

where it began, being not moved one foot backward or forward; so when men have blustered and blown all that they can, and have even run themselves out of breath, to scrape up the commodities of the earth, yet at last they must, spite of their beards, end where they began; end with nothing, as they began with nothing; end with a winding sheet and began with swaddling clouts.' 'The grudges and snudges of this world may very fitly be compared to a king's sumpter-horse, which goeth laden all the day long, with as much gold and treasure as he can bear; but at night his treasure is taken from him, he is turned into a sorry dirty stable, and hath nothing left him but his galled back. Even so the rich cormorants and caterpillars of the earth, which here have treasured and hoarded up great heaps of gold and silver, with which they travel laden through the world, shall in the end be stript out of all, let down into their grave, and have nothing left them but their galled conscience, with the which they shall be tumbled down into the dungeon of eternal darkness.'

But Demas himself is not a working-man. He only stands, gentleman-like, to call to passengers to come and see. He manages the mine by proxy, while he himself occupies his time in advertising and exhibiting it, and putting its stock upon the market. He is a superior person, who does not himself dig, but (in Bacon's phrase) 'eats his bread in the sweat of another man's brow.' Especially is he occupied in persuading men to Come and see. Here is the rarest of sights, that he can show to any that will. Here is the Grand Industrial Exhibition of the labour and the triumph of the world in material things, that Carlyle scorned; and here is the 'gigman' of it, whom Carlyle scorned still more bitterly. His great argument is just the mine. Mr. By-ends and his friends exercised their ingenious brains to construct a plausible case for the world. Demas has a shorter argument and a far more convincing one. There are no subtleties here, but only one obvious fact—that solid fact of men at your side who are actually tapping the wealth of the world. Come and see, says Demas.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Luther's Position in History.

PROFESSOR LOOFS'S RECTORIAL ADDRESS.

ON the 12th of July last Dr. Frederick Loofs entered upon his duties as Rector of the Halle-Wittenberg University. Ninety years ago Wittenberg was amalgamated with Halle, and in his inaugural address¹—now published in pamphlet form—Dr. Loofs began by recalling the fact that nearly 400 years have passed since that epoch-making period in Martin Luther's career,—his occupancy of a professorial chair in the University of Wittenberg (1508–1517). It is obvious that this happy reminiscence alone would have suggested a fruitful theme of discourse.

But Dr. Loofs also remembered that he was speaking a few weeks after the 200th anniversary of the death of Christopher Cellarius (4th June

1707), the first Halle Professor of Rhetoric and History. This learned philologist has an enduring reputation as an historian. 'It is true that he did not invent the term "mediæval"; before his day *medium ævum* was used to designate the period of barbarian, post-classic and pre-humanistic Latinity. But Cellarius was the first to introduce the term into universal history.' In 1685 he published his *historia antiqua*, and at the same time announced a *historia medii ævi* which appeared in 1688, and a *historia nova* which was completed in 1696.²

In the history of 'The Middle Ages,' Cellarius included the period from Constantine to the Conquest of Constantinople and the end of the fifteenth century. But he regarded the Reformation as the most essential factor in the introduction of a new era. Hence arises the comprehensive question which Dr. Loofs proceeds to investigate

¹ *Luther's Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit*. Rede gehalten beim Antritt des Rektorats der Vereinigten Friedrichs-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg am 12 Juli, 1907. Von Friedrich Loofs. Halle-a-S.: Verlag von Eugen Strien.

² 'Haec tripartita universae historiae divisio . . . Cellarii libris si non primum inventa, at certe ita confirmata est, ut inde ab illo tempore communi omnium usu comprobaretur.' Keil, *de Chr. Cellarii vita*, etc. p. vii.

and to answer: Is Cellarius correct in his estimate of the historical significance of the Lutheran age? It is rightly urged that the judgment of Cellarius has been accepted even by historians who have frankly recognized mediæval elements in Luther's teaching. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer did not exaggerate when he said that Luther's mind was 'the battleground of two ages; no wonder that he saw demons!' In 1883 Heinrich von Treitschke characterized the attempt to begin the history of modern times with the French Revolution as 'quite useless.' With this Protestant judgment in regard to the far-reaching influence of the Reformation, it is shown that Roman Catholic opinion during the *Aufklärung* was in positive accord. Negative support is also found in the Roman Catholic denunciations of Luther both before and after the 'Illumination era.' They yield evidence of 'the conviction that it is not easy to overestimate Luther's share in the origin of the modern world.'

A different note was sounded in a lecture delivered in 1906 at a Conference of Historians by Professor Troeltsch, of Heidelberg. Luther was represented as differing from the Middle Ages only in a few particulars, but as separated from the modern era by a great gulf. The 'true Middle Ages' included Luther, according to Troeltsch, who would so far remove the ancient landmarks as to extend the boundary of the Middle Ages to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In discussing *Luther's Relation to the Middle Ages*, Dr. Loofs finds a truer appreciation of the significance of the Reformation in the Essays of Dilthey, a Berlin philosopher by whom Troeltsch has been greatly influenced. But even Dilthey holds that the influence of the religious ideas of Luther has been too highly appraised, and that the kernel of the Reformation is neither the Reformers' theory of Scripture, nor their doctrine of justification by faith. More stress is laid on such ideas as the value of the individual and the dignity of the earthly calling; these are said to be 'the central thoughts' of Luther, and they are regarded as the religious expression of a general movement of thought throughout Christian Europe.

In maintaining, against Dilthey, that 'the doctrine of justification by faith is unquestionably the starting-point and the kernel of Luther's thought,' Dr. Loofs refers to recently discovered

documents¹ which cast light on Luther's religious development after 1509. They furnish him with the data for the following finely-wrought contrast:— 'Luther and Zwingli were led by quite different paths. Zwingli was familiar with humanistic opposition and humanism had his approval, before he grasped those new religious conceptions which were common to him and to Luther; he was an Erasmian before he was a reformer. Luther's development was narrower, but religiously it was richer. The waves of general intellectual advance made but a very feeble splashing against the convent-cell in which he prepared his lectures, and in which his inward struggles were fought out. Already, before the beginning of the Reformation campaign, what reminds us of the later Luther is solely his doctrine of justification and a series of religious ideas immediately connected with it.' These religious ideas, it is maintained, exerted a powerful influence on every contemporary movement of thought and life. Therefore, to prove that Luther was 'the most significant personal factor in the formation of new relations,' all that is needful is to show that 'his religious ideas were new' as compared with mediæval thought, and that 'they exerted a decisive influence' on the revolution which inaugurated a new era.

Troeltsch emphasizes the connexion between Luther's doctrine of justification and the mediæval Augustinian tradition. Dr. Loofs grants that Luther did more than reproduce the Pauline teaching; nevertheless his thoughts on justification are new, although their genesis can be understood only in the light of the mediæval development. It is erroneous to say that Augustine, St. Bernard, and Tauler taught the same doctrine as Luther. The thesis that man is justified by faith alone was, indeed, upheld in the East in the age of Augustine, but what was signified thereby is that 'from the man who comes to Baptism and seeks therein the forgiveness of all his past sins, God requires nothing more than faith, that is to say, the acceptance of the doctrine of the Church. For Luther the thesis had an altogether different meaning.' What he understood by the gospel was the joyful news of

¹ For a fuller treatment of this and other subjects, Dr. Loofs refers the readers of this pamphlet to the new (fourth) and greatly enlarged edition of his valuable *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (Halle-a-S. : Max Niemeyer). It is now an elaborate volume of more than 1000 pages, full of material for the student of the History of Doctrine.

God's grace, and not the sum-total of the moral precepts of Jesus, as mediæval theologians and humanists taught. 'To believe meant not to hold as true, but to trust the living God; and to be justified was to be brought into a right attitude to God on the ground of His grace realized in experience.'

As to the influence of these ideas, they are described as furnishing 'the Archimedean pivot for the lifting of the papacy off its hinges.' One after another, Luther cast aside the ecclesiastical traditions which did not harmonize with his experience of grace. He was, of course, the child of his age, and was influenced by its spirit. But his reforms originated neither in the intellectual impulses supplied by the era of 'illumination,' nor in social aspirations, nor in political considerations; they are to be ascribed to 'the courage of a personality made strong to stand against the world by its religious experience.' Such a leader could not but mightily influence his contemporaries. Many of his countrymen groaned beneath the burden of the Papacy; Luther was the first who had 'the heroic energy to accomplish what many had long desired; and this energy sprang from his fundamental religious ideas.'

All this may, however, be granted without acknowledging that the Lutheran Reformation divides the modern era from the Middle Ages. Troeltsch traces to the influence of Luther only the older Protestantism, and this he regards as 'the later flowering of mediæval culture.' In his view the overthrow of the older Protestantism, after the close of the seventeenth century, marks 'the real beginning of the modern era.' Dr. Loofs recognizes that there was a mediæval tinge in the older Protestantism, and that the last two centuries form 'a new period in the modern era.' But on two questions he joins issue with Troeltsch, who holds that the older Protestantism was 'more mediæval than modern,' and that Luther's influence on the development of the last two centuries has not been decisive.

Troeltsch charges the older Protestantism with perpetuating the compulsory methods of the Middle Ages. Dr. Loofs is content to point out that Luther decisively broke with the principle of compulsion, as indeed, with his conception of faith, he could not but break with it. 'The true Church, the society of Jesus Christ, the kingdom of God, is not, according to Luther, to be identified with any earthly organization; it is not visible to pro-

fane eyes. When he says that it becomes visible during the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, he is thinking only of its being visible to faith. Because God's Word "does not return void," faith can and should see that there is the Church, just as from God's work in nature and in history it may be seen that God is there, although He remains invisible.' Whatever may be said of post-reformation Protestantism, Luther does clearly distinguish, on the one hand, between moral and religious duties which are non-compulsory and legal demands which may be compulsorily enforced; and, on the other hand, between the invisible Church and the visible organization which can be called a church only when the word is used, in an inexact sense, to describe that *corpus Christianorum* which includes many who, although baptized, were not regarded by Luther as Christians.

In describing the difference between the modern mind and Luther's thought-world, Troeltsch is said to have overshot the mark. These are his contentions: Luther's theology, like that of the Middle Ages, went back to Paul, but not to Jesus; the reply is that throughout the last two centuries there have been, and to-day there are many theologians who, like Luther, fail to recognize the necessity of separating Jesus and Paul in their thoughts. Again, the older Protestantism is said never to have overcome mediæval asceticism; the reply is an acknowledgment of the difference between its attitude towards the world and that of modern Christians, but it is maintained that this difference is slight so long as piety is real, for the interests of the true Christian cannot be confined to this world. Another link with the Middle Ages is found in Luther's doctrine of sin; the reply is that Luther is not so mediæval, nor the modern mind so anti-Lutheran, as they are respectively represented to be. More importance is attached to the statement that Luther's belief in the supernatural stamps his mind as mediæval and therefore as distinctly non-modern; but again it is not difficult to show that the gulf between him and ourselves is neither so wide nor so deep as Troeltsch's estimate implies; moreover, the decisive battle between pantheistic immanence and vital Theism has not yet been fought out.

On the whole subject Dr. Loofs maintains that although thought has not remained stagnant since the days of the older Protestantism, Luther's

influence can be plainly traced in many subsequent developments. His religious ideas involved issues which could not be developed until later. For example, when Pietism found itself in conflict with Wittenberg orthodoxy, a friend of Spener wrote in defence of his teaching and called himself *Luther redivivus*. Again, the theology of Albrecht Ritschl cannot be rightly appreciated, if his indebtedness to Luther is underestimated.

Apart from the evolution of theology, it may be said that ideas foreign to Luther's system of thought have guided the intellectual progress of the last two centuries. This cannot be denied, although Luther did, directly or indirectly, influence such thinkers as Thomasiaus, Lessing, Kant, Arndt, and von Stein. Nevertheless, Luther's religious ideas had an emancipating and inspiring effect on the general development; his interpretation of Christianity prepared the way for the advance in scientific knowledge which has dissolved many traditional beliefs that were part of his own mental environment.

Finally, in a powerful passage, Dr. Loofs acknowledges that Dilthey is right when he insists that Luther, by his emphasis on the historic revelation, did set himself in opposition both to the Theism of the Humanists, especially of Erasmus, and to that of the Spiritualists of the sixteenth century. This opposition is sometimes wrongly ascribed to Luther's mysticism; it is true that he passed through a mystical period, but in the writings referred to there is no trace of genuine mysticism from which he afterwards separated himself completely.

To the peroration of Dr. Loofs's address justice cannot be done without verbatim quotations. They will serve to illustrate the candour and the wisdom with which the lessons of the past are read and applied to present-day conditions of religious thought. 'Those who look for the religion of the future in the direction of a mystical and pantheistic religious universalism, severed from historic Christianity, cannot but regard Luther's influence as retarding progress, as intervening between the humanistic illumination and the beginnings of a universalistic naturalism.' Elements contributing to such a system are discovered in the eighteenth century *Aufklärung*, in Spinoza, in Goethe, and the German Idealists. 'But historically considered, the mystic spiritualism, which rests on this basis its religious ideas, is more mediæval than Luther in his entirety. Neo-Platonism was an under-current in post-Augustinian Catholic thought.' The closing argument is that 'a more or less pantheistic Idealism,' is not adapted to the needs of the modern mind. 'It may well be that the basal thought of Luther, that man is really without God until he finds Him in the historic revelation, is more in accord with the spirit of the age and richer in promise for the future.' No truer estimate of Luther can be found than is expressed in Goethe's words to Eckermann: 'Already we owe to him many a good day, and it is impossible to imagine when the days will come in which he will cease to exert a productive influence.'

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Contributions and Comments.

A moot-Point of Pauline Christology.

FOR the reader's convenience the following texts shall be set down in chronological order:—

1 Co 11⁷ ἀνὴρ μὲν . . . εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.
2 Co 3¹⁸ ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες . . . τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα.

4⁴ . . . τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Col 1¹⁸ . . . τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ . . . ¹⁵ ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.

3¹⁰ . . . κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.

Ph 2⁶ . . . ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 6. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.

He 1² . . . ἐν υἱῷ . . . ³ ὃς ὡν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

It will be seen that four words are used to describe the relation of the Son to the Father:

εἰκὼν.

μορφῇ.

απαύγασμα τῆς δόξης.

χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως.