of remark, that the angels came to have the highest importance to the Jews after God had ceased to speak with his people ; and that in proportion as a prodigal fancy in later time ascribed to them the most important works, the sense of the presence of God himself seemed to retreat, which is an opposite result from that of the true doctrine of a divine Mediator. Nor in the "*Wisdom*" of the Proverbs and the Apocrypha do we find the elements of this doctrine. While this wisdom is the boldest attempt which the Jewish mind made to bring God and the world into conjunction, yet, in its highest form, it is doubtful whether we can regard it as a per-

sonal agent; and even if it be, it has closer affinities with the doctrine of the *Logos* than with that of the Incarnation. When the greatest power and knowledge are ascribed to wisdom, it ceases to have any direct connection with human nature; the idea of a manifestation of God in *history*, which is essential to the Christian view, is lost sight of, and the only revelation recognized is in the soul of man. Nothing like a direct union of God with human nature is recognized in all that is ascribed to wisdom. The view of Philo respecting the *Logos* is often adduced as the precursor of the Christian doctrine. This is the most remarkable attempt made on the basis of the Jewish system, and by a contemporary of Jesus, under the influence also of the Greek philosophy, to bring the floating ideas of the Jews respecting the Messiah into a systematic form; and by giving a philosophical system to do away with the need of having a real and personal Messiah. And the results to which this attempt conducts, when compared with the reality as it is found in the person of Christ, confirms our position, that from the Jewish system alone the idea of the God-man could not be engendered. There are two opposing elements in Philo's system; on the one hand there is the strictest monotheism; God is an absolute, simple and unchangeable being. On the other hand, there is the pagan notion of an emanation from God, which seems to relieve this idea of a purely abstract God, and to bring him into a more intimate connection with his creatures. But between these two elements Philo is never at rest. As soon as there is an emanation, it is taken back again. He has and he has not a difference between God and the world. And he also exchanges the ethical element, which distinguishes the Hebrew conception of God, for the physical element, which is one of the characteristics of Paganism. And as to the *Logos* of Philo's system, it is difficult to maintain the position, that he is a different hypostasis from God, having a middle position between God and the world. To regard him as a distinct hypostasis would be repugnant to Philo's severe monotheism; and the passages which seem to favor this view can be explained on a different supposition.¹ Still more opposed is he to any idea like that

¹ We wish it were in our power to give even an abstract of the thorough discussion of Philo's system, which extends to nearly forty pages in the original. The import of this *Logos*, as is well known, is one of the vexed questions. High authorities, as Lücke, Ritter and Semisch take a different view from our author. The questions are two: 1. Whether the *Logos* of Philo is a personification or an hypostasis; 2. Whether Philo considered this *Logos* as really divine. The whole question has more bearing upon the doctrine of the Trinity than upon that of the Incarnation. As far as Dorner's argument is concerned, the originality of the

of an incarnation of the Most High. And though some faint traces of the expectation of a Messiah may be found in his pages, yet they are with him only a traditional reminiscence, for they are inconsistent with the whole spirit of his system. His whole philosophy, while it is employed in discussing the great problems which the revelation in Christ was intended to solve, and while it has many phrases which sound almost like Christianity itself, is yet in its fundamental principles and inferences wholly alien from the Christian faith. It is only a *fata morgana* hovering uncertainly over the horizon where Christianity was to arise. Yet being employed speculatively about the same problems which Christ was in reality to solve, his philosophy may not only, in God's providence, have prepared the way for the Gospel, but also had an influence afterwards in giving shape and color to the Alexandrian speculations about the person and the work of Christ.

Thus we have seen that the Old Testament religion, neither in its earlier Hebrew nor in its later Jewish form, and this last neither in Palestine¹ nor in Alexandria, had such a view of the relation of God to man, that from it anything like the doctrine of the Incarnation could be directly derived. But if they could not conceive of God as taking human form, did they not, going from the other extreme, have the idea of a man who had divine attributes? The divinely illuminated Hebrew prophets, in the *Servant of God*, (*עַבְד־יְהוָה*), give the ideal of a man; he it is who is to be a perfect example of righteousness; he is not merely a servant, but is in the closest fellowship with God; but it is difficult to prove, even from Ps. 2: 7, that he is represented as being in his essential nature the Son of God, in the sense in which this phrase is used in the New Testament. He is, indeed, not merely the representative of Israel, but *the* servant; and the three-fold theocratic office, of king, priest, and prophet, is laid upon him, as it could be upon no common mortal. The powers and attributes as-

doctrine of the God-man in the Christian system would not be at all affected, even if the *Logos* of Philo and the *Wisdom* of the Proverbs were admitted to be distinct hypostases. That does not touch the question of the union of the human and divine natures in one person. Nitzsch in the *Studien und Kritiken*, for 1840, takes and ably maintains the ground, that in the "Wisdom," and also in the "Angel," of the Old Testament, we have at least the beginning of a distinction immanent in the Godhead. His argument upon this point, against Lücke, is one of great thoroughness and philosophical accuracy.

¹ In the fantastic and mystical Adam Cadmon, (or primitive man,) and in the Memza, (Word,) the Shekinah and the Metatron, we have either no real hypostasis, but only transient or symbolic manifestations of God; or if it be personal, like the Metatron, it is still a creature. To the idea of an incarnation of what is truly divine none of these representations have attained.

signed to him reach forward to a higher sphere; and what Isaiah prophecies of his effectual and vicarious priesthood surpasses all the power of any one man. In Daniel's vision we have the highest majesty ascribed to the Son of Man, but he is rather to be taken as a representative of Israel (9: 27) than as a man. Thus, though there are traces and indications that are in harmony with the full reality,¹ it is not so far anticipated, that one who knew only the Old Testament could say a man is God, or the Son of God, in a proper and metaphysical sense.

In the Hebrew religion, then, while we find those elements which when carried fully out and brought together would give us the idea of the God-man, we do not find them so carried out and united. Unite the Wisdom or the Logos, which expresses the idea of God revealing himself, with that ideal of the Servant of God, which is the highest view of man that the Jews possessed, and we have the basis of the Person of Christ. But this the Hebrew religion did not do, and, therefore, though it was seeking after the great reality, it did not find it until Christ himself appeared.

In this review, now, of the religions which preceded the coming of Christ, we find, that they are indeed, in the grandest sense, a *Præparatio evangelica*; and they prove that Christianity clearly announces the great truth which all religions are seeking after; but they also prove that the idea of the God-man first arose in all its fulness, not outside of Christianity, but within it; and that it is therefore one of its peculiar characteristics. This idea is original and essential to Christianity. It began with a fact, and it was the fact which gave the knowledge.

A new principle was introduced into the world when Christ appeared. The origin of this can only be ascribed to Christ himself, to what he declares respecting himself, and to the declarations which his inspired apostles made respecting him. He who was in the beginning with God, and was God, assumed human nature. Faith in him was the life of the new church. The church believed in him and trusted in him implicitly. They had the truth respecting him in its totality, but not in its fully developed form. It were unnatural to suppose, that from the very first, in all parts and parties of the church, the whole of what belongs to the fully unfolded idea of the God-man was expressly, and with a full sense of its import, ascribed to Christ. To add the more strictly definite terms, to bring out the whole idea

¹ Dr. Dorner here seems to have sacrificed something of accuracy to the purposes of his argument.

in all its relations, was reserved for other times. What was first presented in the simple form of faith was to be unfolded so as to meet the wants of the intellect, and to satisfy the demands of reason. And this process is one of the highest importance; it is that which constitutes the proper historical development of the doctrine. In it the church, especially of the first centuries, was always guided by a sure tact, which was supplied by the vitality and energy of its faith; and this it was which gave it that clearness and firmness in its final doctrinal decisions upon this subject, which have caused them to be freely received by the great body of the church, in all its branches, through so many centuries. In framing these decisions, then, it is not strange that they should even maintain, that they were adding nothing new, but only expressing the same ancient truth in a competent form, to meet new questions and controversies. Thus, while it would be incorrect to say, that the doctrine of the Incarnation was held by the body of the church in the same form in the fourth century as in the second; yet he who would on this account infer that the later form was wholly of human origin or untrue, would only prove his ignorance of the organizing and plastic power of a new principle, and his want of a historical sense. But this position needs to be more definitely applied to our doctrine.

That universal tendency to ascribe to Christ an exalted majesty, which was found in the lowest form of ancient Christianity as well as in the highest, and which could not rest until it had declared the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father, has its ground in the very essence of Christianity. That such a Hebrew as Paul, in the face of his strict Jewish monotheism, could ascribe to Christ divine attributes, is inexplicable, unless we suppose there had been a mighty and total change in his religious conceptions. And all the early Christians were of one heart and mind, such was the power of their new-wrought faith, in putting the Person of Christ into the closest and most living relation to the Father. In the Son they had found the Father. But there was in them, even in the earliest, so far as we can infer from Scripture and history, a difference in the degree of knowledge which they possessed as to the exact relation between God and Christ. Some of them, whose culture was more universal and whose susceptibility for the loftiest views was more intense, express this relation more perfectly than others.

In the canonical Scriptures we do indeed find all the elements fully given. And it is the peculiar office of the history of the doctrine to show how the different elements which are there laid down, and which are the norm for all times, were successively and fully unfolded in the

progress of the church. No generation of the church, and least of all the first, has had in a developed form the full wealth of the apostolic revelation; over all the generations the word of Christ and the apostles extends as a sufficient norm to the end of days. To say that the Scriptures are a part of the process of development, is to put them in a false position. They contain the germs of the whole process; they give it its *impulse*.

In the received canon of Scripture, there is a difference in the different books and writers as to the mode in which this doctrine is announced; combined with an essential unity. The grand, fundamental position is in them all; but there is what may be called a higher and a lower type of the same doctrine. The former is given us in the writings of Paul and John. Of these two, Paul presents us with the new Christian element more in its relation to and distinction from the Old Testament views; while John, though he has the Old Testament also before him, brings out the doctrine in its adaptation to, and distinction from the Hellenistic conception (1 John 5: 20, 21). In respect to them there can be no doubt that both in their earlier and later writings, they ascribe divinity to the Son not merely in a moral but in an essential sense, and that they view the relation of the Son to the Father not only as "economic," but also as ontological or metaphysical; so that Christ, with the Father and the Holy Ghost constitutes a sacred triad. The real humanity of Christ is no less clearly presented in their epistles. The new idea of the God-man is thus fully recognized by them, and their writings give it to us in its highest type.

The second type of the doctrine, contained in our canonical Scriptures, is found in the first three evangelists, and in the writings of James, Peter and Jude. But in this type also we find the essential elements, which are necessary to the doctrine of the person of Christ. The synoptical evangelists may be considered as of special importance, since the proclamation of the gospel did not begin with doctrine so much as with history, in which doctrine was enveloped. We find now, in these Gospels, that Christ is usually designated as the Son of God and as the Son of Man. The former is used in three senses: in a physical sense, to designate his nature; in a moral sense, to declare his perfection; and in an official sense (in which both the others are comprised), to show his work, as Messiah. He calls himself, also, the Son of Man; and this expression is without force, unless we consider him as employing it in contrast with the consciousness he had of a higher nature; while it also refers to his peculiar and special relation to the race—he is *the* Son of Man, not of *a* man. As both Son of God and of Man, he is called Son in an eminent sense; the only Son

of God, so that even when his disciples were present, he could say *my* Father, and not *our* Father. He forgives sins; in the form of baptism he puts his name with that of the Father; he has power to send the Holy Spirit; he alone knows the Father, all other men know the Father through him; all power is given to him; in all space and time he is present; his coming is to be the end of the world; he is the judge of the world; for all eternity, the Son of God and Man is to be the centre of the Christian's blessedness. Such is the Person of Christ, in the first three Gospels. The boldest passages of John have their entire parallel in the other evangelists; and some of their strongest passages have no parallel in John (Matt. 9: 2—6. 28: 18—20). And though the pre-existence of Christ is not as distinctly declared in them as in the other parts of the New Testament; yet their full faith could not be expressed in any other form, nor are there wanting indications of their belief in this point. (Luke 7: 35. Matt. 12: 19. comp. Prov. 8: 11: 27. Luke 11: 49 compared with Matt. 23: 34. Matt. 13: 17. Luke 10: 23, 24 compared with John 8: 36 seq.

The author next proceeds to an examination of the epistles of James and Peter, on which special reliance is placed by those who claim that the early church was Ebionistic, and shows that these apostles held a form of the doctrine wholly inconsistent with such views; that they too, like the first three evangelists, possessed the essential elements in the doctrine of the person of Christ. Our space forbids us to follow him in this course; and it has also prevented us from giving more than the briefest summary of his full and able exposition of the Christology of the synoptical evangelists. It is a cheering contribution to the Biblical argument upon the subject.

Thus far we have been considering the two propositions which it was proposed to maintain: that is, that in none of the ancient religions did the elements of the idea of the God-man exist in such form, that they detract from the exclusive claim of Christianity to its possession, although it is the very idea after which these religions are seeking; and, in the second place, that in the earliest records of the Christian church, we find this idea described as realized in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. It is original with Christianity, and essential to it.

Being given in the Scriptures as a norm, containing such diverse elements, ushered into a world where there were so many conflicting views and tendencies, and where men were busied with the very problems which it was the purpose of this new revelation to solve; it becomes an inquiry of the greatest interest, how this new doctrine would be received and judged. And here is where the historical process of the doctrine commences. What then, we proceed to ask, was the

course and reception of this doctrine in the early church, where it at once came into the midst of two great, conflicting tendencies, those of the Jewish and the Grecian culture.

In considering the history of a doctrine there are two points that need to be carefully impressed. The first is, that the impulse to the development is given by the doctrine, as taught in the Scriptures. This is the seed. This is the origin of the whole. Unless we assume this, the entire history has no vital principle. The second point is — that it is unhistorical to suppose the whole early church to be as fully in possession of the whole doctrine in all its parts and relations, as was the church at a later era, or as it is found in the writings of the apostles, which are the standard for all times. The truth will rather be found to be this; that if there are two or more types of the same doctrine, the lower form will be the one first unfolded in the history of the church; and the higher form will be realized in its full import by the church as a whole only after a long process of discussion and controversy. And this is a natural order. Thus in respect to one doctrine, the lower type, while it still contains the essential elements of the truth, contains them in closer alliance with the views which prevailed, before the new idea was introduced into the world. This type would then probably be the one first discussed, and which would be most congenial to the general associations, especially of the Jewish Christians.

It is further worthy of notice, that the truth is not revealed in the Scriptures in the dogmatic form, but rather in the form of testimony, testimony in word and deed—the form best adapted to the purpose for which the Scripture was given, to awaken faith in the heart. But this does not prevent, nor detract from the necessity of also having the truth in a proper doctrinal form. It is in the nature of Christianity to penetrate the whole man. And he that would except the intellect, and remain content with implicit faith, deprives faith itself of its rights, since in all faith there is an element of knowledge. Testimony, the mere proclamation of the word, is indeed enough to lead the sinner to faith in Christ; and it has done this in all centuries. But the world — historical energy and influence of Christianity are not adequately recognized, where this is made to be all; it is also the office and duty of the church to increase in knowledge, to present its faith in a scientific form; and this, when done, reacts healthfully upon the faith itself. A scientific and philosophical view of Christianity is an absolute good, and essentially contributes to make man more perfectly conformed to the image of God.

But in order to reach this philosophical form, a long and severe process is necessary. It is a hard work. The revealed truth, imbibed by faith, comes into hearts already prepossessed by other notions. It comes among nations who have the widest diversity of opinion, derived from their schools of philosophy, or from their previous religious views. All these the new truth is to remould. It is to conquer their errors; but before it can conquer, it must contend.

Thus was it eminently with the doctrine of the person of Christ, when it was introduced into a world where Jewish or Hellenistic speculations respecting the nature of God and of man had full possession of all minds and hearts. What the radical conception of the two were, we have already seen; we are now to point out, in general terms, how the new truth would be received and affected by the old. We think it will appear that these influences, though they at first had a disturbing effect, contributed in the end to the consolidation of the doctrine; and the fact that they thus contributed, will be an additional proof of the power of this new idea; while the way in which the discussions were carried on and finally adjusted, will further show the difference of the new truth from the more ancient speculations, as also its adaptation to confront and overcome them.

Suppose now, that a man educated in the Jewish system had come, by faith, to know Christ as his Redeemer. He believes in Christ with all his heart. In the Son he has found the Father. There is, then, a close relation between the Son and the Father. What is the nature of this relation, would be his first inquiry, when he came to reflect upon his faith. In interpreting this relation, or the expressions by which the inspired apostles denoted this relation, he would naturally call to aid his previous views and opinions respecting the nature of God and of man. His Christian thinking would naturally be clothed in his traditional forms of thought; at least he would, by way of trial, endeavor to bring the new truth into connection with his former habits of reflection. Thus it would also be with the Greek. And the difference between these two circles of thought would be so great, that different parties would arise, there would be conflict between the two. But though there is a conflict, there is also a common element in them both, the new Christian faith. This faith, as we have seen, proclaimed in the doctrine of the person of Christ a truth, after which both Jew and Greek were seeking, yet which they were not able to find. On the one hand, in its description of Christ as the Messiah, as prophet, priest, and king it harmonized with and carried out to its fullest expression, the elements contained in the Jewish system; on the other hand, in

the idea of the Logos, it came into close affinity with the Hellenist.¹ The Jew would be attracted by those elements which allied it to his previous creed, but he would be repelled by the statements which gave it currency with the Greek; and the Greek would, in like manner, be both attracted and repulsed; attracted by that which the Jew would not be so willing to receive, and repelled by that to which the Jew would most naturally cling. The doctrine of the person of Christ would thus stand, as it were, in the centre between two conflicting tendencies; and it would prove its divine origin by gradually drawing the two together, as to a common centre. Thus it would show itself to contain a truth higher than either, yet adapted to both; and so persuasive and prevalent was it, that it at length drew together these two opposing tendencies, and made them one in the confession of the truth as it is in Jesus. And in this confession are contained the elements which animated the two contending parties, expressed in a higher form, and brought into a state of perfect union, and realized in the person of the God-man.

Had there been only the Greek tendency, this doctrine could never have been brought out; for the Hellenist had no definite sense of the personality of God, or of his highest moral attributes. On the other hand, had there been only the Jewish tendencies, these were too severely monotheistic, to allow them to come naturally to such a truth. Had the Greek and the Jew met in conflict, there would have been perpetual warfare, but no common or reconciling central truth. That reconciling truth was given only in the manifestation of God in the flesh.

Christianity thus solved the great problem which these two parties were discussing from opposite points of view. It contains the substantial truth of these two religions; since in the doctrine of the person of Christ it gives us the difference as well as the unity of the divine and the human, and thus leads to more correct views both of the nature of God and of man. Is heathenism seeking the apotheosis of human nature? In Christ it is given, for here is a *man* who is God. Is the true Jewish tendency that which seeks the completion of the revelation left incomplete in the law? This is given it in Christ, for in him is the revelation of the depths of the divine condescension and love; *God* has become man. Here is the point where the bond of unity between God and the world, which heathenism was always looking af-

¹ Hence, on the one hand the sect of the Ebionites, and on the other the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy, in the early church.

ter, is fully exhibited; but it is so exhibited, that the material notions of heathenism are entirely obliterated, and that the personality as well as the holiness of God, which are the great ideas of the Old Testament, come to their perfect expression. The highest view of man which heathenism could form was, that he is of divine off-spring, in a purely natural sense; but in Christ we have a man, who is not merely divine in nature, but all whose words and acts are divine; both in an ethical and natural sense, he is the Son of God. And thus he was fitted for his great work of reconciling man with God. And as far as man himself is concerned we have also, in the Christian view of his new life, a higher truth than ever Jew or pagan knew — and a truth which corrects and reconciles the highest conceptions of both. The pagan speaks of man as divine, without reference to his moral state; the Jew insists upon his obedience to the external law, without first and directly insisting upon a total change in his spiritual condition, upon his being made a partaker of the divine nature. Christianity would make men both in nature and in act to be the children of God and the brothers of Christ; but in opposition to heathenism, it enforces a moral likeness, and in contrast with the legal principle it demands a spiritual regeneration. And in demanding this spiritual and moral renovation, it annuls the heathen assumption that we are already by nature so closely connected with God that we need no moral change; while it also exposes the futility of that righteousness which comes from external conformity to the law. Thus the old man dies and gives place to the new, who by the grace of the Holy Spirit is made a partaker of the divine nature, and through the Son received into the fellowship of the Father. Man becomes the Son of God in a sense which neither Jew nor pagan ever conceived; and thus does the Christian faith rebut the errors which each held, and bring out the truth which reconciles the two, and which also leads man to a state of reconciliation with God.

But before the full truth could be received, it must contend against prevalent errors and partial principles. When introduced into the world it encountered masses of Jewish and heathen prejudices. It dissipated them, not by a sudden magical stroke, but by severe toil. The principle which gave life to the error lost its exclusive influence wherever Christianity was really embraced; and the innate and victorious power of the new principle is seen as it diffuses itself through a world filled with error, and forms a new world of its own.

To trace this triumphant progress of the doctrine of the Person of Christ is the appropriate office of a history of this doctrine. The animating principle of this history, as we have seen, is the new rev-

elation which was given to Christ, and which is laid down in the canonical Scriptures as a norm for all ages. Starting from this point, the history has to do, not with the simple faith of the church, which has been more nearly the same in all its centuries; nor yet alone with the successively framed confessions of faith, for these are but the condensed summary of ages of discussion; but the appropriate work of such a history is to exhibit the process and progress of human thought, as employed about the new revelation. It will show how men speculated upon a novel and grand truth; how they were often bewildered and led astray by their previous views; how the truth at length obtained full mastery; how its various elements were successively developed and combined; in a word, how that which was originally given in the form of faith, came to assume also the form of system and of science; how it came to be dominant in human reason, as it was from the first dominant in the human heart. And that historical view of this doctrine would be the true one which should be able to depict how it was introduced into the full current of human thought and feeling, and, with a quiet confidence in its ultimate victory, subjected to misrepresentations and perversions without number; and how it there worked still and constant, sinking deeper and deeper into the human heart, until when the hour had struck, it emerged in its grand and victorious progress, and, suddenly, as by enchantment, the bands fall from the eyes of Christendom, the mists are dispersed, and the radiant image of Christ stands forth in fuller form and glory than ever before. Such an exhibition would be a true one, for it would be animated by the same pulsation which beats in the history itself. Such a history will give the *development* of the doctrine in both its parts; it will show how the human or lower element was unfolded. To neglect this would be the Docetism of historical narration. It will also exhibit the evolution of the higher and divine element, for to neglect this would be the Ebionitism of an historical narration. Between these two tendencies the doctrine pursued its course; so to describe it is the duty of the historian.

The whole course of the doctrine is to be divided into three distinct periods, each of which has its special characteristics.

The *first* period comprises the first four centuries of the Christian church: It begins with the general consciousness that in the Person of Christ the divine and the human are united. Starting from this general assumption, the church proceeds to establish the concrete ele-

ments which respectively belong to the idea of what is divine, and what is human. These two extremes being thus brought into direct contrast, it then becomes necessary and possible, still further, to inquire into the *modes* of their union. This is a *necessary* inquiry, because in proportion as the differences of the two are distinctly discovered in that same measure will the unity, from which they first started, seem to be endangered, and to need a fuller exposition. It has also then only become *possible* to answer this inquiry, because there could be no adequate conception of the mode of the union before the differences of the elements which are to be united had been clearly defined.

The *second* period, now, proceeds to perform the task, for which the first has prepared the data, and it works with these data. These data are — the elements which belong to the idea of what is divine, and the elements which belong to the idea of what is human, both of which distinct elements have been combined in the great position, that in the Person of Christ are two distinct natures. Starting from the distinction of the two natures, this period would investigate the *modes* of their union in one person. The fact of their union is assumed. But so long, now, as there is such a conception of the divine nature as excludes all union with the human, or the converse, so long will this union be imperfectly recognized in the Person of Christ; that is, the two factors will not have equal rights conceded to them. One epoch will be liable to give the preponderance to one side, and another to another. These two epochs are found historically prescribed. One of the characteristics of the dogmatic views of the period before the reformation is that the divine (the theological) element has the preponderance; equally remarkable is the preponderance of the human element over the divine in the centuries after the reformation. Thus our second period naturally falls into two epochs; between them stands the Reformation, whose wide historical significance in relation to our doctrine consists in this, that while it retained the substance of the theological truth of ancient times, it also opened a free course to the attainment of a correct knowledge of what belongs to human nature. Thus the period of the Reformation, continuing the two sides, is a testimony against the one-sidedness both of the earlier and the later epoch. It contains the essential elements of an era which was to introduce a new order of things. It is freed from the exclusive theological tendencies of the scholastics, and it bears testimony against the too great partiality for the human nature of Christ, which has been so prevalent in the later centuries.

Finally, the *third* period, which begins with the commencement of the nineteenth century, has for its peculiar and special problem to exhibit the person of Christ, as the perfect union of the divine and the human, with a full recognition of the difference as well as equilibrium of these two elements.

ARTICLE IX.

REMARKS ON CERTAIN ERRONEOUS METHODS AND PRINCIPLES IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

A MORE sober and just method of studying the Bible may be among the favorable results which will flow from the the political revolutions which are taking place in various parts of Germany. Some essential and salutary changes in the general habits of thinking and modes of investigation may be expected. We confidently look for this valuable moral product from these political strifes. The grounds for this encouragement are various. In the first place, a profounder and more practical religious feeling may be awakened. This was one result of the wars which followed the first French Revolution. It is said that there are indications in various parts of Germany of more earnest religious emotion. The "present distress," the uncertainties which hang over all earthly things, have led some to look for "a city which hath foundation." A natural consequence of these awakened sensibilities will be a more reverential regard to God's written word, a profounder conviction that it is infallible and eternal truth. In the multifarious and conflicting systems of morals — each containing more or less of important truth — which have rapidly succeeded each other, in the attractive and exciting political theories which are now brought forward, not a few of which, on experiment, will be found insufficient or baseless, there may be a yearning of the heart for the simple truths of the Bible, a desire to place the feet on the rock of ages, a craving for an *objective* guide that cannot mislead. In other words, a revived sense of practical religion implies that serious state of mind without which the Scriptures will not be used aright, and will, therefore, be misinterpreted.