

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 11.—July, 1882.

I.

RECENT ETHICAL THEORY.

THE attitude of recent science and of recent speculations in the field of science, with respect to their bearing on ethical theory, has come to be regarded with lively and, to some extent, anxious interest by those conversant with these subjects. The reason for this, which is twofold, may readily be seen.

In the first place, it is felt that now as heretofore a true ethical theory is of primary importance; and this chiefly on two grounds: First, because the right conduct of life is the highest interest alike of society and of the individual, and it is not presumable that an adequate code of ethical maxims can ever spring from a false ethical theory; and second, because a true ethical theory is the finished product, and hence the test and criterion of right thinking in the inferior branches of knowledge. The normal movement of thought is from the physical to the metaphysical, and in metaphysics from the psychological to the ethical. Thus the ethical becomes in one sense the touchstone of all that precedes it. No reasoning can be accounted adequate that will not bear the strain of an ethical application. Whatever makes for wrong doing instead of right doing carries with it its own refutation. The taint of moral defect betrays a previous taint of false logic and false philosophy.

In the next place, it is not to be questioned that much of recent speculation in the field of science wears a hostile look toward all the old accepted tenets of ethical philosophy. The attitude, though less pronounced here than in some other directions, is yet not less certain and decided. The new philosophy, whether true or false, may

III.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

WE shall first consider the origin and history of Biblical Theology, and then its position and importance with reference to other departments of Theological Encyclopædia.

I.—THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

Biblical Theology, as a Theological Discipline, had its origin in the effort to throw off from the Bible the accumulated traditions of Scholasticism, guard it from the perversions of Mysticism, and defend it from the attacks of Rationalism. Its growth has been through a struggle with these abnormal tendencies, until it has established a well-defined system, presenting the unity of the Scriptures as a divine organism, and justly estimating the various human types of religion, doctrine, and morals.

The Bible is the divine revelation as it has become fixed and permanent in written documents of various persons in various periods of History, collected in one body called the Canon, or Sacred Scriptures. All Christian Theology must be founded on the Bible, and yet the various theologians of the various Christian churches, and the various periods of Christian History have differed greatly in their use of the Bible. Each age has its own providential problems to solve in the progress of our race, and seeks in the divine word for their solution, looking from the point of view of its own immediate and peculiar necessities. Each temperament and characteristic tendency of human nature approaches the Bible from its own peculiarities and necessities. The subjective and the objective, the form and the substance of knowledge, the real and the ideal, are ever readjusting themselves to the advancing generations. If the Bible were a codex of laws, or a system of doctrines, there would still be room for difference of attitude and interpretation, but inasmuch as the Bible is rather a collection of various kinds of Literature, poetry and prose, history and story, oration and epistle, sentence of wisdom and dramatic incident; and, as a whole, concrete rather than abstract, the

room for difference of attitude and interpretation is vastly enhanced. Principles are not always distinctly given, but must ordinarily be derived from a concrete body of truth and facts, and concrete relations; and everything depends upon the point of view, method, process, and the spirit with which the study is conducted.

Thus the *mystic* spirit arising from an emotional nature and unfolding into a more or less refined æsthetic sense, seeks union and communion with God, direct, immediate, and vital, through the religious feeling. It either strives to break through the forms of religion to the spiritual substance, or else by the imagination sees allegories in the forms, or modes of divine manifestation in sensuous outlines and colors of beauty and grandeur, to be interpreted by the religious æsthetic taste. The Religious element is disproportionately unfolded, to the neglect of the doctrinal and ethical. This mystic spirit exists in all ages and in most religions, but it was especially prominent in the Ante-Nicene Church, and in Greek and Oriental Christianity, and was distinguished by its intense *devotion* and its too exclusive absorption in the contemplation of God and of Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. Its exegesis is characterized by the allegorical method.

The *scholastic* spirit seeks union and communion with God by means of well-ordered forms. It searches the word of God for a well-defined system of law and doctrine by which to rule the Church and control the world. It arises from an intellectual nature, and grows into a more or less acute logical sense and taste for systems of order. This spirit exists in all ages and in most religions, but was especially dominant in the middle age of the Church and in Latin Christianity. It is distinguished by an intense legality and by too exclusive attention to the works of the law, and the consideration of the sovereignty of God, the sinfulness of man, and the satisfaction to be rendered to God for sin. In Biblical studies it is distinguished by the legal, analytic method of interpretation, carried on at times with such hair-splitting distinctions, and subtlety of reasoning, that the Scriptures become as it were a magician's book, which through the device of the manifold sense are as effectual to the purpose of the dogmatician for proof texts as are the sacraments to the priests in their magical operation. The doctrinal element prevails over the religious and ethical.

The *speculative* spirit seeks union and communion with God through the human reason and conscience, and, like the mystic spirit, disregards the form, but from another point of view. It is developed into a more or less pure *ethical* sense. It works with honest doubt and inquisitive search after truth, for the solution of the great problem of the world and man. It is distinguished by an intense *rational-*

ality and *morality*. It yearns for a conscience at peace with God and working in faith toward God and love toward man. This has been the prevailing spirit in the Germanic world since the Reformation, and is still the characteristic spirit of our age. The Church, its institutions and doctrines, the sacred Scriptures themselves, are subjected to earnest criticism in the honest search for moral and redemptive truth, and the eternal ideas of right, which are good forever, and are approved by the Reason and Conscience. The ethical element prevails over the religious and the doctrinal.

Now, the Evangelical spirit combines what is true and of advantage in all these tendencies of human nature. Born of the Holy Spirit, it is ever appropriating all the faculties and powers of man, and eliminating therefrom defective and abnormal tendencies and habits. It is reverent, believing, loving approach to God *through* the means of grace. It is above all vital union and communion with the Triune God in the forms of divine appointment, and the love and service of God and the brethren with all the faculties. It uses the form in order to the substance. It is inquiring, obedient, devout, and reformatory. It combines the subject and the object of knowledge, and aims to make real the ideal. It unites the devotional with the legal and moral habits and attitudes. It strives to unite in the Church the various types of human experience in order to complete manhood, and the completion of the kingdom of God in the golden age of the Messiah.

This evangelical spirit is the spirit of our Saviour, who speaks to us through four evangelists in the various types, in order to give us a complete and harmonious representation of Himself. This is the spirit which combines the variety of the Old and New Testament writers into the unity of the Holy Ghost. This is the spirit which animated the Christian Church in its great advancing epochs, when a variety of leaders, guided by the Holy Spirit, combined the types into comprehensive movements. This was the underlying and moving principle of the Reformation and of the British Revolution, where vital religion combined with great intellectual activity and moral earnestness, to produce the churches of Protestant Christianity.

The great initial movements by which the Christian Church advanced in the combination of the variety of forces into harmonious operation, in every case gave way to reaction and decline, in which the various forces separated themselves, and some particular one prevailed. So was it in the 17th century after the Reformation. The successors of the Reformers declining from the vital religion and moral vigor of Luther, Calvin, and Knox, broke up into various an-

tagonistic parties in the various national churches, in hostility with one another, more and more marring the harmony of divine truth and the principles of the Reformation. The reaction first began with those who had inherited the scholastic spirit from the middle age, and substituted a Protestant Scholasticism for the Mediæval Scholasticism in the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of the Continent, and a Protestant Ecclesiasticism for a Papal in the churches of Great Britain. The Scriptures once more became the slaves of dogmatic systems and ecclesiastical machinery, and were reduced to the menial service of furnishing proof texts to the foregone conclusions of Polemic divines and ecclesiastics.

The French Huguenots and British Puritans, in their struggles against persecution, maintained a vital religion, and reacted to the unfolding of the mystic type of Theology and devoted their attention to works of piety, to union and communion with God, and the practical application of the Scriptures to Christian Life, holding fast to the Covenant of grace as the principle of their entire Theology, while they distinguished between a Theoretical and a Practical Divinity, presenting the former in the common Reformed sense, but advancing the latter to a very high degree of development, the best expression of which is found in the Westminster standards.* Puritanism had, however, within itself antagonistic elements, which separated themselves after the composition of the Westminster standards, into various types, and the *Puritan* spirit largely advanced into the *Puritanical*, on the one side reacting to *Scholasticism* in the school of the Independent divine, John Owen, and on the other into *Mysticism*, in the many separating churches of Great Britain, and in such members of

* The English Puritans distinguished between Theoretical and Practical Divinity, and it was their characteristic mark that they laid the stress on the latter and unfolded it so richly that the Reformed divines of the Continent looked to England for light on this topic. John Dury, one of the Westminster divines, a Scotchman, the great peacemaker of his age, in his work, "*An Earnest Plea for Gospel Communion*," sheds much light upon this subject. He defines Practical Divinity to be "a system or collection of divine truth relating to the Practice of Piety." The great majority of the writings of the Puritan divines and Westminster men are upon this theme. It embraces chaps. xix.—xxx. of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the larger part of the Catechisms, and indeed the more characteristic, the abler, and the better parts. Wm. Gouge (also member of Westminster Assembly) in 1633 headed a petition of the London ministers to Archbishop Ussher to frame a system of Practical Divinity, as a bond of union among Protestants, distinguishing between essentials and circumstantialia. John Dury, in 1654, presents such an outline himself, working it out on the principle of the Covenant of Grace. He says: "Nor is it possible (as I conceive) ever to unite the Professors of Christianity to each other, to heal their breaches and divisions in Doctrine and Practice, and to make them live together, as brethren in one spirit ought to do, without the same sense of the Covenant by which they may be made to perceive the terms upon which God doth unite all those that are his children unto himself." (p. 19, *An Earnest Plea for Gospel Communion*. Lond., 1654.)

the Westminster Assembly as Thomas Goodwin and Peter Sterry. Puritanism passed over to the Continent through Wm. Ames and others, and in the school of Cocceius maintained a more Biblical cast of doctrine in the system of the Covenants, and afterwards gave birth to Pietism in Reformed and Lutheran Germany, producing the Biblical school of Bengel and the Moravians; subsequently bursting forth in England in the form of Methodism, which is a genuine child of Puritanism in the stress that it lays upon piety and a Christian life, although it shares with all these movements that have grown out of Puritanism, the common fault of undue emphasis upon the religious element, and a more or less sharply defined Mysticism, to the neglect of the doctrinal and the ethical.

The school of Saumur in France, the school of Calixtus in Germany, and the Cambridge Platonists in England (who were Puritan in origin and training), revived the ethical type and strove to give the human reason its proper place and functions in matters of religion, and prepared the way for a broad, comprehensive church. They were accompanied, however, by a more active movement, which by an undue emphasis of the rational and the ethical, followed Hobbes, John Goodwin, and Biddle into a movement which in England assumed the form of Deism, and in France of Atheism, in Holland of Pantheism, and in Germany of *Rationalism*. And thus the three great types became antagonized both within the National Churches, in struggling parties, and without the National Churches, in separating churches and hostile forms of Religion and Irreligion, of Philosophy and of Science. Thus the evangelical spirit of the Reformation was crushed between the contending parties, and its voice drowned for a while by the clamor of partisanship. The struggle has continued into the present century, but has been modified since Schleiermacher in the growth of the evangelical spirit to become the potent reconciling force of the 19th century.*

It was in the midst of this conflict that Biblical Theology had its origin and historical development, and has now its position and importance.† It was first during the conflict between Rationalism and

* The various types are not always found in their strength and purity as divergent forces, but frequently in a more or less mixed condition. Thus the Cambridge Platonists, while predominantly rational and ethical, were also characterized by the mystic spirit, especially in the case of Henry Moore. The Puritans Wm. Perkins and Wm. Ames combined the scholastic and mystic types. The scholastic and the rational combined in Calixtus and Arminius, and this might be illustrated by numerous examples.

† We would refer to two articles upon *Biblical Theology* in the *American Presbyterian Review*, 1870, pp. 105 and 293, upon which the present article is to some extent based. The language is reproduced in the presentation of the history in some cases as a matter of convenience, in that our earlier articles present essentially the same position as the present.

Supernaturalism in Germany that the need of a Biblical theology began to be felt. Scripture was the common battle-field of Protestants, and each party strove to present the Scriptures from its own peculiar point of view; and it became important to distinguish the teachings of the Scriptures themselves from the teachings of the schools and the theologians of the contending parties. This was attempted almost simultaneously from both sides of the conflict. G. T. Zacharia, a pupil of Baumgarten at Halle, and a decided supernaturalist, issued his *Bibl. Theol. oder Untersuchung des biblischen Grundes des vernehmsten theologischen Lehren*, 1772. The title shows the spirit of the work. The author would compare the Biblical ideas with the church doctrine in order to correct and purify the latter. He would base Dogmatics on the Scriptures, which alone can prove and correct the system. The author speaks of the advancing economy of redemption, but has no conception of an *organic* development.*

Soon after Ammon (C. F.) issued his *Entwurf einer reinen Bibl. Theologie*, 1792, and *Biblische Theologie*, 1801. Ammon was a Rationalist. Miracles and Prophecy are rejected as untenable. They will not bear critical and historical investigation. He would gather material from the Bible for a dogmatic system without regard to the system that might be built upon it.† Thus from both sides the scholastic system was undermined by the Scriptural investigation. In the meanwhile Michælis, Griesbach, and Eichhorn had given a new impetus to Biblical studies. Gabler (J. F.), the pupil and friend especially of Eichhorn and Griesbach, who influenced him and largely determined his theological position, first laid the foundations of Biblical Theology as a distinct Theological discipline in his academic discourse: *de justo discrimine theologiæ biblicæ et dogmaticæ regundisque recte utriusque finibus*, 1787. He presented the *historical principle* as the distinguishing feature of Biblical Theology over against a system of Dogmatics.‡ Gabler himself did not work out his principles into a system, but left this as an inheritance to his successors.

Lorenzo Baur, in his *Bibl. Theo. d. N. T.*, 1800–1802, defines Bibl. Theo. as a development pure and unmixed with foreign elements of the religious theories of the Jews, of Jesus, the apostles, according to

* See Tholuck's view of him in Herzog's "*Real Ency.*," xviii., p. 351.

† Tholuck regards his Biblical Theology as a fundamental one for the historico-critical Rationalism. (See Herzog, xix., p. 54 sq.)

‡ Gabler was a man of the type of Eichhorn and Herder, on the borders of the 18th and 19th centuries, from whom the fructifying influences upon the Evangelical Theology of the 19th century went forth. He labored for many years as Professor at Jena, and worked for the advancement of Biblical and Historical Learning with an intense moral earnestness.

the different historical periods, the varied acquirements and views of the sacred writers, as derived from their writings. He sought to determine the universal principles which would apply to all times and individuals. He would from the shell of Biblical ideas get the kernel of the universal religion.*

De Wette, in his *Bibl. Dogmatik des Alt. und Neuen Testaments oder kritische Darstellung des religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums, des Urchristenthums*, 1813, 3d Edit., 1831, sought to separate the essential from the non-essential by religious philosophical reflection. He would exclude the local, the temporal, and the individual in order to attain the universal religion. He made the advance of treating Biblical Theology in periods, and distinguishing the characteristic features of Hebraism and Judaism, of Christ and His apostles, but in his treatment the dogmatic element has too great prominence given to it so that he justly gives this work the title, *Biblical Dogmatics*.†

Daniel von Cöln, *Bibl. Theo.*, 1836, carries out the historical method more thoroughly than any of his predecessors, and presents a much more complete system, but he does not escape the speculative trammels of his predecessors. He presents the following principles of *Bibl. Theol.* :

“(1), To carefully distinguish the time and authors, and the mediate as well as the immediate presentation of doctrine ; (2), To strongly maintain the religious ideas of the authors themselves ; (3), To present and explain the symbolical mythical forms and their relation to the pure ideas and convictions of the authors ; (4), To explain the relation of the authors and their methods to the external conditions of the people, the time and the place under which they were trained ; (5), To search for the origin of the ideas in their primitive forms.” (*Bibl. Theo.*, I. p. 30).

* P. C. Kaiser's *Biblische Theologie oder Judaismus und Christianismus nach grammatisch-historischen Interpretationsmethode und nach einer freimüthigen Stellung in die kritisch vergleichende Universalgeschichte der Religion und die universale Religion* (Bd. I., 1813 ; II. a. 1814 ; II. b. 1821) is of the same point of view.

† L. F. O. Baumgarten Crusius' *Grundzüge der Biblischen Theologie*, 1828, is of slight importance, reacting from the advances made by L. Baur and De Wette. W. Vatke's *Religion des Alten Testaments nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt*, 1835, as the first part of a Biblical Theology is an able and instructive work, discussing fully the essential character of the Biblical Religion in relation to the idea of Religion. He divides his theme into two parts, presenting the religion of the Old and the New Testaments. The first part is subdivided into two stages : the Bloom and the Decay, historically traced. The author also divides into a general and a special part ; the former alone has been published, and is entirely speculative in character. It does not consider the individualities of the authors, and shows no advance beyond L. Baur and De Wette. It has recently come into prominence, owing to the author's views of O. T. Literature, which are in agreement with those of Reuss and Kuenen, at the basis of the Critical Theories of Wellhausen.

J. C. F. Steudel's *Vorlesungen über die Theologie des Alten Testaments* nach dessen Tode herausgegeben von G. F. Oehler, 1840, is still on the older ground, taking *Bibl. Theo.* to be “the systematic survey of the religious ideas which are found in the writings of the Old Testament,” including the Apocryphal, without distinction of periods or authors or writings, all arranged under the topics : Man, God, and the relation between God and Man.

De Wette and Von Cöln recognize a difference of the authors, but not from any inner peculiarity of the authors themselves, but from the external conditions of time, place, and circumstances. The authors are placed side by side without any real conception of their differences or of their unity. The historical principle is applied and worked out, but in an external fashion, and the relation to the universal religion and other religions is considered rather than the interrelation of the various doctrines and types of the Scriptures themselves.

This was the condition of affairs when Strauss issued his *Life of Jesus*, and sought, by arraying one New Testament writer against another, as F. Baur justly charges against him, to prove the incompetence of all the witnesses and reduce the life of Jesus to a myth.* F. Baur himself sought by the historico-critical process to show the natural development of Christianity out of the various forces brought into conflict with each other in the first and second Christian centuries, reducing the life and teachings of Jesus to a minimum. Neander grappled with the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, and the development hypothesis of F. Baur, and sought to construct a life of Jesus and a history of the Apostolic Church, resting upon a sound historical criticism of the New Testament writings. In his *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*, 1832, 5th Aufl., 1862,† he introduced a new principle into Biblical Theology, and made it a section in his *History of the Apostles*. He sought to distinguish the individualities of the various sacred writers in their conception of Christianity and to unite them in a higher unity.

“The doctrine of Christ was not to be given to man as a stiff and dead letter, in a fixed and inflexible form, but, as the word of the Spirit and of life, was to be proclaimed in and by its life in living variation and variety. Men enlightened by the Divine Spirit caught up these doctrines and appropriated them in a living manner according to their respective differences in education and life. These differences were to manifest the *living* unity, the richness and depth of the Christian spirit according to the various modes of human conception, unconsciously complementing and explaining each other. For Christianity is meant for all men, and can adapt itself to the most varied human characters, transform them and unite them in a higher unity. For the various peculiarities and fundamental tendencies in human nature are designed to work in and with one another at all times for the realization of the idea of humanity, the presentation of the kingdom of God in humanity.” (Gesch. d. Pf. und Leit. ; Gotha, 5th edition, p. 501).

* F. Baur, *Krit. Untersuch. in. d. kann. Evang.*, p. 71 ; F. Baur, *Kirchengeschichte des 19 Jahrhunderts*, p. 397. Strauss replies in his *Leben Jesu f. d. deutsche Volk.*, p. 64.

† In English in *Biblical Cabinet*, Edinburgh, 1842 ; Bohn's Library, London, 1856 ; translated by J. E. Ryland, revised and corrected according to the fourth German edition by E. G. Robinson, D.D., N.Y., 1865.

Neander thus gave to Bibl. Theo. a new and important feature that was indispensable for the further development of the discipline. Neander's presentation has still many defects. It is kept in a too subordinate position to his history. But he takes the stand so necessary for the growth of Bibl. Theo. that the theology of the various authors is to be determined from their own characters and the essential and fundamental conceptions of their own writings.*

Schmid, a colleague of F. Baur at Tübingen, first gave Biblical Theology its proper place in Theological Encyclopædia in his invaluable essay, *Ueber das Interesse und den Stand d. Bibl. Theo. des Neu. Test. in unsere Zeit. Tübinger Zeitschrift f. Theo.*, 4 Heft., 1838, pp. 126, 129. He defined Biblical Theology as belonging essentially to the department of *Exegetical Theology*.† For many years he lectured on the 'Theology of the New Testament. These lectures were published after his death by his pupils under the title, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1853, 4th ed., 1869.‡

Oehler (G. F.), also of the University of Tübingen, takes the same position with reference to the Old Testament. In his *Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1845, he defines the theology of the Old Testament as "the historico-genetic presentation of the revealed religion contained in the canonical writings of the Old Testament." His Lectures were first issued in 1873-4, under the title *Theologie des Alten Test.*, 2 Bde., by his son.§ Schmid and Oehler

* Neander presents as the central idea of Paul the law and righteousness, which give the connection as well as contrast between his original and final conception. The fundamental idea of James is that Christianity is the *perfect law*. John's conception is that divine life is in communion with the Redeemer, death in estrangement from Him.

† "We understand by Bib. Theol. of the New Test. the historico-genetic presentation of Christianity as this is given in the canonical writings of the New Test. ; a discipline which is essentially distinguished from Systematic Theology by its *historical* character, while by its *limitation to the biblical writings of the New Testament*, it is separated from Historical Theology, and is characterized as a *part of Exegetical Theology*. Of this last it constitutes the *summit* by which Exegetical Theology is connected with the roots of Systematic as well as Historical Theology, and even touches Practical Theology" (p. 126). Schmid regards Christianity as the fulfilment of the Old Covenant, which consists in Law and Promise (Bib. Theo., p. 367). He seeks to present Christianity in its unity with the Old Testament as well as in its contrast thereto. He thus gains four possibilities of doctrine, which are realized in the four principal apostles. James presents Christianity as the fulfilled Law ; Peter as the fulfilled Promise ; Paul as contrasted with the Law ; and John as contrasted with both Law and Promise.

‡ Trans. into English, but without the invaluable *definitions* at the beginning of the sections, in Clark's Lib., 1870.

§ Oehler distinguishes in the Old Testament three parts : Mosaism, Prophetism, and the Chokma,—the first fundamental ; the Prophetism representing the objective side, and the Chokma the subjective : these two unfolding in parallelism with one another. Thus he marks an advance in the Old Testament in the discrimination of *types*, corresponding with the distinguishing of types in the New Testament by Neander and Schmid. His work has been translated into English in Clark's Lib., 2 vols., 1874.

combine in giving us organic systems of Biblical Theology as the highest point of Exegetical Theology, and with a distinction of types combining in a higher unity, and with Neander introduce a new epoch in Biblical Theology.*

On the other hand, F. Baur attempts to account for the peculiarities of the New Testament writings, as well as the origin of the Christian Church, by his theory of the two opposing forces, the Judaistic and the Pauline, gradually uniting in the later writings of the New Testament in the second century into a more conservative and mediating theology, reaching its culmination in the Johannean writings, which are at an elevation above the peculiarities of the earlier stages of development. Bib. Theology is to Baur a pure historical discipline. In it the Scriptural doctrine loosens itself from the fetters of the dependent relation in which it has been to the dogmatic systems of the Church, and will more and more emancipate itself therefrom. N. T. Theology is that part of Historical Theology which has to present the doctrine of Jesus as well as the doctrinal systems resting upon it, in the order and connection of their historical development, according to the peculiar characteristics by which they are distinguished from one another, so far as this can be ascertained in the New Testament writings. Baur strongly objects to the idea of Neander and his school, that there is a *unity* in the variety of New Testament doctrines, which is the very opposite of his own view of a development out of contrasted and irreconcilable forces.†

* The posthumous Lectures of Prof. Hävernich, of Königsburg, on *Bibl. Theo. d. Alt. Test.*, were published by Hahn in 1848, and a revised edition by Hermann Schultz in 1863, but are of no special value.

Prof. H. Messner, of Berlin, in 1856, published *Die Lehre der Apostel* in the spirit of Neander. He begins with the system of James, Jude, and Peter; makes the discourse of Stephen a transition to the Pauline system, and gives the theology of Paul with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews appended, and concludes with the theology of John and the Apocalypse. He finally gives a searching comparison of the various forms of apostolic doctrine, seeking a unity in the variety. •

† Baur justly admits that the doctrines of Jesus must be at the foundation. The doctrine of Jesus must be drawn chiefly from the discourses in Matthew, yet these not in their present form, as given in our Greek Gospel, but in their original form, to be determined by sound criticism. The essential principle of Christianity and of the doctrine of Jesus is the *ethical* principle; the law is not only enlarged by the Gospel, but the Gospel is contrasted with it. They are related as the outer to the inner, the act to the intention, the letter to the spirit. "Christianity presented in its original form in the doctrine of Jesus is a religion breathing the *purest moral spirit*." "This moral element, as it is made known in the simple sentences of the sermon on the mount, is the purest and clearest content of the doctrine of Jesus, the real kernel of Christianity, to which all the rest, however significant, stands in a more or less secondary and accidental relation. It is *that* on which the rest must be built, for however little it has the form and color of that Christianity which has become historical, yet it is in itself the entire Christianity" (Neu. Test. Theologie, p. 64 sq.)

Neander and Baur, the great historical rivals of our century, thus attain the same end in John's contemplation which reconciles and harmonizes all the previous points of view. According to Neander and his school, the variety therein attains a higher unity; according to Baur and his school, the contradictory positions are reconciled in an ideal spirit which is indifferent to all mere externals. The Lectures of Baur were published after his death in 1864 (*Vorlesungen über Neutestamentliche Theologie*).

Prof. Reuss, of Strasburg, in 1852 issued his *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique*, 2 tomes.* In the Preface to the last edition he states :

“ The unity which has been sought at the end of the work, I have dwelt upon where the history itself points to it—namely, at the beginning. It is in the primitive Gospel, in the teaching of the Lord Himself, that we find the focus of those rays which the prism of analysis places before us, separately in their different shades of color. As it has not been my design to produce a critical or theoretical, but a historical work, I have necessarily followed the natural evolution of the ideas, nor did it come within my province to violate this order to subserve any practical purpose, however lawful.”

It is the distinguishing merit of Reuss that he sets the Biblical Theology of the New Testament in the midst of the Religious movements of the times.† But the historical method absorbs and overwhelms the inductive, and he justly names his work a History of Christian Theology in Apostolic Times. Standing with the school of Baur in contending for the position of the discipline in Historical Theology, he differs from it in his giving up the reconciliation of contrasts in John's Theology.‡

The *Théologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. i., by G. L. Hahn, 1854, is a reaction to the historical ground without distinction of types. B. Weiss in his *Lehrb. d. Bibl. Theo. d. N. T.*, 1868, 3d Aufl., 1880, has

* A translation of the 3d edition into English has been published by Hodder & Stoughton, London, in 2 vols., 1872.

† He begins with a discussion of Judaism, e.g., the Theology of the Jews subsequent to the Exile and in its various sects, then considers John the Baptist and the Forerunners. In the second part he treats of the Gospels; in the third part the Jewish Christian Theology, and in the fourth the Pauline, and the fifth the theology of John.

‡ In the same year, 1852, appeared Lutterbeck's *Neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffen*, Ein Handbuch für älteste Dogmengeschichte und systematische Exegese des Neuen Testaments, 2 Bände. This Roman Catholic writer goes even more thoroughly than Reuss into the doctrinal systems in the midst of which Christianity arose: (1) The Heathen systems; (2) The Jewish; (3) The mixed systems and heresies of the apostolic period. He then passes over to the Christian system, distinguishing the various types as did Neander, and shows their genesis and internal harmony in an able and thorough manner, distinguishing three stages of apostolic doctrine: (1) From the death of Christ to the Apostolic Council, the original type; (2) The time of contrasted views, 50-70; (3) The period of mediation, or the later life of the Apostle John, 70-100, A.D.

also been influenced by the conflict between the schools of Neander and Baur to take an intermediate position. He excludes the life of Jesus and the great events of Apostolic history, and also restricts Biblical Theology to the variety of the types of doctrine and abandons the effort for a higher unity. Within the limits chosen by the author his work is elaborate and thorough and a most valuable addition to the literature, but does not show any progress in his conception of the discipline.

Hermann Schultz, in 1869, published his *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 2d edit., 1878, and laid stress upon the historico-critical method of the school of Baur, yet includes religion as well as dogmatics and ethics in his scheme, excluding the apocryphal books and limiting himself to the Canonical writings. It is elaborate and thorough in its working out of details, but does not show any real progress.*

In 1870 Van Oosterzee issued his *Bibl. Theo. of the New Test.*,† a compendium in the line of the school of Neander.

Ewald (H.) in 1871-6 issued his massive and profound work, *Lehre der Bibel von Gott oder Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes*, 4 Bde. The first volume treats of the doctrine of the word of God, the second of the doctrine of God, the third of the world and man, the fourth of the life of men and the kingdom of God. These divisions of the subject matter are simple and comprehensive, and the treatment, especially in the first volume, admirable and profound, and yet the historical side of the discipline falls too much into the background; so that we must regard the work on the whole as a decline from the higher position of the schools of Neander and Baur. Indeed Old Testament Theology was not yet ripe for the treatment that was necessary to bring it up to the standard of the New Testament Theology. The older views of the Biblical writings of the Old Testament, both of the Critical and Traditional sides, were too mechanical and uncertain. There was needed a great overturning of the soil of the Old Testament by a radical critical study of its religion and history such as Strauss

* In his last edition Schultz has gone over to the school of Wellhausen, and reconstructed his Biblical Theology so as to distinguish a Prophetic and Levitical period, and abandons the historical development, and thus like Ewald declines from the advanced position of F. Baur and Neander.

† Van Oosterzee does not enter much into details or present a thorough going comparison, yet he seeks the *higher unity* as well as the individual types. He regards *Bibl. Theol.* as a part of *Hist. Theology*, but his treatment of it is after the style of Neander. He does not estimate the life of Jesus and the religious life of the apostolic church. He neglects the religious and ethical elements, and as a whole must be regarded as falling behind the later treatises on the subject.

Bernard's *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, Bampton Lectures, 1864, 2d edit., 1867, is a brief work in the spirit of Neander, but without any advance in the working out of the theme.

had made in the New Testament. Such a treatment was prepared by Vatke, Reuss, and Graf,* but first carried out by Kuenen in his *Religion of Israel*, 1869-70 (in the Dutch lang., trans. 1873-5 into English) and by his *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, 1877, and then by Julius Wellhausen in his *Gesch. Israel*, Bd. i., 1878. These distinguished three great codes and sections in the Pentateuch, and found two antagonistic elements in the O. T. Scriptures, and ventured upon a radical reconstruction of Old Testament Religion and History and established a large and enthusiastic school.

Kuenen, in his history of Israel, finds in the period from Hezekiah to the exile two antagonistic parties in perpetual conflict. The one is the more popular and conservative party advocating the ancient religion of the land, the local sanctuaries and image worship, together with various deities. This party was formed by the majority of the prophets and the older Levitical priests. The other party was the progressive and the reforming party aiming at a central and exclusive sanctuary and the worship of Jehovah alone in a more spiritual manner. This was the priestly party at Jerusalem formed by the prophets Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah. These parties struggled with varying fortunes until the exile. The reforming party issued as their programme the Deuteronomic code. Independent of them, yet at times merging with the party of progress, was the Chokma tendency (*Hist. of Israel*, ii., chap. 6). The struggle was thus "between Jahvism and Jewish nationality" (I., p. 70). During the exile, influenced by Ezekiel's programme of reconstruction, the priestly Legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch was composed, and Ezra introduced it to the new commonwealth at Jerusalem.

"Ezra and Nehemiah assailed as much the independence of the religious life of the Israelites, which found utterance in prophecy, as the more tolerant judgment upon the heathen to which many inclined; their reformation was in other words anti-prophetic and anti-universalistic. History teaches us that the Reformation of Ezra and Nehemiah nearly coincides in date with the disappearance of Prophecy in Israel." (II., p. 240 sq.) †

The three great codes were afterwards combined in the Pentateuch. Thus this scheme of Reconstruction of Old Testament Legislation

* Hitzig, in his posthumous *Vorlesungen über Bibl. Theo. und Mess. Weissagungen*, 1880, treats first of the principle of the religion of the Old Testament, e.g., the idea of God as a holy spirit. This developed itself in two directions: *Universalism* and *Particularism*. It is defective in method, arbitrary in judgment, and shows no real progress beyond this distinction of types.

† See the article: *The Theory of Professor Kuenen*. By the Rev. T. W. Chambers, D.D., in the *PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW*, 1880, p. 304 sq.; also the article: *The Critical Theories of Julius Wellhausen*, by Prof. Henry P. Smith, in the same *REVIEW*, 1882, p. 357 sq.

and Religion adopted by such a large number of critics resembles in a most remarkable degree the reconstruction of the New Testament History and Doctrine proposed by Baur; namely, two antagonistic and irreconcilable forces resulting in a final system above them both.

With reference to the three codes and sections of the Pentateuch, evangelical men should not fail to recognize them. They correspond in a remarkable manner with the various presentations of the gospel of Jesus. And so the great types such as we find in the Prophetic, Priestly, and Chokma writings are clearly defined, corresponding closely with the Petrine, Pauline, and the Johannean types of the New Testament. The correspondence goes even farther, in that, as the Jewish Christian type is divided in twain by the gospels of Mark and Matthew, and by the apostles Peter and James, so the Prophetic type breaks up into the Psalmist and the Prophets. The three great types must be recognized in the Old Testament from the *Thora onward*, extending through the histories, prophets, and poetical books and other writings, as in the New Testament the types are recognized from the gospels through the book of Acts to the Epistles and Apocalypse. The school of Kuenen and Wellhausen regard them as antagonistic as are the parties in Church and State in our own day, the history and religion having a purely natural development. Evangelical exegetes will, in the main, deal with the Old Testament as they have done with the New Testament under the lead of Neander, Schmid, and Oehler, and recognize the variation of type in order to a more complete and harmonious representation as they combine under the supernatural influence of a divine progressive revelation.

Recent works on New Testament theology have devoted themselves more to a study of the particular types with reference to their psychological development out of the condition of mind and historical position and training of the various New Testament writers. Immer, in his *Theo. d. N. T.*, 1877, restates the positions of the school of Baur, but with the important advance that he traces the various stages of the development of the Pauline Theology itself with considerable industry and skill, so Pfleiderer,* Sabbatier,† and especially Holsten, in his

* It was natural that the theology of Paul should receive at first the closest examination. Usteri's *Entwicklung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffes*, 1829, 6th Edit., 1851, is a classic work; followed by Dahne's *Entwicklung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriff*, 1835; Baur's *Paulus der Apostel Jesus Christ*, 1845; 2d Edit., 1866; Opitz's (H.) *System des Paulus*, 1874.

† *L'Apotre Paul esquisse d'une Histoire de sa Pensée*, 1870. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, 1881, Paris. He finds the origin of Paul's Theology in the combination of the three facts, his Pharisaism which he left, the Christian church which he entered, and the conversion by which he passed from the one to the other. He then traces the genesis of the Pauline Theology in three periods.

Zum Evangelium des Petrus u. d. Paulus, 1868; *Evangelium des Paulus*, 1880, who strives to derive the peculiarity of the doctrine of Paul out of his consciousness rather than the vision and Christophany on the way to Damascus.* Thoma, in *Die Genesis des Johannes Evangelium*, 1882, strives to explain the theology of John as a development out of the struggling doctrinal conceptions of Judaism and Alexandrianism.† These, then, are the two points on which Bibl. Theology may be expected to make a new advance: (1) in the relation of the variety of types to one another and to their unity; (2) in the origin and development of the particular types.

We have thus far distinguished two stages in the development of the discipline of Bibl. Theology. Gabler first stated its *historical* principle and distinguished it from Systematic Theology. Neander then distinguished its variety of types, and Schmid stated its exegetical principle and distinguished it from Historical Theology as a part of Exegetical Theology. We are about to enter upon a third stage in which Biblical Theology, as the point of contact of Exegetical Theology with the three other great sections of Theological Encyclopædia, will show the true relation of its various types to one organic system of divine truth, will trace them each and all to their supernatural origin and direction as distinguished from the ordinary types of human thinking; and thus will act as a conserving and a reconciling force in the theology of the last quarter of our century. Step by step Bibl. Theo. has advanced in the progress of exegetical studies. It is and must be an aggressive discipline. It has a four-fold work of removing the rubbish that Scholasticism has piled upon the Word of God; of battling with Rationalism for its principles, methods, and products; of resisting the seductions of Mysticism; and of building up an impregnable system of sacred truth. As the Jews returning from their exile built the walls of Jerusalem, working with one hand, and with the other grasping a weapon, so must we build up the system of Biblical Theology, until we have erected a structure of Biblical truth containing the unity in the variety of Divine Revelation, a structure compacted through the

* Prof. A. B. Bruce, of Glasgow, in his article on *Paul's conversion and the Pauline Gospel*, in this REVIEW, 1880, p. 652 sq., ably discusses these theories and shows the connection of Pauline Theology with the supernatural event of the Christophany, and the apostle's consequent conversion.

† Other special writers upon particular types are:

Riehm's *Lehrbegriff des Hebraerbriefes*, 1867.

K. R. Kostlin *Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der Briefe Johannes*, 1845.

B. Weiss' *Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, 1855; *Johanneische Lehrbegriff*, 1862.

Zschokke *Theologie des Propheten des Alten Testaments*, 1877.

W. Schmidt's *Lehrgehalt des Jacobus Briefes*, 1869.

fitting together of all the gems of sacred truth according to the adaptation of a divine prearrangement.

II. THE POSITION AND IMPORTANCE OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

Having considered the origin and history of Biblical Theology, we are now prepared to show its position and importance, and define it as to its idea, method, and system. (1). *The idea of Biblical Theology.*—Biblical Theology is that Theological Discipline which presents the Theology of the Bible in its historical formation within the Canonical Writings. The discipline limits itself strictly to the Theology of the *Bible*, and thus excludes from its range the theology of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings of the Jewish and Christian sects, the ideas of the various external religious parties, and the religions of the world brought in contact with the people of God at different periods in their history. It is true that these must come into consideration for comparative purposes in order to show their influence positively and negatively upon the development of Biblical doctrine; for the Biblical Religion is a religion in the midst of a great variety of religions of the world, and its distinctive features can be shown only after the elimination of the features that are common with other religions. We must show from the historical circumstances the psychological preparations and all the conditioning influences how far the origin and development of the particular type and the particular stage of religious development of Israel and the Church were influenced by these external forces. We must find the supernatural influence that originated and maintained the Biblical types and the Biblical Religion as distinct and separate from all other religions. And then these other religious forces will not be employed as co-ordinate factors with the Biblical material, as is done by Reuss, Schwegler, and Kuenen, who make Biblical Theology simply a history of religion, or of doctrine in the times of the Bible and in the Jewish nation. Rather these theological conceptions of other religions will be seen to be subordinate factors as influencing Biblical Theology from *without*, and not from within, as presenting the external occasions and conditions of its growth, and not its normal and regulative principles. The Biblical limit will be maintained; for the Biblical material stands apart by itself, in that the Theology therein contained is the Theology of a divine Revelation, and thus distinguished from all other theologies, both as to its origin and its development, for they give us either the products of Natural Religion in various normal and abnormal systems, originating and developing under the influence of

unguided or partially guided human religious strivings, or else are apostasies or deflections from the religion of Revelation in its various stages of development.

The discipline we have defined as presenting the *Theology* of the Bible. It is true that the term Theology is ambiguous as being too broad, having been employed as a general term including Biblical Introduction, Hermeneutics, and so on. And yet we must have a broad term, for we cannot limit our discipline to *Dogmatics*, for Biblical Dogmatics as rightly conceived is a part of Systematic Theology, being *a priori* and deductive in method. Biblical Dogmatics deduces the dogmas from the Biblical material and arranges them in an *a priori* dogmatic system, presenting not so much the doctrines of the *Bible* in their simplicity and in their concrete form as they are given in the Scriptures themselves, but such doctrines as may be fairly derived from the Biblical material by the logical process, or can be gained by setting the Bible in the midst of Philosophy and Church Tradition. We cannot deny to this department the propriety of using the name *Biblical Dogmatics* or even *Biblical Theology*. For where a Dogmatic system derives its chief or only material from the Scriptures there is force in its claim to be *Biblical Theology*. We do not, therefore, use the term *Biblical Theology* as applied to our discipline with the implication that a dogmatic system derived from the Bible is *non-Biblical* or *not sufficiently* Biblical, but as a term which has come to be applied to the discipline which we are now distinguishing from *Biblical Dogmatics*. *Biblical Theology*, in the sense of our discipline, and as distinguished from *Biblical Dogmatics*, cannot take a step beyond the Bible itself, or, indeed, beyond the particular writing or author under consideration at the time. *Biblical Theology* has to do only with the sacred author's conceptions, and has nothing whatever to do with the legitimate *logical* consequences. It is not to be assumed that either the author or his generation argued out the consequences of their statements, still less discerned them by intuition; although, on the other hand, we must always recognize that the Religion and, indeed, the entire Theology of a period or an author may be far wider and more comprehensive than the record or records that have been left of it; and that, in all cases, *Biblical Theology* will give us the *minimum* rather than the *maximum* of the *Theology* of a period or author. But, on the other hand, we must also estimate the fact that this *minimum* is the inspired authority to which alone we can appeal. The only consequences with which *Biblical Theology* has to do are those historical ones that later Biblical writers gained in their advanced knowledge of divine revelation, those conclusions that are

true historically—whatever our subjective conclusions may be as to the legitimate logical results of their statements. And even here the interpretation and use of later writers are not to be assigned to the authors themselves or the Theology of their times. We would therefore urge that the term Biblical Dogmatics should be applied to that part of Dogmatics which rests upon the Bible and derives its material from the Bible by the legitimate use of its principles. Dogmatics as a Theological Discipline, in our judgment, is far wider than the Biblical material that is employed by the dogmatician. The Biblical material should be the normal and regulative material, but the dogmatician will make use of the deductions from the Bible and other authorities that the Church has made in the history of doctrine and incorporated in her creeds, or preserved in the doctrinal treatises of the Theologians. He will also make use of Right Reason, and of Philosophy, and Science, and the religious consciousness as manifest in the history of the Church and in the Christian life of the day. It is all-important that the various sources should be carefully discriminated and the Biblical material set apart by itself in Biblical Dogmatics, lest in the commingling of material *that* should be regarded as Biblical which is *non*-Biblical, or *extra* Biblical, or *contra* Biblical, as has so often happened in the working of Ecclesiastical Tradition. And, even then, when Biblical Dogmatics has been distinguished in Systematic Theology, it should be held apart from Biblical Theology, for Biblical Dogmatics is the point of contact of Systematic Theology with Exegetical Theology, and Biblical Theology is the point of contact of Exegetical Theology with Systematic Theology, each belonging to its own distinctive branch of Theology, with its characteristic methods and principles. That system of Theology which would anxiously confine itself to supposed Biblical material to the neglect of the material presented by Philosophy, Science, Literature, Art, Comparative Religion, the History of Doctrine, the Symbols and the Liturgies, the life of the Church, and the pious religious consciousness of the individual or of Christian society, must be extremely defective, unscientific, and cannot make up for its defects by an appeal to the Scriptures and a claim to be Biblical. None of the great systematic theologians, from the most ancient times to Martensen, Dorner, Charles Hodge, and Henry B. Smith, have ever proposed any such course. It has been the resort of the feebler Pietists in Germany, and of the narrower Methodism and Evangelicalism of Great Britain and America, doomed to defeat and destruction, without a systematic body of divinity.

We do not, therefore, present Biblical Theology as a substitute

for Systematic Theology. Systematic Theology is far more comprehensive than Biblical Theology can ever be. But we urge the importance of Biblical Theology in order to the important distinction that should be made, in the first place, between the Biblical sources and all other sources of Theology, and then, in the second place, to distinguish between the Biblical Theology as presented in the Scriptures themselves, and Biblical Dogmatics which makes legitimate deductions and applications of the Biblical material.

But Biblical Theology is wider than the doctrines of the Bible. It includes *Ethics* also. Here the school of Baur and even Weiss and Van Oosterzee would stop. But Schmid, Schultz, and Oehler are correct in taking Biblical Theology to include *Religion* as well as doctrines and morals, that is, those historic persons, facts, and relations which embody religious, dogmatical, and ethical ideas. This discrimination is important in Systematic theology, but it is indispensable in Biblical Theology where everything is still in the *concrete*. Thus a fundamental question in the theology of the New Testament, is what to do with the life of Jesus. The life of Jesus is, as Schmid shows, the fruitful source of his doctrine, and a theology which does not estimate it, lacks foundation and vital power. The life of Jesus may indeed be regarded from two distinct points of view, as a biographical, or a doctrinal and religious subject. The birth of Jesus may be regarded as a pure historical fact or as an incarnation. His suffering and death may be historical subjects, or as expressing atonement. His life may afford biographical matter or be considered as religious, doctrinal, and ethical, in that his life was a new religious force, a redemptive influence and an ethical example. Biblical Theology will have to consider, therefore, what the life of Jesus presents for its various departments. And so the great fact of Pentecost, the Christophanes to Peter, Paul, and John, and the apostolic council at Jerusalem must all be brought into consideration. And in the Old Testament we must consider the various covenants and the religious institutions and laws that were centered about them. Without Religion, with its persons, events, and institutions, Biblical Theology would lose its *foundations*, and without ethical results it would fail of its rich fruitage.

We state, furthermore, that the discipline presents the Theology of the Bible in its *historical formation*. This does not imply that it limits itself to the consideration of the various particular conceptions of the various authors, writings, and periods as Weiss and even Oehler maintain, but with Schmid, Messner, Van Oosterzee after Neander it seeks the *unity in the variety*, ascertains the roots of the divergencies,

traces them each in their separate historical development, shows them co-operating in the formation of one organic system. For Biblical Theology would not present a mere conglomerate of heterogeneous material in a bundle of miscellaneous Hebrew literature, but would ascertain whether there is not some principle of organization; and it finds that principle in a supernatural divine revelation and communication of redemption in the successive covenants of grace, extending through many centuries, operating through many minds, and in a great variety of literary styles employing all the faculties of man and all the types of human nature, in order to the accomplishment of one massive, all-embracing, and everlasting *Divine Word* adapted to every age, every nation, every type of character, every temperament of mankind; the whole world.

(2.) *The Place of Biblical Theology.*—Biblical Theology belongs to the department of Exegetical Theology as a higher exegesis completing the exegetical process, and presenting the essential material and principles of the other departments of theology.

The boundaries between Exegetical and Historical Theology are not so sharply defined as those between either of them and Systematic Theology. All Historical Theology has to deal with *sources*, and in this respect must consider them in their variety and unity as well as development; and hence many theologians combine Exegetical Theology and Historical Theology under one head—Historical Theology. It is important, however, to draw the distinction, for this reason. The *sources* of Biblical Theology are in different relation from the sources of a history of doctrine, inasmuch as they constitute a body of divine revelation and in this respect to be kept distinct from all other *sources* even cotemporary and of the same nation. They have an absolute authority which no other sources can have. The stress is to be laid less upon their historical development than upon them as an organic body of revelation, and this stress upon their importance as *sources* not only for historical development, but also for dogmatic reconstruction and practical application, requires that the special study of them should be exalted to a separate discipline and a distinct branch of theology.

Now in the department of Exegetical Theology, Biblical Theology occupies the highest place, the latest and crowning achievement. It is a higher exegesis completing the Exegetical Process. All other branches of Exegetical Theology are presupposed by it. The Biblical Literature must first be studied as sacred literature. All questions of date of writing, integrity, construction, style, and authorship must be determined by the principles of the Higher *Literary Criticism*.

Biblical Canonics determines the extent and authority of the various writings that are to be regarded as composing the sacred canon and discriminates them from all other writings by the criticism of the believing spirit enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church. Biblical Textual criticism ascertains the true text of the writings in the study of MSS. and versions and citations, and seeks to present it in its pure primitive forms. Biblical Hermeneutics lays down the rules of Biblical Interpretation, and Biblical Exegesis applies these rules to the various particular passages of the Sacred Scriptures. Now Biblical Theology accepts all these rules and results thus determined and applied. It is not its office to go into the detailed examination of the verse and the section, but must accept the results of a thorough exegesis and criticism in order to advance thereon and thereby to its own proper work of higher exegesis; namely, rising from the comparison of verse with verse, and paragraph with paragraph, where simple exegesis is employed, to the still more difficult and instructive comparison of writing with writing, author with author, period with period, until by generalization and synthesis the theology of the Bible is attained as an organic whole.

Biblical Theology is thus the culmination of Exegetical Theology, and must be in an important relation to all other branches of Theology. For Historical Theology it presents the great principles of the various periods of History, the fundamental and controlling tendencies which, springing from human nature and operating in all the religions of the world, find their proper expression and satisfaction in the normal development of divine Revelation, but which, breaking loose from these salutary bonds, become perverted and distorted into abnormal forms, producing false and heretical principles and radical errors. And so in the Biblical unity of these tendencies Biblical Theology presents the ideal unity for the church and the Christian in all times of the world's history. For Systematic Theology Biblical Theology affords the holy material to be used in Biblical Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics, the fundamental and controlling material out of which that systematic structure must be built which will express the intellectual and moral needs of the particular age, fortify the church for offence and defence in the struggles with the anti-Christian world, and give unity to its life, its efforts, and its dogmas in all ages. For Practical Theology it presents the various types of religious experience and of doctrinal and ethical ideas which must be skilfully applied to the corresponding differences of type which exist in all times, in all churches, in all lands, and indeed in all religions and races of mankind. Biblical Theology is indeed the *Irenic* force which

will do much to harmonize the antagonistic forces and various departments of Theology and bring about that *toleration within the church* which is the *greatest* requisite of our times.

(3.) *Method of Biblical Theology.*—The method employed by Biblical Theology is a blending of the genetic and the inductive methods. The method of Biblical Theology arises out of the nature of the discipline and its place in Theological Encyclopædia. As it must show the Theology of the Bible in its historic formation, ascertain its genesis, the laws of its development from germinal principles, the order of its progress in every individual writer, and from writer to writer and age to age in the successive periods and in the whole Bible, it must employ the genetic method. It is this genesis which is becoming more and more important in our discipline, and is indeed the chief point of discussion in our day. Can all be explained by a natural genesis, or must the supernatural be called in? The various Rationalistic efforts to explain the genesis of the Biblical types of doctrine in their variety and their combination in a unity in the Scriptures are extremely unsatisfactory and unscientific. With all the resemblances to other religions, the Biblical Religion is *so* different that its differences must be explained, and these can only be explained by the claims of the sacred writers themselves, that God Himself in various forms of Theophany and Christophany revealed Himself to initiate and to guide the religion of the Bible in its various movements and stages. Mosaism centres about the great Theophany of Sinai, as Christianity centres about the *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, and the life, death, ascension, and second advent therein involved. It is now the problem of Biblical Theology as it has traced the Theology of the Jewish Christian type to the Theophany of Pentecost and of the Pauline to the Christophany on the way to Damascus, so to trace the Johannean type and the various Old Testament types to corresponding supernatural initiation. The Johannean type may be traced to the Christophanies of Patmos.* The Old Testament is full of Theophanies which originate particular Covenants and initiate all the great movements in the history of Israel.

As it has to exhibit the unity in the variety of the various conceptions and statements of the writings and authors of every different type, style, and character, and by comparison generalize to its results,

* We regard the Apocalypse as the earliest of the Johannean writings. The Christophanes therein described had been granted to the apostle prior to the composition of the Gospel, so that the Gospel was written under their influence still more even than under the recollection of the association with Jesus during His earthly ministry.

Biblical Theology must employ the *inductive* method and the synthetic process. This inductive method is the true method of Exegetical Theology. The details of Exegesis have been greatly enriched by this method during the present century, especially by the labors of German divines, and in most recent times by numerous laborers in Great Britain and America. But the majority of the laborers in Biblical Theology have devoted their strength still to the working out of the historical principle of our discipline. Yet within the various types and special doctrines a large amount of higher exegesis has been accomplished by Weiss, Riehm, Schultz, Diestel, Weiffenbach, and others. But the *highest* exegesis in the comparison of types and their arrangement in an organic system with a unity and determining principle out of which all originate and to which they return their fruitage, remains comparatively undeveloped. Indeed the study of the particular types, especially in the Old Testament, must be conducted still further and to more substantial results ere the *highest* exegesis can fulfil its task.

The *genetic* and the *inductive* methods must indeed combine in order to the best results. They must co-operate in every writing, in the treatment of every author, of every period and of the whole. They must blend in harmony throughout. On their proper combination the excellence of a system of Biblical Theology depends. An undue emphasis of either will make the system defective and inharmonious.

(4.) *The system and divisions of Biblical Theology.*—These are determined partly by the material itself, but chiefly by the *methods* of dealing with it. We must make the divisions so simple that they may be adapted to the most elementary conceptions, and yet comprehensive enough to embrace the most fully developed conceptions and also be capable of a simple and natural subdivision in the advancing periods. In order to this we must find the dominant principle of the entire revelation and make our historical and our inductive divisions in accordance with it. The Divine revelation itself might seem to be this determining factor, so that we should divide historically by the historical development of that revelation, and synthetically by its most characteristic features. But this divine revelation was made to intelligent man and involved thereby an active appropriation of it on his part, both as to its form and substance, so that from this point of view we might divide historically in accordance with the great epochs of the appropriation of divine revelation, and synthetically by the characteristic features of that appropriation. From either of these points of view, however, there might be—there naturally would be, an

undue emphasis of the one over against the other at the expense of a complete and harmonious representation. We need some principle that will enable us to combine the subject and the object—God and man—in the unity of its conception. Such a principle is happily afforded us in the Revelation itself, so distinctly brought out that it has been historically recognized in the names given to the two great sections of the Scriptures, the Old and the New Testaments or Covenants. The *Covenant* is the fundamental principle of the divine revelation, to which the divine revelation commits its treasures and from which man continually draws upon them. The Covenant has a great variety of forms in the sacred Scriptures, but the most essential and comprehensive form is that assumed in the Mosaic Covenant at Sinai which becomes the *Old Covenant*, pre-eminently, and over against that is placed the *New Covenant* of the Messiah Jesus Christ, so that the great historical division becomes the *Theology of the Old Covenant* and the *Theology of the New Covenant*.

The *Covenant* must also determine the synthetic divisions. The Covenant is a union and communion effected between God and Man. It involves a *personal* relationship which it originates and maintains by certain events and institutions. This is Religion. The Covenant and its relations, man apprehends as an intelligent being with meditation, reflection, and reasoning. All this he comprehends in *doctrines*, which he apprehends and believes and maintains as his faith. These doctrines will embrace the three general topics of *God*, of *Man*, and of *Redemption*. The Covenant still further has to do with man as a *moral* being, imposing moral obligations upon him with reference to God and man and the creatures of God. All these are comprehended under the general term *Ethics*. These distinctions apply equally well to all the periods of divine revelation; they are simple, they are comprehensive, they are all-pervading. Indeed they interpenetrate one another, so that many prefer to combine the three under the one term Theology, and then treat of God and Man and the union of God and Man in redemption, in each division by itself with reference to religious, ethical, and doctrinal questions; but it is easier and more thorough-going to keep them apart, even at the expense of looking at the same thing at times successively from three different points of view.

From these more general divisions we may advance to subdivisions, as these may be justified in the successive periods of Biblical Theology, both on the historic and synthetic sides, and, indeed, without anticipation.

The relation between the historical and the synthetic divisions may

be variously viewed. Thus Ewald, in his *Biblical Theology*, makes the historical divisions so entirely subordinate as to treat of each topic of Theology by itself in its history. The difficulty of this method is, that it does not sufficiently show the *relative* development of doctrines, and their constant action and reaction upon one another in the successive periods. It may be of advantage for thoroughness in any one department to take that topic by itself and work it out in its historical development; but in a comprehensive course of *Biblical Theology* the interests of the whole cannot be sacrificed for the particular sections. They must be adjusted to one another in their historical development in the particular periods. Hence it will be necessary to determine in *each period* (1) the development of each particular doctrine by itself, as it starts from the general principle, and then (2) to sum up the general results before passing over into another period.

It will also be found that Theology does not unfold in one single line, but in several, from several different points of view, and in accordance with several different types. It will therefore be necessary on the one side ever to keep these types distinct, and yet to show their unity as one organism. Thus in the Pentateuch the three great types of the Jahvist, Elohist, and Deuteronomist will be distinctly traced until they combine in the one organism of our Pentateuch, presenting the fundamental *Thorah* of Israel. In the historical books the Prophetic and Levitical Historians will be distinguished and compared for a higher unity. The three great types, the Psalmists, Wise men, and Prophets, will be discriminated, the variations within the types carefully studied and compared, and then the types themselves brought into harmony, and at last the whole Old Testament presented as an organic whole. The New Testament will then be considered in the Forerunners of Christ; then the four types in which the evangelists present the Theology of Jesus, each by itself, in comparison with one another, and as a whole. The Apostolic Theology will be traced from its origin at Pentecost in its subsequent division into the three great types, the Jewish Christian of Peter, James, and Jude; the Gentile Christian of Paul, Luke, and the epistle to the Hebrews; and, finally, the Johannean of the gospels, epistle, and apocalypse of John; and the whole considered in the unity of the New Testament; and then, as the last thing, the whole Bible will be considered, showing not only the unity of the Theology of Christ and His apostles, but also of the unity of the Theology of Moses and David and all the prophets, with the Theology of Jesus and His apostles, as each distinct Theology takes its

place in the advancing system of divine revelation, all conspiring to the completion of a perfect, harmonious, symmetrical organism, the infallible expression of God's will, character, and being to His favored children. At the same time, the religion of each period and of the whole Bible will be set in the midst of the other religions of the world, so that it will appear as the divine grace ever working in humanity, and its sacred records as the true lamp of the world, holding forth the light of life to all the nations of the world.

C. A. BRIGGS.