

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

SCHWEITZER ON THE MYSTICISM OF PAUL : A CRITICISM

I

*The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*¹ is the third work of a trilogy which sets forth Dr. Albert Schweitzer's interpretation of the New Testament in terms of his theory of "Consistent Eschatology". To appraise it rightly, therefore, it is necessary to glance at the teaching of the two $\sigma\mu\omega\omega\kappa$ which go before, and lead up to it. The first of these was *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.² This is one of the few books which mark a definite turning point in New Testament studies. It put an end, for all time, to a certain type of sentimental liberal scholarship which proceeded by constructing a model of its ideal man and then fitting Jesus into the mould thus prepared for Him. The second work is *Paul and his Interpreters*.³

Schweitzer indicates that the difficulty of finding serious attempts to understand the Jesus of History is to be traced to the Definition of Chalcedon, which, with its doctrine of the Two Natures, dissolved the Unity of the Person. This cut off any possibility of a return to the historical Jesus. The Reformers were the victims of this situation.

"The self-contradiction was elevated into a law. But the Manhood was so far admitted as to preserve, in appearance, the rights of history. Thus by a deception the formula kept the life prisoner and prevented the leading spirits of the Reformation from grasping the idea of a return to the historical Jesus."⁴

Since the Reformation, those who have struggled free from the fetters of Chalcedon have tried to understand the Jesus of History. But they have all failed in greater or in less degree. Schweitzer surveys the series of these attempts beginning with Reimarus and ending with his contemporary, Wrede. Then he takes Wrede and uses him as a foil against which to set off his own interpretation. Schweitzer demonstrates conclusively that Eschatology was an integral part of the thinking and mental environment of Jesus. So far most scholars would agree with

¹ English translation (1931) of *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (1929).

² English translation (1910) of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (1906), a second German edition of which appeared under the title *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* in 1913.

³ English translation (1912) of *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung* (1911).

⁴ *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 3.

him. But he goes much further than that : he insists that this eschatological outlook was the absolute and sole determining factor in all that Jesus said and did. It formed the total content of His thinking. This "Consistent Eschatology" is elaborated in the two closing chapters of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*,¹ and is used as the key to the understanding of everything which is recorded of Jesus. To sum up Schweitzer's teaching, it is this: The catastrophic Judgment and the Kingdom of God are near; men therefore are called upon to repent. Jesus knew that He was the Messiah, but only a few of His intimate friends recognised Him as such. With the coming of the Kingdom, however, He would be manifested to all as the Son of Man. He sent out His disciples to proclaim the Kingdom believing that they would share in the Messianic pains which they must suffer on behalf of the elect, and that before they had passed through all the cities of Israel the great event would have taken place. But the disciples returned, and none of these things had happened. Jesus therefore was compelled to modify His views: He resolved, since the Kingdom delayed its coming, to precipitate events by His own action.

"There is silence all around. The Baptist appears, and cries, 'Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand'. Soon after that came Jesus, and in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man lays hold on the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn; and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of one immeasurably great man, who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging upon it still. That is His victory and His reign."²

In this light we must understand the saying "Never imagine I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace but a sword" (Matt. x. 34, Moffatt).³ The Ethic of Jesus is intended to meet merely the need of the short interval to elapse before the Parousia. It is an emergency ethic: hence Jesus' lack of interest in questions of family, state, etc. The Sermon on the Mount is an exposition of this special ethic of the interval before the coming of the Kingdom. It is an *Interimsethik*. Upon this point most interpreters to-day would challenge Schweitzer.

¹ Op. cit., pp. 328-401.

² Op. cit., pp. 368 f.; cf. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 58.

³ *Quest*, p. 369.

The second book mentioned above does for the history of Pauline interpretation what the *Quest of the Historical Jesus* did for that of Jesus. In *Paul and his Interpreters*, Schweitzer gives an account of the different attempts which have been made to understand the teaching of the Apostle, and concludes that they have also failed, in so far as they did not possess the key of Consistent Eschatology with which to unlock the mystery. In this book the ideas are adumbrated which are developed fully, and in detail, in the third work, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*.

In *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, Schweitzer connects with the Eschatological view of history Paul's "in Christ" mysticism. This is not a mysticism of "being-in-God" because the elect man shares the fate of the world, and, therefore, so long as the world has not returned to God, the elect man cannot be in God.¹ The "in Christ" mysticism is rooted in the eschatological world-view.² This Christ-mysticism is not an absolutely new thing in Paul. Jesus had taught a Christ-mysticism in a form which was suitable to the days when He was walking the earth as the Great Unknown; His disciples had the assurance of being the future companions of the Son of Man.³ Jesus preached Christ-mysticism in ways appropriate to the time when He was still upon earth. Paul taught Christ-mysticism in a manner suitable to the time immediately following Jesus' death and resurrection. The important thing which Paul added was the thought that in the time between Christ's resurrection and His return again the communion of the elect is actual.⁴

"The fundamental significance of the dying and rising again of Jesus consists therefore, according to Paul, in the fact that thereby death and resurrection have been set afoot throughout the whole corporeity of the Elect to the Messianic Kingdom. That is, so to speak, a mass of piled-up fuel, to which the fire there kindled immediately spreads. But whereas this dying and rising again has been openly manifested in Jesus, in the Elect it goes forward secretly but none the less really. Since in the nature of their corporeity they are so assimilated to Jesus Christ, they become, through His death and resurrection, beings in whom dying and rising again have already begun, although the outward seeming of the natural existence remains unchanged."⁵

The next link in the chain of Schweitzer's reasoning involves the central place which he assigns to Baptism. The Elect are "in Christ". This being "in Christ" is a partaking in the corporeity of the elect. The "Body of Christ" is not a pictorial

¹ *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 12.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 105 f.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 110.

nor a symbolical expression: it represents a physical fact. Christ can suffer for the elect and the elect for Him, and for one another, because they are "physically interdependent in the same corporeity".¹ Dying and rising with Christ is thus not a metaphorical expression but an actual description of what actually takes place; it is a simple reality.² The expression "re-birth" is never used by Paul with reference to this experience because his thinking is wholly conditioned by eschatological expectation.³ "For him the believer experiences the dying and rising again of Christ in actual fact, not in an imitative representation."⁴ The act in which the Elect pass "into Christ" is Baptism. That is to say, between Jesus' resurrection and His coming again the Elect Believer through Baptism becomes "corporeally" or "physically" partaker of the Resurrection Life "in Christ".

II

I purpose to note briefly several points, which Schweitzer brings out in the development of his argument, upon which he is open to criticism, and then subject the main position to a little more detailed treatment.

(a) I doubt if the absolute separation, upon which Schweitzer insists, between Christ-mysticism and God-mysticism, will bear the weight or argument built upon it. Paul's utterance on the Areopagus would suggest the contrary. Schweitzer urges that there are weighty reasons for not attributing this saying to Paul: "For it is in him that we live and move and exist" (Acts xvii. 28). Upon a technical discussion of that point I shall not enter: but the suspicion is unavoidable that there would be a strong temptation to find reasons for discarding the one statement attributed to Paul, which contradicts Schweitzer's assertion. At any rate the writer of Acts did not feel any incongruity in ascribing the words in question to Paul.

(b) Schweitzer makes too free use of the argument from silence. To take one instance: Schweitzer points out that Paul never uses the expression "re-birth" to describe the renewal of being which takes place when the Elect become "in Christ". He repudiates the notion that this could be accidental. But, granted that Paul does not employ the expression "born again",

¹ Op. cit., p. 127.

² Op. cit., p. 15.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 16.

it would crystallise his whole teaching if he had done so.¹ Schweitzer, however, insists that it is "with consistent logic he applies to the renewal of being which originates from fellowship with the risen Christ only the term resurrection, which is alone appropriate".² Here, as elsewhere, the argument from silence is strained beyond what it will justly bear.

(c) We cannot avoid being sceptical when we are told that Paul "is a logical thinker and his mysticism is a complete system"³, or that his thinking is "wholly conditioned" by his eschatological expectation.⁴ In earlier generations theologians also sought for a single principle from which to explain Paul's writings. None of these, when allegedly found, is completely convincing. No more is Schweitzer's solution convincing now. Of course there was an underlying conviction, wrought out in experience, which did give the main direction to Paul's life. But it is more likely that this would be such a conviction as that expressed in the phrase "justification is by faith" than that it should be a scheme of "Consistent Eschatology". The former can be related to Paul's religious history in an intelligible manner: this cannot be said for the latter. But, of course, the fact is that Paul never sat down to arrange his thought into any closed system. For one thing, the Hebrew mind did not feel much urge to work after that fashion. If Paul had done anything of the kind it would have indicated Greek influence which, in the interests of his argument, Schweitzer is over-anxious to exclude as a factor contributing to the shape of Paul's thought. If there was such a system in Paul's writings it is difficult to explain why no interpreter has recognized its outlines until Schweitzer. They were not hampered here by the Definition of Chalcedon, as Schweitzer, with some justice, says they were in the case of Jesus. Paul's most systematic letter is that to the Romans: but even here the shape and distinctions of a system are not marked with the sharpness of consistent logic. One suspects that the structure of Pauline "in Christ" mysticism, determined by "Consistent Eschatology", is due to the system-loving twentieth-century German mind, rather than to the first-century Jewish Christian. Perhaps Schweitzer himself felt the insecurity of his position when he wrote: "A further peculiarity of the mysticism of

¹ C. A. Anderson Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul*, pp. 115 ff.

² *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 14.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Paul is that he is not solely a mystic."¹ Schweitzer follows this up with the statement that there are three different doctrines of redemption which for Paul go side by side. These are the eschatological, the juridical, and the mystical. Paul moves freely from the one circle of ideas to the others. "If co-existence of such disparate views is in itself difficult enough to conceive, it becomes a complete enigma when we find it in a mystic."² It may be answered that it is only difficult to conceive of this when one has set out from the position that the writer's thinking is to be wholly explained in terms of one rigid system. Does this statement not go a long way towards surrendering Schweitzer's position?

(d) If Schweitzer makes use of the argument from silence on the point of the New Birth, for example, we may be allowed to point out that Paul's later epistles are silent regarding the Parousia. And their whole tenor strongly indicates that this is not accidental, but that this hope no longer holds the position which it did for Paul at an earlier stage. Eschatologism is no longer in line with the whole attitude which Paul had by this time come to adopt. It is impossible to demonstrate that Ephesians, or Colossians, or Philippians, are "wholly determined", or indeed, determined at all, by a "Consistent Eschatology". We feel that the writer is on surer ground who recently commented on 2 Cor. v. 19, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself", thus: "Here the world has become again the stage of the divine redeeming love and purpose. God is restored to his world, but as the transcendent, all-holy Redeemer. . . . *The future and higher sphere of glory already in a real sense penetrates and intersects this sphere of humiliation through the power of the Spirit.*"³

(e) The "Status Quo-ism" of Paul can not be quoted as evidence that Paul's thinking was determined by "Consistent Eschatology", unless that fact of Paul's Eschatologism is first established upon independent grounds. If that were done it would provide a sufficient explanation of Paul's desire that certain things should remain as they are. We cannot argue from the latter to the former. Paul's attitude here is equally capable of other explanation. Schweitzer will have it that Paul's directions that "as the Lord called every one, so let him walk", and "let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called"

¹ Op. cit., p. 18.

² Op. cit., p. 25.

³ W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1943), p. 152.

(1 Cor. vii. 17, 20), are to be explained as necessary because of the mystical "being-in-Christ". The fact is that when a man is in Christ the change is so great that his earthly condition is of too little importance, by comparison, to be taken into any serious account. "He is like a house sold for breaking up, all repairs to which become irrational."¹ But it may very well be that Paul saw that there was a real danger of equating Christianity with a movement of social emancipation.² The teaching of Christianity about equality of status "in Christ", and the abolishing of distinctions of sex, race, and social standing, might be nullified by a too early and too reckless application of these very principles. "Christianity would have sunk beyond hope of recovery along with such revolutionary attempts; it might have brought on a new slave-rising, and been crushed along with it. The time was not ripe for the solution of such difficult questions."³

III

The arguments under (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), deal with minor points in the argument. The principal thesis could be established apart from the question of Schweitzer's correctness or incorrectness of interpretation on any or all of them. To be right on all of them would establish a presumption in Schweitzer's favour: but if his main thesis is wrong then we would expect to find that these points are capable of a different construction than that put upon them by Schweitzer. Up to this point I have tried to show that such alternative construction is, at least, possible. We now come to grips with the heart of the subject: we come to review Schweitzer's teaching on Baptism, and the central place it holds in his scheme of Pauline interpretation. According to Schweitzer, for Paul, "the believer experiences the dying and rising again of Christ in actual fact, not in an imitative representation".⁴ The gateway to this mystical state of "being-in-Christ" is Baptism. Schweitzer affirms that for Paul: (a) The Sacraments are inherently efficacious, (b) "Being-in-Christ" is not equivalent to, nor the result of, "belief in" Christ, (c) Without Baptism there is no "being-in-Christ". He

¹ *Mysticism of Paul*, p. 194.

² E.g., those who to-day want to equate a political party-programme with the Kingdom of God.

³ W. Bousset, quoted by Anderson Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

⁴ *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 16.

writes : " With Paul, his whole being, from his baptism onwards, is a constantly renewed experiencing of the dying and rising again which began in that act ".¹ The sacraments are " inherently efficacious acts ".² Paul was not troubled by the fine distinctions which perplex Protestants, when they think of Paul as holding such beliefs. " He simply asserts that it is with Baptism that the being-in-Christ and the dying and rising again have their beginning ".³ Paul assumed " as self-evident that a grafting into Christ takes place in Baptism and is bound up with this ceremonial act ".⁴

" All attempts hitherto undertaken to pass from the concept of belief-in-Christ to that of being-in-Christ have proved a failure. And all that may be made in the future are equally without prospect of success. They all come to the same point, that the belief in Christ, growing in depth, is by verbal ingenuity made to figure as a being-in-Christ. That the being-in-Christ arises out of such an enhancement of belief in Christ is nowhere indicated by Paul and is nowhere pre-supposed by him. The relationship of faith in Christ to union with Christ is for him thus: that belief in Christ being present, union with Christ automatically takes place—under certain circumstances, that is to say, when the believer causes himself to be baptised. Without Baptism there is no being-in-Christ! The peculiarity of the Pauline mysticism is precisely that being-in-Christ is not a subjective experience brought about by a special effort of faith on the part of the believer, but something which happens, in him, as in others, at baptism."⁵

This is certainly not the impression which Paul makes upon the careful reader. He is surely a preacher rather than a priest. Closer examination of his words and life bears this impression out. The Pauline emphasis is not on the efficacy of sacraments, but upon the necessity for faith. " You see, faith must come from what is heard, and what is heard comes from the word of Christ " (Rom. x. 17) ; " God resolved to save believers by the ' sheer folly ' of the Christian message " (1 Cor. i. 21). Men who heard the message and responded were sealed of the Holy Spirit : " You have also heard in him the message of the truth, the gospel of your salvation, and in him you also by your faith have been stamped with the seal of the long-promised holy Spirit " (Eph. i. 13). Salvation follows invocation of the name of the Lord : " Everyone who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved. But how are they to invoke One in whom they do not believe ? And how are they to believe in One of whom they have never heard ? And how are they ever to hear, without a preacher ? " (Rom. x. 14 f.). The Gospel is a saving power to everyone who

¹ Op. cit., p. 17.

² Op. cit., p. 18.

³ Op. cit., p. 19.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Op. cit., pp. 116 f.

has faith (Rom. i. 16). Paul asks the Galatians, “. . . did you receive the Spirit by doing what the Law commands or by believing the gospel message ?” (Gal. iii. 2). “When He supplies you with the Spirit and works miracles among you, is it because you do what the Law commands or because you believe the gospel message ?” (Gal. iii. 5). This verse “seems expressly to exclude as the ground of the same experience any external rite or ceremony whatever”.¹ It was to the preaching of the Word that Paul and Barnabas were set apart (Acts xiii. 2-5). Paul was the Corinthians’ father in Christ by means of the Gospel (1 Cor. iv. 15). These and other utterances of Paul’s make it clear that he was not using a stray expression in an unguarded moment, but expressing the central thing in his understanding of his ministry when he said, “Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel” (1 Cor. i. 14-17). “St. Paul saw in Baptism the normal but not the necessary, the helpful but not indispensable sign and seal put upon the act of faith appropriating the gift of God in Christ.”²

We now turn to note some features of Paul’s positive teaching concerning Baptism. Paul uses the expression, “one Lord, one faith, one Baptism” ; but this does not give us any clue to Paul’s understanding of the rite (Eph. vi. 5). In another passage Paul speaks as though Baptism could become an actual danger. If the rite obscured the Christ whose name was preached, then it would be better not to baptise at all. Paul thanked God that he had not baptised any of the Corinthians, save only Crispus and Gaius, so that no one could say he had baptised in his own name. Evidently some were speaking of having been baptised in the name of Paul, or Apollos, or Christ. That is to say that Baptism was in danger of being thought of as sealing a relationship between the baptised and the baptiser, instead of between the baptised and the One in whose name the rite was administered. But better than have that misunderstanding in the matter, leave out the rite altogether: “For Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the Gospel” (1 Cor. i. 13-17).

There are two passages which, at first sight, lend more colour to Schweitzer’s contention. “Surely you know that all of us who have been baptised into Christ Jesus have been baptised into his death ! Our Baptism in his death made us share his burial, so that, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of

¹ Anderson Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

² Anderson Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

the Father, we too might move in a new sphere of Life" (Rom. vi. 3 f.). "In him you have been circumcised, with no material circumcision that cuts flesh from the body, but with Christ's own circumcision, when you were buried with him in your baptism and thereby raised with him as you believed in the power of God who raised him from the dead (Col. ii. 11 f.). These words, however, refer not only to the baptised person as dying and rising again with Christ: they also refer to the baptised as having been circumcised with the circumcision not made with hands. Schweitzer has no place in his scheme into which to fit this expression. And if this is to be taken symbolically, as it must be, then there are no grounds upon which it can be argued that part of the paragraph must be treated as describing a real physical fact rather than the symbolical meaning of the rite. We feel that we are on safer ground in interpreting these passages as an emphatic statement of the symbolism of the ceremony. The baptised person is united to Christ to such a degree that he must be spoken of as having died with Him and risen again with Him. Baptism is the sign and seal of something which has already happened, not the instrumental cause of its happening.

In Galatians Paul declares, "for all of you who had yourselves baptised in Christ have taken on the character of Christ" (Gal. iii. 17). The same expression is used in Rom. xiii. 14, where it is addressed to those who were already Christians and presumably already baptised. That is to say, their having been baptised did not render it for ever after unnecessary to urge believers to "put on" Christ. In 1 Cor. x. 1 ff. Paul speaks of the fathers who crossed the Red Sea being all baptised unto Moses by the cloud and by the sea. The point here seems to be that, although the people were baptised unto Moses, that is to say under Moses' authority, and participated in all that accompanied the deliverance, they did not sufficiently recognise the obligation thereby incurred.

In these passages where "putting on" Christ is mentioned, the idea of a corporate fellowship with Him is evident. So far we may go with Schweitzer. The "dying" and "rising again" expressions contain the same idea, and the notion of coming under His authority is also present. But unless it can be shown that this relationship to Christ, however connected with Baptism, is utterly unique—not because of the uniqueness of the One to Whom the baptised is united, but because the relationship is

of such a quality as cannot hold in any other sphere of relationship in any degree—Schweitzer's case breaks down. The concept of a sphere of corporeal-mystical-physical "being-in-Christ" will not contain the weight of doctrine poured into it. We must therefore consider the expression "in Christ".

"In Christ" must be understood against the background of that stage of thought to which the idea of the solidarity-of-the-Community was inevitable. That idea holds over large areas of present-day thinking of a relatively primitive type. We see it, for example, in the Japanese attitude to their race, and in the Chinese attitude to the family. The family of Achan was put to death for what we should judge to be the guilt of one member (Josh. vii. 24 ff.). Such thinking lies behind an expression like, "He is the Head of the Body, the Church" (Col. i. 18). Often, in ancient times, the distinction between a representative and those represented vanishes, as that between the king and the people tended to do in Israel.¹ This solidarity-of-the-group idea, rather than the "aggregation-of-individuals" idea, controlled ancient primitive thought. The essential meaning of "being-in-Christ", therefore, is probably to be found in the idea of "being-in-the-fellowship". He was continuously realising Himself in the Church, which, for this reason, is called His body. In it He finds His completion. The Ephesians have been taught "in Christ" (Eph. iv. 21).

"When we see how St. Paul equated the community and its Head, we can see how being 'in Christ', 'baptised into Christ', and 'putting on Christ', were intelligible forms expressing the deepest meaning of incorporation into the *community*. . . . It is not that the two were identical, the Society and the Saviour. But the Society represented the Saviour in such a way, and to such a degree, that the faith-union with Christ which was the key to salvation found perpetual expression and illustration in the fellowship of the Church."²

Schweitzer tries to support his teaching by citing Paul's reference to Baptism for the Dead. He writes :

"The effect of Baptism is thought of so objectively that some in Corinth caused themselves to be baptised for the dead, in order that through this Baptism by proxy they might share in the benefits of the sacrament. Far from combating such a view as superstitious, Paul uses it as an argument against those who cast doubt upon the resurrection."³

Throughout this book Schweitzer uses the argument from silence with too great facility. If Paul here does not express disapproval,

¹ Cf. Ps. lxxxix. 49 f. I owe this thought to Anderson Scott, *op. cit.*

² *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, p. 157.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

Schweitzer assumes that he is expressing approval. But, as a matter of fact, he does not do so. Whether he approves or not does not appear from his discussion at this point at all. The point at issue is the reality of the Resurrection; and what Paul does here is to point out that it is absurd for people who have had themselves baptised for the dead to deny the Resurrection. If his main position was established, then Schweitzer's inference concerning the interpretation of the passage would be in harmony; but this passage cannot be used as a step towards the establishing of the main position; it is still capable of intelligible explanation even if a different main position is found to be the true one.

To sum up : this remarkable book, by a most remarkable Christian, is vitiated by the attempt to reduce Paul's thought to a hard and fast system. Eschatologism is certainly in the New Testament; but it is only one factor among several. It cannot be regarded as the hub from which the spokes of the wheel of New Testament truth radiate, and without which they would fall apart. The "in-Christ" mysticism cannot be made to hold all that Schweitzer presses into it. The Sacraments are not the mechanical producers of magic transformations in human nature, and the state of the "elect". The book is full of the insights of genius, but is vitiated by the presupposition with which Schweitzer approached his study. When it is taken along with *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* we find that Schweitzer is attempting to interpret the whole New Testament in terms of a single integrating principle. *A priori*, it is difficult to think that the New Testament is such a book ; investigation shows that it is not. There is a unity throughout the New Testament; but it is a religious unity; it is the unity of religious attitude towards Jesus Christ which characterises the different writers, but which is expressed in different ways. Denney brought it out clearly in his *Jesus and the Gospel*. It is not a unity determined by any scheme of thought which can be set out systematically as Schweitzer sets out his Consistent Eschatology. To suppose that it is is the weakness of *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*.

AUSTIN A. FULTON.

Belfast.