

H. Bavinck. "Christological Movements in the
Nineteenth Century." Bibliotheca Sacra,
LXVIII (1911), 381-404.

ARTICLE II.

CHRISTOLOGICAL MOVEMENTS IN THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY HERMAN BAVINCK, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE FREE UNIVERSITY
AT AMSTERDAM.

[Translated from Dr. Bavinck's *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* (2d ed.), vol. iii. (1910) pp. 273-291, by Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Princeton Theological Seminary. Dr. Bavinck in the immediately preceding pages had given an exposition of the doctrine of the Person of Christ as it was defined in the Chalcedonian decree, held in the medieval church, and embodied in the Confessions of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. It is to this discussion that he alludes in the first sentence here printed.]

ALL the developments of the doctrine of Christ which we have described take their start from and move within the limits of the Chalcedonian Symbol. But very many Christians have been unable to find contentment in this formulary. There have been in all ages those who turned off either to the right or to the left, and followed in the tracks of the old Ebionitism or Gnosticism. On the one side there are ranged Arianism, Nestorianism, Socinianism, Deism, Rationalism, etc., and on the other, appear Patripassianism, Sabellianism, Monophysitism, Anabaptism, and Pantheism in all its varied forms.¹ Above all, the idea has become dominant in the more recent theology that the doctrine of the Two Natures, however well adapted it was to the Greek theology and church, has lost for us its whole religious value; that it has hopelessly given way under the criticism of Socinianism and Rationalism, and needs now to be remodeled in an entirely new, religious-

ethical sense.² This new Christology has its most outstanding adherents in Kant, Schleiermacher, and Ritschl.

Kant could not accept the biblical and ecclesiastical doctrine of Christ; because, denying as he did that the supernatural could be known, and asserting that obligation infers ability, he had no need of a Redeemer. Christ could remain, accordingly, for Kant, only an ethical example and a teacher of virtue. Whatever over and above this the Scriptures and the church have affirmed of this Christ has symbolical value only. The Christ of the church is the symbol of God-pleasing humanity; this is the true, only-begotten, well-beloved Son, for whom God created the world. The incarnation of Christ symbolizes the rise of the true moral life in man; his substitutive sufferings mean that the moral man in us must make atonement for the evil of the sensuous man; faith in Christ signifies that, to be saved, man must believe in a humanity which is well pleasing to God. In one word, the historical man, Jesus, is no Mediator or Saviour; but all that the church confesses of this person applies, in its entirety, to the idea of humanity.³ By means of the new philosophy, Kant, like the old Gnostics, began the process of separating the historical from the ideal Christ; and others have carried this process forward. Fichte took his start from the idea that God and man are absolutely one. Christ, however, was the first who recognized this unity in himself, and gave clear expression to it; that is his great, historical significance; thousands have been brought by him to this recognition, to this unity with God. But though this is what has historically happened, it is not implied that man cannot come to this unity of himself, apart from Christ. Should Jesus return, he would be perfectly content to see Christianity ruling in men's hearts, though his own person were wholly

forgotten. Nothing but the metaphysical, eternal truth, the recognition of unity with God, is saving; what is historical is an isolated fact which has passed away.⁴

With Schelling, in his first period, the Absolute is not an unchangeable being, but an eternal becoming, which thus comes to revelation in the world as its Logos and Son. Theology represents Christ as the only-begotten and incarnated Son of God. But that is incorrect: God is eternal, and cannot have assumed human nature at a particular time; as a historical fact Christianity has only temporary significance. The idea, however, remains eternal; the world is the Son of God; the incarnation of God consists in this, that, in order to be itself, the Absolute comes to revelation in a world, in a plurality of individuals, in a rich history, in a historical process. The world is thus God himself in his becoming: the incarnation of God is the principle of all life in history, the finite is the necessary form for God's becoming visible; everything must be conceived from the idea of the incarnation. And this is also the esoteric truth of Christianity: the historical clothing is only the temporal form of this eternal idea.⁵ Similarly Hegel said that what theology sets forth symbolically in representations is translated by philosophy into conceptions; Christ is not the only God-man, but man is essentially one with God, and becomes conscious of this at the highest point of his development.⁶ From these philosophical premises, Marheineke, Rosenkranz, Göschel, Daub, Conradi, and others, no doubt, sought to retain the incarnation of God in Christ; but Strauss drew the logical conclusion, and said, in his "*Leben Jesu*,"⁷ that the idea cannot have its full embodiment in one example, but only in a multitude of individuals; mankind is the incarnated God, which is conceived of the Holy Ghost, lives sinlessly, rises from the dead, ascends to heaven,

etc. In that modern dogmatics which is the outgrowth of this philosophy there remains no place for Christ, except as a religious genius, a teacher of talent, a prophet, who has the most profound understanding of religion, and has most clearly revealed the love of God and declared the unity and fellowship of God and man; the person of Christ, nevertheless, stands actually outside the essence of Christianity.⁸ It is not without propriety, therefore, that with his eye on this modern theology, Von Hartmann spoke of a crisis, and a "self-disintegration," of Christianity.⁹

Another tendency was introduced by Schleiermacher. He decisively rejected, indeed, the church doctrine of Christ; but he endeavored to avoid the fault of the speculative philosophy when it sought the essence of Christianity in an abstract idea, and separated this from the historical person of Christ. He took his starting-point from the experience of the community, from the Christian consciousness, which had as its contents reconciliation and communion with God. The ultimate cause of this is to be found nowhere else than in the founder of the Christian community, in whom, therefore, the God-consciousness must have been present in absolute power. He is the religious prototype of humanity, sinless, perfect, the highest product of the human race, and at the same time the product of the creative act of God as the perfect subject of religion. Our primary concern is not with his teaching but with his person, not with what he did but what he was, not with his ethical example but with his religious life.¹⁰ Thus, seeking the realization of the religious idea not in humanity, but in Christ, Schleiermacher exerted a powerful influence and secured for Christology again a place in dogmatics.

Schleiermacher's influence was first of all noticeable in an endeavor, in opposition to Kant, Fichte, Hegel, to maintain

that there is in Christ an altogether special and absolutely unique revelation of God. Because the God-consciousness in Christ was absolute and undisturbed by any sin, God must have dwelt in him in a wholly unique manner. Of course this could be looked at in different ways, according to the view taken of the Trinity. Those who rejected the ontological Trinity saw in Christ a special manifestation of God, a complete indwelling of God, the realization of God's eternal thought of the world or idea of man.¹¹ Others recognized, no doubt, an ontological Trinity, but thought of the relation of the Son to the Father more or less after a subordinationist fashion, and came therefore to the Arian Christology.¹² Still others coördinated the Son with the Father, and thus approached the church doctrine.¹³ As a consequence there came through Schleiermacher into the newer Christology an unwonted interest in the human, historical development of the person of Christ. The doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* was accordingly as good as discarded, and the human nature of Christ pushed into the foreground: the doctrine of the two states was transmuted into a life of Jesus, and that life was investigated in its preparation, development, and influence. The history of Israel, of the classical world, and above all of Jesus' own times became a favorite object of study;¹⁴ the incarnation came to be thought of as not accidentally necessary on account of sin, but as given in the idea of God's outflowing, and with creation itself;¹⁵ and the development of Jesus as man was followed out in its historical evolution until he became the second Adam, the head of mankind, the central individual.¹⁶

Finally, there arose in the newer Christology, which still retained the confession of Christ as God-man, an effort to maintain the unity of these two with one another in a

better way than had been done in the Chalcedonian formula and the church dogmatics. To this end there was applied, in part to God himself, and especially to the God-man, the idea of becoming. Schelling made a beginning with this in his second period.¹⁷ The Son was in a certain sense, no doubt, eternally in the Father; but as generated by the Father, as Son outside of (*practer*) the Father, he came into being in the creation. Even then, however, the Son did not exist as a real person; rather, as a potency, which can and must realize itself. By the sin of man, however, the world became an extra-divine Being, and the Son who was generated for the world and remains bound to the world, strives to be a Being not inwardly, but outwardly, independent of the Father.¹⁸ He was in an intermediating position, *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*. He became Christ, remains bound to the fallen world, which the Father leaves to him, brings this back to the Father himself in the way of self-exinanition and obedience; and so, at the end of the world, becomes himself Son in the complete sense.¹⁹ The notion of the becoming of the God-man had great influence in theosophical circles, especially with Baader, Steffens, etc. And even Rothe and Dörner adopted the idea that God or the Logos came to dwell in the historical person of Jesus just in the measure in which this person developed into a religious personality, into spirit; God's becoming man progressed *pari passu* with man's becoming God. In another and yet related fashion, the explanation of the God-man is attempted by the doctrine of the *κένωσις*, that is by the hypothesis that the Logos in the incarnation emptied himself of all or some of his attributes down to the level of humanity, and then gradually reassumed them in the course of development.²⁰

With Schleiermacher's Christology that of Ritschl agrees;

although Ritschl, attaching himself more closely to the philosophy of Kant, lays more stress on the work than on the person of Christ, and gives a greater place in Christianity to the ethical element. Ritschl too discards all that is metaphysical in the doctrine of Christ, and all that rests under the condemnation of natural science and historical criticism; particularly the preëxistence, the supernatural birth, the resurrection, the ascension, and the second coming of Christ. Christ is in this respect a common man. But his peculiarity lay in his calling, in the work which he did—in a word, in the founding of the Kingdom of God. As an ethical person Christ stands high above all men; his will was perfectly one with the will of God, with the plan and end which God had set before himself with respect to the world and mankind. But on this account there belongs to Christ a great religious importance: in him, God himself, his grace and truth, his will and purpose with man, has been revealed; Christ has shown to us, and confirmed it by his death, that the Kingdom of God is destined for every man, that his will must become the will of the whole human race. In this consists the kingly power, the world-dominion of Christ, and in this consists also his deity. Christ is not God in the metaphysical sense, but the name of God expresses in his case his rank and position in the Kingdom of God, and is thus not a designation of nature but of office. Christ may be called God, because with respect to us he occupies the place and has the value of God.²¹

The Christology of the nineteenth century as it arose under the influence of Schelling and Hegel, Schleiermacher and Ritschl, is characterized in general by this,—that it has returned, by way of reaction against rationalism and moralism, to the person of Christ, and seeks to recognize in his historical appearance an abiding significance for the religious life.

Even among the followers of Ritschl the effort to do this continues to be made. Herrmann, for example, draws a distinction between the ground and the contents of faith, and reckons to the former nothing but what the most stringent historical criticism must recognize and respect in Jesus — that is to say, his “inner life,” his moral greatness and goodness. This may be very little, but the Christian faith remains still with Herrmann bound in some degree to the historical person of Jesus, and sees in his moral goodness a proof of the indwelling and revelation of God in him.²² Kaftan takes up a still more conservative attitude and does not consider himself compelled by science to limit the historical portrait of Jesus to his inner life. On the contrary, the exalted Lord whom the community confesses is no other than the historical Saviour who walked on earth. But because God was in him in an entirely unique way, because the perfect revelation of God has come to us in him, and God in him communicates his spirit and his life to us, therefore the community rightly speaks of his deity and confesses him as its Lord and God.²³ Häring does not consider it necessary to speak of Jesus’ deity, because this term creates all sorts of misunderstanding and discord, but maintains its rightfulness, because Christ is the complete self-revelation of God; and he sees this revelation in the historical Jesus as the evangelists describe him, including even his resurrection.²⁴ Thus among the followers of Ritschl there is much divergence as to what in the historical Jesus may be considered to be established; some let the portrait of Jesus work upon men directly out of the Gospels (Herrmann, Haupt), others think more of a mediation through word and community, through the examples of Christians and the operation of the Holy Spirit (Johannes Weiss, O. Ritschl, Max Reischle, Gottschick); some are more (O.

Ritschl, Max Reischle, Häring), others less (Kaftan, Wobermin, Wendt),²⁵ averse to philosophy and metaphysics. But all recognize a special revelation of God in the historical person of Christ, and all endeavor to preserve for Christology a place in dogmatics.

By this they distinguish themselves from the "modern theologians," who, with Biedermann, divide the principle of Christianity from its founder, and thus expel Christology from dogmatics. But they separate themselves also from the theological tendencies which find in the Confessions, or at least in the New Testament, a trustworthy portrait of the historical person of Jesus. For they all think themselves compelled by the natural and especially by the historical science of recent times to make a distinction between the historical Jesus and the dogmatic Christ. Greek philosophy and Oriental metaphysics have corrupted and falsified the original gospel of Jesus. There are differences with respect to the time when this injurious commingling made its beginning. Lagarde said already some years ago that Paul had corrupted the religion of Jesus, by making Christ its content and object. And, particularly, that its falsification consisted in these four points. First, Paul brought in "the deification of the man Jesus," and made of the historical Jesus a preëxistent Being that once appeared on earth and afterwards returned to heaven. Secondly, he inserted into the primitive gospel "the supernatural redemption," which consists in this, that the redemption is wrought out for men objectively, outside of themselves. Thirdly, he ascribed to the sacrificial death of Christ "an atoning significance," and thereby prepared the way for the Romish Sacrifice of the Mass. And, fourthly, he added to all this still further the doctrine of the sacraments as objectively working mysteries.²⁶ Certainly all do

not go so far as this, and especially Harnack and Kaftan to think of Paul as one who understood Jesus very well. But by virtue of their starting-point they feel themselves compelled to recognize that Paul "transformed" the original gospel of Jesus. With Jesus the gospel was a matter between God and the soul, and redemption was a subjective experience; but with Paul Christ comes to stand between God and man, and works out redemption outside of us. Accordingly the watchword is common to all Ritschl's followers: We must go back from Paul and John to the Jesus of the Synoptics, and especially to the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount.

This idea has led, however, very differently from what had been expected, to a great uncertainty with regard to the person and work of Christ. In the winter of 1899-1900 Harnack delivered at Berlin his lectures on the Essence of Christianity. They had a great success, indeed, and were excessively praised by kindred spirits;²⁸ but on the other side they awoke great uneasiness and threw up to observation the great gulf that stretches between the confession of Christ according to the Scriptures and the modern doctrine of Jesus. According to Harnack, the essence of Christianity consists in this,—that men can obtain through the appearance, the teaching, and the life of Jesus the experience that God is their Father and they are his children. For man as a moral being there exists, that is to say, a deep discord between the visible and the invisible, the outward and the inward, the flesh and the spirit, this world and that to come, between God and the world. But the Christian religion lifts him above this painful opposition: it places him on the side of God, provides him eternal life in the midst of time, and brings God and the soul into union and communion with each other. And it does this by continually proclaiming the Fatherhood of God and

the nobility of the human soul; and in these two great truths it gives full expression to itself. In the original gospel as Jesus himself proclaimed it, the Son has no place, but only the Father. Jesus did not preach himself, he demanded no faith in his own person, he set forth no Christology: the poor publican, the woman at the treasury, the lost son, set this sufficiently in the light.

But this does not do away with the fact that Jesus nevertheless, by his whole unique knowledge of God, by his person, by his word and his deed, is in truth for others the guide to God and the way to the Father. Thousands have come to God through him. He was the personal realization and the power of the gospel, and he remains that also still to-day. The personal life in us derives its existence solely from his personal power. How Jesus became partaker of his wholly unique knowledge of God, by what means he attained such an eminent place, Harnack does not explain; he appeals for it merely to the mystery of personality. But we come to communion with God, to peace of soul, to the overcoming of the world, solely in the path of faith in the gospel of Jesus. This faith does not consist, however, in the acceptance of a doctrine, for the gospel is no doctrine but a glad tidings; it consists in a moral experience, in a doing of the will of the Father, in a life according to the gospel of Jesus, in a personal *Erlebniss* ("experience") of the soul, which Jesus works in us by his appearance, his word, and his life.

As every one can see at once, the description which Harnack gives in these lectures of the essence of Christianity differs markedly from that which has been given through all the ages of the Christian church in its confessions. And no little arrogance is exhibited when the school of Ritschl sets this portrait of Jesus as the purely historical one over against

the church's portrait of Jesus, and through the mouth Wernle cries out, "Christianity has for thousands of years forgotten what its master was" — as if the church had in all ages striven against all sorts of sects precisely to confess no other Christ than that which is pictured before our eyes in the Scriptures. But the watchword "Back to Jesus" leads to entirely different results from those which had been at first imagined. For when once a separation had been instituted between the so-called "historical Jesus" and the apostolic "Christ," men came suddenly face to face with the double question, How is the "historical Jesus" then to be known? and, How was he transformed in the hands of the apostles into the "Christ"? Kähler no doubt gave faithful warning and made it very clear that such a separation was not possible, and that, for example, the expiatory death and the resurrection made part of the historical Jesus;²⁹ but men pressed on, nevertheless, in this pathway and fell into the greatest confusion with these two questions.

In proportion as the search for the "historical Jesus" was pressed forward did it become more and more plain that the figure of "Christ" does not first appear in Paul and John, but already in the Synoptics. It is true that the majesty of Christ does not stand forth in the first three Gospels as splendidly as in the fourth; but in the essence of the matter, nevertheless, it is the same Christ which they all describe. There is ascribed to the Synoptical Jesus also a high self-consciousness, the Messianic dignity, the divine Sonship, the power to work miracles and to forgive sins, an absolutely unique place in the Kingdom of God, an atoning efficacy for his sufferings and death, resurrection and glorification with the Father, a second coming to judgment.³⁰ And all this is not spoken of him by others.

high self-consciousness from his first coming forward on, and he himself constantly speaks and acts in virtue of his regal power. It is the same Christ which meets us throughout the New Testament. And how could it be otherwise? The Synoptical Gospels are just as truly apostolical writings as the letters of Paul, and were written later than they; there never was any controversy among the apostles on the person of Christ: all placed their faith and found their salvation in the same Christ, although they may, according to their different characters and experiences, have depicted him from different sides. The original "historical Jesus" has thus not been discovered by the simple expedient of setting Paul and John aside. In the Synoptical Gospels a distinction must again be made between the traits which verily belonged to Jesus and those which his disciples only later ascribed to him. The strata of tradition must be so deeply pierced that the lowest and oldest may be surely reached, everything must be reduced until nothing but the man Jesus is left.

But this seems to be an endless task and to lead to limitless arbitrariness. Every one makes a Jesus for himself, and finds himself at the end in possession of just the Jesus that imagination had formed for itself beforehand in his mind. For Carlyle Jesus was a hero; for Strauss a religious genius; for Renan a liberal reformer and preacher of humanity; for Schopenhauer a herald of the renunciation of the wish to live; for Proudhon a social reformer.³¹ Kalthoff was not wholly wrong when he poked fun at the Professors' Christ, who takes on a different form at every university and yet in the face of all this is still set forth to the people as the ideal example, as the way, the truth, and the life.³² The greatest differences of opinion exist with regard to the character and the work of Jesus, his relation to the Jewish people and the law, to

culture and to humanity. Even regarding the question whether he thought himself the Messiah, views draw very far apart: many prefer to give this question an affirmative answer, but they often conceive the Messiahship merely as a temporal and national form in which Jesus had to clothe his special vocation for the Kingdom of God, but which has lost all its significance for us (Harnack, Schürer, Jülicher, Holtzmann, etc.); while others are inclined to give the question a more or less decided negative answer (Lagarde, Wrede, Merx, etc.).³³ In the presence of so much difference of view, the conclusion which is drawn by some cannot surprise us — that on account of the fragmentary and tendential character of the sources, we shall never be able to learn anything with certainty about Jesus, and even his very existence is open to serious doubt.

This radicalism does not, however, remove, but rather entangles us in yet greater difficulties. For now with redoubled force the second of the two questions mentioned above presses itself on us — To what, to wit, does the figure of Christ in the writings of the New Testament owe its origin? Here we find even greater differences of view than in the case of the nature and character of the "historical Jesus." There are some who think that already before the Christian era there existed a sect of Nazoraei who worshiped a certain deity under the name of Jesus, that is, Saviour or Liberator, and brought that cult gradually into connection with the Messiah, the anointed king, who was expected by the Jews as their redeemer.³⁴ Others imagine that in consequence of the oppressive social conditions at Jerusalem a community had formed itself which was organized according to communistic principles, and which had, under the influence of the modes of thought of the day, ascribed to the Jesus worshiped by it, who had died as —

cates, such as the supernatural conception, miraculous power, resurrection, exaltation to God's right hand, speedy return for judgment.³⁵ For the ideas which have molded the figure of Christ, there come into consideration, according to some especially the Old Testament prophecies,³⁶ or the apocalyptic expectations of contemporary Judaism;³⁷ according to others rather the Buddhistic teachings which at that time had gradually penetrated to the West,³⁸ or, in general, the syncretistic combination of all sorts of Eastern and Western, Jewish and Greek, notions, by which the earlier centuries of the Christian era were marked.³⁹ All of these attempts have already something about them very unsatisfactory, because they eliminate personality, and substitute for it the creative phantasy of the community. But over and above this they lead to a conclusion which calls out much reluctance. For, when the traits of the figure of Christ, the divine Sonship, the supernatural birth, the Messiahship, the resurrection, etc., are made to rest on a phantasy of the community, and are explained from all sorts of alien ideas current in that age, it may be possible to give them some validity for a while by taking them in a symbolical sense; but at bottom they have become false notions and pernicious errors. Wherever this standpoint has been taken up, therefore, reverence for the person of Jesus falls away: the attempts to make Paul, John, or the community in general responsible for the creation of the dogmatic Christ all still proceed from a certain respect for the person of Jesus: men seek to hold him free from the errors which his disciples have formed with respect to his person, and thus even in a sense to excuse the errors themselves. But as the development advances this effort falls away: reverence no longer guards the person of Jesus; in the errors of his community Jesus is held himself to have already a part; the so-called

"historical" explanation leads to the mythological and symbolical, and these in turn prepare the way for the psychological and pathological. So it has come about that, in the latest times, men have arisen who look upon Jesus as a man of evil inheritance, suffering from epilepsy, paranoia, and hallucinations, who cherished much too exalted ideas of himself, and when he was disappointed in his expectations with respect to the people, endeavored to attain his end by a bold stroke.⁴⁰

But this rude and violent handling of the "problem of Christ" has in the case of others opened their eyes again, and called into being a notable reaction. It has enabled them to see with new clearness that the historical Jesus and the apostolical Christ cannot be divided after the fashion in which biblical criticism at first imagined they might: the Christ of Paul and John is in point of fact no other than the Christ of the earliest community and agrees in all his traits with the Son of man who is made known to us in the Synoptic Gospels.⁴¹ Men cannot reverence Jesus without accepting him as the Christ, the Son of the living God. In modern circles there has been awakened, therefore, even in the most recent years, a new demand for a Christology, not merely in a subjective, symbolical sense,⁴² but also in such a sense that it may stand in connection with the historical Jesus and the apostolical testimony.⁴³ Among others who have felt the influence of Schleiermacher and Ritschl there is an effort noticeable to think of Jesus not merely as a prophet, teacher, and example, but determinately as the revelation of God, as a man who in a wholly unique sense lived in communion with God, in whom God dwelt as in no one else, and through whom God has revealed himself therefore in a special and absolute fashion.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, to maintain Christ in that position and in that

but the object and center of the Christian religion, and this Christian religion may retain its peculiarity and not sink into an idolatrous Jesus-cult,⁴⁵ it is not enough that Christ should have been *ἐν θεῷ*; he must have been himself *θεός*, the only begotten of the Father; and therefore the truth and value of the deity of Christ is again brought rightly into the foreground by others.⁴⁶ And thus there is, finally, once again restored the connection between dogmatics and the faith of the community — for through all the ages the community has confessed the crucified and resurrected Christ as its Lord and its God.

NOTES.

¹ On these deviations in the doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, cf. Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek* (2d ed.), vol. ii. pp. 23-331; and also Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, vol. i. chap. 1: synopsis haeresium omnium, quae cath. incarnationem fidem oppugnant; Forbesius a Corse, *Instruct. hist. Theol.*, lib. 2, 3, 5, 6; M. Vitranga, *Doctr.*, vol. v. pp. 46 f.; and the works on the History of Doctrine.

² Strauss, *Christl. Glaub.*, vol. ii. pp. 153 f.; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i. pp. 3 f., vol. iii. pp. 653 f., 691 f.; Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.), pp. 942 f.; G. Krüger, *Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung* (1905), pp. 267 f.

³ Kant, *Religion innerhalb, usw.* (ed. Rosenkranz), pp. 69 f.; cf. Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte, usw.*, vol. ii. pp. 978 f.; J. W. Chapman, *Die Theologie Kants* (1905).

⁴ Fichte, *Anweisung zum seligen Leben*; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 1049 f.

⁵ Schelling, *Vorles. über die Methode des akad. Studiums* (1903), (Werke, vol. i.), pp. 5, 286 f.; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 1058.

⁶ Hegel, *Religionsphilosophie* (Werke, vol. xii.), pp. 235 f.; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 1096 f.

⁷ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (1835), vol. ii. pp. 716 f., 734 f., and *Christl. Glaub.*, vol. ii. p. 193: The Speculative Christology; cf. on Strauss: A. Hein, "Die Christologie von D. Fr. Strauss," in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1906, pp. 321-345.

* Strauss, *Christl. Dogm.*, vol. ii. pp. 214 f. and *Alte und neu Glaub.* (2d ed.), pp. 24 f.; Schweitzer, *Christl. Glaub.*, sect. 116 f. Pfeiderer, *Grundriss*, sect. 123; Biedermann, *Christl. Dogm.* (2d ed.), vol. ii. pp. 580 f.; Lipsius, *Dogm.* (2d ed.), sect. 588; Scholten, *Initia*, chap. 4, p. 171.

* Ed. von Hartmann, *Die Krisis der Theol. und die moderne Theol.* (1880); *Die Selbstzersetzung des Christ. und die Religion der Zukunft* (3d ed. 1888); *Das Christ. des N. T.* (1905).

²⁰ Schleiermacher, *Christl. Glaub.*, sect. 91 f.; cf. Strauss, *Christl. Glaub.*, vol. ii. p. 175; Schleiermacher's *Christology*; Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 1153.

²¹ Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, sect. 533 f.; Weisse, *Philos. Dogm.*, vol. i. pp. 437-556; Schenkel, *Dogm.*, vol. ii. sect. 2. pp. 717, 724, etc.

²² Gess, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi* (1856), pp. 157 f.

²³ C. I. Nitzsch, *Syst. d. christl. Lehre* (6th ed. 1851); Kahnis, *Luth. Dogm.*, vol. ii. sect. 3. pp. 369 f.; Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk* (3d ed.), vol. i. p. 447; Lange, *Dogm.*, vol. ii. pp. 597 f.; and further Sartorius, Liebner, Ebrard, Philippi, Vilmar, etc.

²⁴ Schneckenburger, *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (1862); and further Hausrath, Schürer, O. Holtzmann, W. Staerk, etc.

²⁵ C. I. Nitzsch, *Syst. d. christl. Lehre*, p. 258; Martensen, *Christl. Dogm.* (1856), pp. 221 f.; Schöberlein, *Princip und Syst. der Dogm.* (1881), pp. 657 f.; and many others; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 1243-1260.

²⁶ Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, sect. 541; Lange, *Christ. Dogm.*, vol. ii. sect. 60, and others; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 1227 f.

²⁷ Cf. Bavinck, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 339 f.

²⁸ Schelling, *Werke*, vol. ii. sect. 3. pp. 317 f.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. sect. 4. pp. 35 f.

³⁰ Gess, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi* (1856), pp. 281 f., 309 f.; Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk* (3d ed.), vol. i. pp. 409-445; Sartorius, *Die Lehre v. d. heiligen Liebe*, vol. ii. (2d ed.) p. 21; Schöberlein, *Princip und Sys. der Dogm.*, pp. 167 f.; Martensen, *Dogm.*, sect. 133; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, vol. ii. pp. 1, 20; Deitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie* (2d ed.), pp. 326 f.; Kahnis, *Luth. Dogm.*, vol. ii. p. 33; Frank, *Christl. Wahrheit*, vol. ii. pp. 137 f.; Kübel, *Ueber den Unterschied zwischen d. posit. und d. liber. Richtung in der mod. Theol.* (2d ed. 1893), p. 124; A. von Oettingen, *Luth. Dogm.*, vol. iii. pp. 107 f. (teaches laying aside of the use, not of the possession); H. Schmidt, "Zur Lehre v. d. "

in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1896, pp. 972-1005, especially pp. 982 f.; O. Bensow, *Die Lehre v. d. Kenose* (1903), cf. *Theolog. Literaturblatt*, Jan. 22, 1904; Godet, *Com. on John i. 4*; Grétilat, *Exposé de theol. syst.*, vol. iv. pp. 180 f.; Recolin, *La personne de J. C. et la théorie de la kenosis* (1890); Van Oosterzee, *Dogm.*, vol. ii. p. 494; Ch. de la Saussaye, see my *Theologie van de la Saussaye* (2d ed.), pp. 44 f. Into British and American theology, also, this hypothesis has found much entrance,—in Dr. Lewis Edwards at Bala, 1850, O'Brien in Ireland, H. W. Beecher, 1871, H. M. Goodwin, 1894, Howard Crosby in America; and especially, after 1890, for the purpose of reconciling with Jesus' view of the Old Testament that of the historical criticism in Swayne, *Our Lord's Knowledge as Man* (1891); Plummer, "The Advance of Christ in *σοφία*," in *Expositor* for 1891; Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God* (1891), and *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation* (1895); Mason, *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth* (1896); and many more named by B. B. Warfield in an article on the "Kenosis" in the *Princeton Theological Review*, Oct. 1899, pp. 701-712; cf. also the articles on "Kenosis" in *Hastings's Dict. of the Bible*, and *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*.

* Ritschl, *Rechtf. und Versöhnung* (2d ed.), vol. iii. pp. 338 f., *Unterricht in der christl. Relig.* (2d ed. 1881), pp. 17 f.; cf. Joh. Wendland, *Albrecht Ritschl und seine Schüler* (1899), pp. 84 f.

* Herrmann, *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott* (1886), pp. 18 f., 92 f., *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschichtlicher Thatsachen?*; cf. also Bavinck, *op. cit.*, vol. i. pp. 167, 584 f.; Robert Favre, "Le Christ historique d'après W. Herrmann," in the *Revue de theol. et philos.* (1909), pp. 454-476.

* Kaftan, *Wesen der christl. Religion* (1881), pp. 295 f., *Brauchen wir ein neues Dogma* (1890), pp. 49-72, *Dogmatik* (1897), sect. 45-47; H. Schultz on Rom. ix. 5, in the *Jahrbücher f. d. Theol.* (1868), pp. 462-507, *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi* (1881); *Grundriss der evang. Dogmatik* (1890), p. 72; Gottschick, *Die Kirchlichkeit d. s. g. kirchl. Theologie* (1890), p. 207.

* Häring, *Der christl. Glaube* (1906), p. 426, "Gehört die Auferstehung Jesu zum Glaubensgrund," in *Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1907, p. 330-351. Nitzsch, *Lehrb. der evang. Dogm.* (1902), p. 574, also refers to speak of Christ rather as Son of God than as God.

* Haupt, *Die Bedeutung der h. Schrift für den evang. Christen*; Oh. Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi*, pp. 134 f.; O. Ritschl, *Zeit f. theol. u. Kirche*, 1893, pp. 384 f.; Kirn, *Glaube und Geschichte* (901), *Grundriss der evang. Dogm.* (1905), pp. 91 f.; Traub, *Zeit.*

f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1901, pp. 323 f.; Max Reischle, "Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens auf dem geschichtlichen Christus," Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1897, pp. 171-264, Lehrsätze für eine akad. Vorlesung über die christl. Glaubenslehre (1899), pp. 89 f.; H. H. Wendt, System der chr. Lehre (1907). See the comparison of Häring and Wendt by Kirn, Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1908, pp. 337-388.

²⁶ Lagarde, Deutsche Schriften (4th ed. 1903).

²⁷ Harnack, Das Wesen des Christ., Akad. Ausgabe, p. 110; Dogmengeschichte, vol. i. (2d ed.), p. 18; Kaftan, Jesus und Paulus, etc. (1906); cf. Bavinck, *op. cit.*, vol. i. p. 106.

²⁸ Cf. especially Foerster, "Harnacks Wesen des Christ. eine Bestreitung oder eine Verteidigung des christl. Glaubens?" in Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1902, pp. 179-201; Rolffs, Harnacks Wesen des Christ., und die relig. Strömungen der Gegenwart (1902). With Harnack on the Essence of Christianity Sabatier agrees, Esquisse d'une philos. de la religion (7th ed. 1903), pp. 129-205, and even to a large degree A. Loisy, L'évangile et l'église. Cf. Wobbermin, "Loisy contra Harnack," Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1905, pp. 76-102. It further deserves notice that Harnack's lectures were greeted with great delight by the Jews, and that a number of books by them were called out by them, such as Eschelbacher, Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christ. (1905); Joseph, Zur Sittenlehre des Judentums (1902); Bäck, Das Wesen des Judentums (1905); Perles, Was lehrt uns Harnack? (1902); Ackermann, Judentum und Christentum (1903). Harnack was reproached with still maintaining the originality of the gospel and the independence of the Christian religion, and it was asserted against him that Jesus taught nothing original; but satisfaction was expressed at the exclusion from the essence of Christianity of the doctrines of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, original sin, atonement, sacraments. Thus the most prominent barrier was taken away which had been erected between Christians and Jews. As on their part the Jews were permitting Talmudism to fall away and were passing over to liberal Judaism, there remained as good as nothing in the way of the union of the two, according to the testimony of Rabbi Levy at the congress of Free Thinkers held at Geneva in 1905 (Actes du 3e Congrès internat. Genève (1906), p. 121) as well as that of Fiebig in Die christl. Welt (1907), no. 40. Compare also Strack and Bieling on this in the Jahrbuch der evang. Judenmission, I, (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906), vol. i. pp. 20 f., 47 f.

²⁹ Kähler, Der sogenannte historische biblische Christus.

"Cf. especially Kähler, *op. cit.*, and farther Schäfer, Ueber das Wesen des Christ. und seine modernen Darstellungen (1904); W. Walther, Adolf Harnacks Wesen des Christ. für die christl. Gemeinde geprüft (5th ed. 1904); Ihmels, Wer war Jesus? Was wollte Jesus? (1905).

"H. Weinel, Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrh. (1903); A. Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede (1906); Pfannmüller, Jesus im Urteil der Jahrh. (1908); Hollmann, "Leben und Lehre Jesu," in Theol. Rundschau, 1904, pp. 197-211; 1906, pp. 132-147, 253-275; S. Faut, Die Christologie seit Schleiermacher (1907); A. Rau, Harnack, Goethe, Strauss, und Feuerbach über das Wesen des Christ. (1903); A. Hein, "Die Christologie von D. F. Strauss," in Zeit. f. Theol. und Kirche, 1906, pp. 321-345; Hollensteiner, "Harnack und Bousset," in Neue Kirchl. Zeit., 1906, pp. 517-533; W. Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research (1907).

"Kalthoff, Was wissen wir von Jesus? (1904), p. 40.

"Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu (1907) and the literature there cited. Farther also W. Brandt, Jezus en de Messianische verwachting in Teylers Th. T., 1907, pp. 461-568; Bruins, Hoe ontstond de overtuiging, dat Jesus de Christus is? and Brandt's review of it in Teyler's Th. T., 1909, pp. 583-592; as also that by De Graaf, Theol. Tijds., 1909, pp. 413-434.

"Meyboom, "Jesus de Nazoraer," in the Theol. Tijds., 1905, pp. 512-536; W. B. Smith, Der vorchristliche Jesus, with introduction by P. Schmiedel (1906) along with Wernle's review of it in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, 31 Aug. 1907; as also the review by Meyboom in the Theol. Tijds., 1907, pp. 1-17.

"Kalthoff, Das Christusproblem (2d ed. 1903), Die Entstehung des Christentums (1904), Was wissen wir von Jesus? (1904); K. Kautsky, Der Ursprung des Christentums (1908), and Maurenbrecher's review of it in the Sozial. Monatshafte (1909), pp. 36 f., 94 f.; cf. also Dr. v. d. B. v. Eysinga's review of Kautsky's book at the convention of Modern Theologians, April, 1909; Maurenbrecher, Von Nazareth nach Golgotha (1909); K. C. Anderson, "The Collapse of Liberal Christianity," in the Hibbert Journal, Jan. 1910, pp. 301-320.

"So already Schelling, and afterwards especially Strauss; cf. Carl Weidel, "Studien über den Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises auf die evangelische Geschichte," in the Studien und Kritiken, 1910, pp. 83 f.

"Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neustest. Zeitalter (1903); Wernle, Die Anfänge unserer Religion (2d ed. 1904).

"R. Seydel, *Die Buddhalegende und das Leben Jesu nach Evangelien* (2d ed. 1907); G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Indische Einflüsse auf die evang. Erzählungen* (2d ed. 1909); Pfeleiderer, *Das Christusbild des urchristl. Glaubens in religiösgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (1903). Anti-Semitism and the glorification of the Aryan race and Buddhism have led Dühring, Chamberlain, and others to deny Jesus' Israelitish descent, and to ascribe to him an Aryan origin. See especially A. Müller, *Jesus Arier* (1904); Th. J. Plange, *Christus ein Inder?* (1907).

"J. M. Robertson, *Pagan Christs* (1903); K. Breissig, *Die Entstehung des Gottesgedankens und der Heilbringer* (1905); W. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Christus* (1906); P. Jensen, *Das Epos in der Weltliteratur* (1906); A. Drews, *Die Christenmythe* (1909); Gunkel, *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N. T.* (1903); Carl Clemen, *Religionsgesch. Erklärung des N. T.* (1909); M. Brückner, *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland den orient. Religionen und ihr Verhältnis zum Christ.* (1908); Bolland, *De evang. Jozua* (1907), *Het Evangelie* (1910). Compare against this Christ-myth, K. Dunkmann, *Der historisch. Jesus, der mythol. Christus, und Jesus der Christ* (1910); H. Weinel, *Zeit. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1910, pp. 1 f.

"So already earlier, A. Dulk, *Der Irrgang des Lebens Jesu* (1884); Soury, *Jésus et la religion d'Israel* (2d ed. 1898); and later, E. Rasmussen, *Jesus: Eine vergl. psychopathol. Studie* (1905); De Loosten (Dr. Georg Lomer), *Jesus Christus vom Standpunkte des Psychiaters* (1905); Binet-Sanglé, *La folie de Jésus* (1908-10); A. Heulhard, *Le mensonge Chrétien* (Jesus Christ never existed) vol. i. (1908). Compare also O. Holtzmann, *War Jesus Ekstatischer?* (1903), and J. Baumann, *Die Gemütsart Jesu* (1908). There have appeared in opposition to this, among others, Steude in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, 1906, pp. 325-330, and Kneib, *Moderne Leben-Jesuforschung unter dem Einfluss der Psychiatrie* (1908).

"A very large literature has appeared of late on the relations of Jesus and Paul. On the one side, there is seen in the teaching of Paul a departure from and a falsification of the original gospel of Jesus. So, after Lagarde, especially Bousset, *Das Wesen der Religion* (1903); M. Brückner, *Die Entstehung der paulin. Christologie* (1903); Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (2d ed. 1904); Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jesus-Christ* (1904); Wrede, *Paulus* (1905); O. Michel, *Vorwärts zu Christus! Fort mit Paulus! Deutsche Religion!* (1905); A. Meyer, *Wer hat das Christ. begründet Jesus oder Paulus?* (1907).

Paul by Eb. Vischer, in the *Theol. Rundschau*, 1905, pp. 129-143; 1908, pp. 307-312. On the other hand, it is held that the teaching of Paul (and John) is a simple development of the word which Jesus preached and of the work which was accomplished by him. So W. Götz, *Paulus der wahrhaftige Zeuge Jesus Christi* (1903); Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (1902); Ihmels, "Jesus und Paulus," in the *Neue Kirche Zeit.*, 1906; Schäder, *Ueber das Wesen des Christ.*, usw. (1904), *Das Evangelium Jesu und das Evangelium von Jesus* (1906); G. Wüstmann, *Jesus und Paulus* (1907); H. Bachmann, "Stehen der Jesus der synopt. Evang. und der Christus der Paulus in Widerspruch?" in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, 1908, pp. 278-288; A. Scholz, "Besteht ein wesentliche Unterschied zwischen dem johann. Christusbilde und dem der Synoptikern?" in *Glauben und Wissen*, 1908, pp. 243 f. Against the exaggerations of Wrede in his *Paulus* (1905) there came forward also P. Kölbinger, *Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus* (1906); J. Kaftan, *Jesus und Paulus* (1906); A. Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus* (1907); cf. also A. Deismann, "Die christl. Religion," in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, pp. 77-138.

"In sequence to Kant, Hegel, Ed. von Hartmann, A. Drews, A. D. Loman, Bolland, a symbolical Christology is advocated by Boekennoogen, "Christologische Beschouwingen" in the *Theol. Tijds.*, 1892; Eldering, *De plaats en de beteekenis der Christusgestalte in ons geloofsleven*, a review at the convention of Modern Theologians, April 8-9, 1902; G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Christusbeschouwingen onder Modernen*, 1909, pp. 223-271.

"Dr. H. T. de Graaf, *De waarde der moderne Christologische beweging*, a review at the convention of Modern Theologians, April 28-29, 1908. But such a repristination of Christology was already at an earlier date antagonized by Hugenholtz, "De Christologie en de huidige godsdienstwetenschap," in the *Theol. Tijds.*, 1881, pp. 30-52, and finds opposition also from Bruining, "Methode onzer Dogmatiek," in *Teylers Theol. Tijds.*, 1903, pp. 426-458, *Jesus von Nazaret en ons geloofsleven*, *Christusbeschouwingen onder modernen*, pp. 3-41.

"J. Kaftan, *Dogmatik*, p. 411, *Zur Dogmatik* (1904), pp. 211 f.; Häring, *Der christl. Glaub.*, pp. 390, 428, "Einfachste Worte für eine grosse Sache, die Stellung Jesus im christl. Glauben," in *Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1909, pp. 177-203; Loofs, art. "Christologie," in *Herzog* (3d ed.), vol. iv. pp. 16-56; Thieme, "Die neuesten Christologien im Verhältnis zum Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," in *Zeit. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1908, pp. 401-472; R. Seeberg, *Die Grundwahrheiten der christl. Religion* (3d ed.), pp. 71 f., 109 f., *Die Per-*

sönlichkeit Christi, der feste Punkt im fließenden Strome Gegenwart (1903); Theod. Kaftan, *Moderne Theologie des A Glaubens* (1905), *Der Mensch Jesus Christus der einzige Mi zwischen Gott und den Menschen* (1908); R. J. Campbell, *The Theology* (popular ed.), pp. 66 f.; Sir Oliver Lodge, *The Substa of Faith*, pp. 86 f.

"Cf. the warning against the modern Jesus-cult by A. Dr (cited by Meffert, *Die geschichtliche Existenz Christi* (1905), 94); R. Eucken, *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion* (2d ed. 190 p. 428; W. von Schnehen, *Der moderne Jesus-Kultus* (1906); M. Weiss, *Der religiöse Gefahr* (1904), p. 168.

"Kunze, *Die ewige Gottheit Jesu Christi* (1904); Steinbeck, *D göttliche Selbstbewusstsein Jesu nach dem Zeugnis der Sync tiker* (1908); Braig, Hoberg, Weber, and Esser, *Jesus Christ* (1908); A. Arnal, *La personne de Christ et la rationalisme all mand contemporain* (1904); Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theolog* (5th ed. 1909); Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Chris* (1909); Roozemeyer, "Jezus' persoonlijkheid" in *Jezus Christu voor onzen Tijd*. (1907).