

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X.

APRIL, 1912.

NUMBER 2.

## THE LITURGICAL USE OF ENGLISH HYMNS.\*

### I.

#### THE DENOMINATIONAL DIVISIONS OF CHURCH SONG AT THE RESTORATION.

We have considered the development of the English Hymn from the metrical Psalm. As the metrical Psalm had been originally cast into the mould of the congregational Hymn, the change was in the subject matter rather than in the form. This change we have followed through its several phases, from a close translation of canonical Scripture, to a freer paraphrase first of Psalms then of other Scriptural songs, and up to the point where the purpose of turning Scriptural materials into metre met the impulse to give lyrical form to devotional poetry, and coincided in the production of Hymns, freely composed and yet more or less based upon Scripture.

The movement toward hymns was always a liturgical one. It had for its motive the enrichment of English worship rather than of English literature. The same thing was true of the Hymn movement in the period following the Restoration. But what gave it special significance was the weakened hold of the old Psalmody upon the people, the number of men who concerned themselves with the new movement, and the acceptable character of the new hymns themselves. Under such conditions hymn singing

---

\* Being the second of the lectures upon "The Hymnody of the English-speaking Churches", delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in February, 1910.

use of the title ascribed to Jesus, reflects the consciousness of the cryptic character of the Messiahship of Jesus. With Mark (no longer consistently with Matthew and Luke) Jesus calls himself Son-of-Man to conceal his Messianic character. The Pauline idea according to which Jesus was not recognizable as the Christ before his crucifixion and resurrection finds a clumsy expression in this. And yet he was the Messiah and must have revealed himself as such. Hence the compromise is revelation in secret. And for this compromise the name Son-of-Man presented the appropriate formula, for it discloses the superhuman power and glory of Jesus only to those who know the Messianic exegesis of Dan. vii. 13. All this has, of course, nothing to do with the self-consciousness of the historical Jesus: it is the precipitate of a Christological process in the mind of the early church. Hertlein applies to the Son-of-Man passages the same principle which Wellhausen applies to the section in the Synoptics which he calls "the nest" of the Gospel, i. e., the seat of the specifically Christian delineation of the Messiahship of Jesus. In view of the cryptic meaning of the name, he does not think Dalman's one-time surmise implausible that Son-of-Man may have passed as a denomination *ex opposito*, viz. for Son-of-God, just as in Rabbinical writings a "sharp-sighted man" is called "blind" and the Old Testament for "to blaspheme God" stands "to bless God". It goes without saying that all this has for its background a thoroughly sceptical attitude towards the Gospel-history. The greater part of the self-attestation of Jesus is on this hypothesis wiped out, for, as Hertlein truly observes, the sayings of Jesus in which he calls himself Son-of-Man are such that, especially in Mark, form and content cannot be separated. But the author does not worry over this. Only theologians will be distressed by the change of attitude in the scientific mind towards the character of the Synoptical Gospels. One should free himself from the "trübseliger Realismus which finds in the legends of sacred history nothing but transcripts of a "spröde dingliche und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit", whilst they are in reality organic embodiments of religious sentiment and creative production.

In the title this solution of the Son-of-Man problem is called the last stage. We presume this is meant not merely chronologically, but in the absolute sense, of the final stage, in which the problem has come to rest. We do not believe that this belief of the author will be verified. But if it were, we would surely be warranted in affirming that the last stage of the problem is worse than the first.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

DIE HANDAUFLEGUNG IM URCHRISTENTUM NACH VERWENDUNG, HERKUNFT UND BEDEUTUNG IN RELIGIONSGECHICHTLICHEM ZUSAMMENHANG UNTERSUCHT. Von LIC. JOHANNES BEHM, Repetent der Theologie an der Universität Erlangen. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. 1911. Pp. 207. Mk. 4.50.

An interesting and instructive monograph on an interesting subject.

The title names the three sections into which the author divides the discussion: the usage, the origin and the import of the laying on of hands. The "religionsgeschichtliche" aspect of the matter, while not made particularly prominent, still occupies more space than is justified by the meagre results of its consideration, for it yields little else than this, that for the laying on of hands in healing and benediction general analogies can be quoted from the extra-biblical sphere, which are, however, no more than analogies, since the act is so naturally suited to the purpose as to rule out the question of historical derivation from one quarter to another. As to the usage in ordination and in connection with baptism, here even general analogies, aside from the Old Testament, are lacking. The act in healing differs from the act elsewhere in that it is not applied regularly or even prevailingly to the head, but to other parts of the body, and thus bears a less ritual character and falls rather under the general rubric of bodily contact. From the Gospel-data the author draws the conclusion that the supernatural healing-power of Jesus was transmitted from him to men not exclusively through intent or volition or word, but that it also streamed out, as it were, through his body, so that the hands became the natural instruments for communicating it (Mt. vi. 2). This, to be sure, is the implication wherever the usage occurs in paganism, as well as in the Gospels, but the author carefully shields Jesus from the charge of magic by emphasizing that in his case the conscious, mental exercise of power was always present, whilst elsewhere the effect is frequently conceived to be *ex opere operato*. In order to establish this distinction the more surely he is willing even to deny the historicity of the representation in Mark and Luke according to which, in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, the proceeding of the power from Jesus by mere physical contact first made him aware of what was taking place. But only Jesus is thus shielded; Mark and Luke had no different conceptions of such things than were vulgarly current in the Hellenistic-Roman world. In another direction the author convincingly shows how little basis there is for the modern idea, that Jesus performed his cures through magnetism and suggestion. Even "the physical elements in his miraculous power sprang from the mysterious depths of his personality" (p. 157). On the other hand, this personal aspect of the matter does not seem to exclude to us, that the healing power of the miracles was consciously associated in the mind of Jesus with the Spirit. Whilst in regard to ordination, the author makes the nexus between the rite and the Spirit of the closest, he seems to avoid affirming this in the case of the use of the hand for healing, and here speaks only of "Kraft" generally (p. 156), or contents himself with saying that the thought of the Spirit stood in the background and only slightly begins to color the meaning of the act (p. 160). Is this reserve warranted in view of such statements as Mk. xi. 5, xii. 28; Lk. iv. 18 ff.?

In regard to the rite of ordination, the Old Testament and Judaism permit a sufficient explanation of the Christian custom. To be sure,



the Jewish tradition about the Semikha as perpetuated from the age of Moses down to the New Testament times and later, through the continuity of the Synedrium, lacks all historic support. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in the second century after Christ the scribal judges in Palestine were ordained by laying on of hands, which must, of course, rest on much older usage. It is interesting to learn that Judaism, even after this, abandoned the rite, like some other things, probably in resentment against the Christian usurpation of it.

Less satisfactory to our mind is the discussion of the laying on of hands in connection with baptism. Behm here presents a hypothesis of his own in order to explain that, on the one hand, the rite of baptism itself appears in the New Testament as symbolic of the bestowal of the Spirit, whilst, on the other hand, the laying on of hands as a separate act, added to baptism, is given the same significance. He suggests that originally the two rites were separated, that baptism was a washing from sin pure and simple, and contained no symbolic reference to the positive grace of the impartation of the Spirit. The laying on of hands added to this the positive side, the gift of the Spirit. Because, however, the two acts were regularly performed in such close proximity, and because the bestowal of the Spirit was figuratively also spoken of as a "baptism", the two became fused or confounded, and baptism was now supposed to carry within itself the symbolism of the bestowal of the Spirit. To this hypothesis we have serious objections. It leads the author to cast doubt on the verbal accuracy of the tradition when it attributes to both John the Baptist and Jesus the comparative statement, that the former baptized with water, the latter with the Spirit. While in this saying, of course not two rites are contrasted, but the Johannine rite is set over against its Christian fulfilment, the outpouring of the Spirit by Jesus, yet it will be observed, that the latter is described in terms of baptism, and this is hardly a mere figure altogether independent of the symbolism of the rite. It is further unwarranted to deny that the bestowal of the Holy Spirit occurs directly connected with baptism, without the intermediate link of the laying on of hands. Thus Acts ii. 30 certainly is most naturally understood. Of course, Acts x. 47 proves nothing either way, because here baptism appears only as justified by the possession of the Spirit, not necessarily as significant of it. The connection of the Pneuma with baptism in Paul counts heavily against the hypothesis, for it is difficult to believe that as early as this a fusion of the two rites and the attribution to the one of what belonged to the other could have taken place to such an extent that Paul nowhere even so much as mentions any longer the laying on of hands as an integral part of the ritual of introduction into the church, and finds in the bestowal of the Spirit the "true essence" of baptism. Nor do we see how it can be reconciled with this that in Titus iii. 5 (rendered by Behm: "through a bath of regeneration, and through a renewal from the Holy Spirit") the two factors can again appear separated, for the author acknowledges the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. In view of this would it not be better to say, that from the

beginning in the Apostolic church the gift of the Spirit was directly associated with baptism and stood in no necessary ritual connection with the laying on of hands? Obviously both Acts viii. 17 and xix. 6 are exceptional cases; in both the implication is rather that normally baptism and the Holy Spirit go together, but that, where the latter for some reason or other has not come with the former, the laying on of hands can supply the deficiency.

The author's method is, on the whole, sound and cautious, but occasionally he indulges in taking critical liberties with the text. One instance of this is his treatment of the account in Acts viii. 14 ff. Here the strange phenomenon, just alluded to, presents itself, that the Samaritans converted and baptized by Philip have to wait for the arrival of the Apostles Peter and John before they can receive the Holy Spirit. In order to avoid the apparent implication, that only the Apostles were qualified by laying on of hands to impart the Spirit, Behm assumes that here two independent accounts have been patched together by Luke, one which spoke of the ministry of Philip and mentioned only the baptism of the Samaritan converts, without meaning to exclude the subsequent laying on of hands for communication of the Spirit, and another account which spoke of a later missionary visit of Peter and John to the same place and emphasized the pneumatic phenomena, without implying that the persons affected thereby had not been baptized immediately beforehand and received the imposition of hands. Luke, by erroneously combining the two pieces, created the present impossible situation. But we are unable to see that the situation is impossible. Von Hofmann's view, partially accepted by the author himself (p. 30), seems to offer a plausible explanation of the fact that two things usually connected here fall apart. Where the Gospel for the first time was carried beyond the sphere of Judaism it may well have appeared necessary to make the full coördination of these non-Jewish converts with the Jewish Christians dependent on Apostolic sanction. The endowment with the Spirit was the concrete form in which such full coördination naturally expressed itself. Von Hofmann would bring this into connection with the Spirit as an equipment for the work of extending the Gospel. According to him, the question was specifically whether the converted Samaritans could share in this task, and in order not to prejudge this the Spirit was withheld at first. But, apart from the peculiar turn thus given to the explanation, its general principle sufficiently commends itself to render Behm's partition of the text unnecessary.

It also seems to us questionable exegesis when in 1 Tim. iv. 14 the verb ἐδόθη and in 2 Tim. i. 6 the words "which is in thee through the laying on of my hands" are weakened so as to yield the thought that the χάρισμα of Timothy was previously in him as a natural endowment, and that the laying on of hands only brought it to clear consciousness, a theory which Behm seems inclined to apply to the Apostle's conception of the *χάρισμα* generally (pp. 45 ff). These are, however, minor matters, dissent in regard to which can in no wise detract from our

appreciation of the author's admirable treatment of his theme as a whole.

*Princeton.*

GEERHARDUS VOS.

CHRIST AND HIS CRITICS. *Studies in the Person and Problems of Jesus.* By the REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, M.A., B.D., formerly Scholar and University Student of Trinity College and Donellan Lecturer in Dublin University, Author of "The Mystery of the Cross", "Suggestions for Bible Study", "Present Controversy on Prayer". Introduction by the Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Dean of St. Patrick's. New York, Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1910. Pp. xi, 180.

The title of Mr. Hitchcock's book is misleading; for the book is concerned almost exclusively with "Christ" and only incidentally with "His Critics". Indeed Mr. Hitchcock apparently has little regard for historical criticism. That is hardly surprising in a writer who exalts the argument from Christian experience at the expense of other kinds of evidence: "We do not believe that the Christ of history was 'the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth', because we believe in the authenticity and genuineness of the Gospels; but we believe that the Gospels are true records, because we have first believed in the Real Presence of Christ" (p. 167). In such a writer, no very intimate acquaintance with recent criticism is to be expected. The reader need not be surprised, therefore, when he is told that no one outside the Rationalistic Press Association has denied that Jesus existed (pp. 26f., 159), or when a simple appeal to the Fourth Gospel is apparently offered as an adequate refutation of Harnack (p. 66). Fortunately, the author is not really so independent of documentary evidence as some of his remarks might seem to indicate. But he has not defined the relation between historical and experiential evidence. What is the meaning of the following passage (p. 35): "Christianity is an historical religion. It is older than the New Testament, and its virtues are independent of the fate that may befall that Testament; they are part and parcel of our Christian consciousness"? The author's discussion of the supernatural is unsatisfactory. On p. 149 he says: "The miracles of Christ . . . are not . . . interruptions of the course of nature, but revelations of a new order of things hitherto undreamt of in our philosophy." Does "nature", then, include that "new order of things"? However, despite faults in the theoretical discussion, the author clearly holds a high view of the trustworthiness of the New Testament, and a thoroughly supernaturalistic view of the origin of Christianity. The omission of all discussion of the Cross is hardly to be justified, even by the reference of Dean Bernard, in the Introduction, to the author's work on "The Mystery of the Cross". Nevertheless, the book proceeds evidently from a genuine religious experience, to which the author has given fervent expression. Mr. Hitchcock has performed a service in demonstrating once more that real Christian experience is possible only if