

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1922

DARIUS THE MEDE

It is about six years since my first volume of *Studies in the Book of Daniel* was published; and now that the second volume is about to appear, it seems like an opportune time to reply to some of the criticisms of the reviewers of the first. The most elaborate of the criticisms was one by Professor Kemper Fullerton of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology which appeared in the Bulletin of my alma mater, the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa., for October 1918. Had Professor Fullerton's criticism been confined to myself, I would have forever held my peace; but inasmuch as I am merely the occasion for a violent onslaught on the veracity of the book of Daniel, I shall be excused for referring at length to his strictures. It is high praise, though intended as blame, to be spoken of by him as a "bringer-up-to-date" of the work of such men as Hengstenberg, Keil, Pusey and Green, with whom I am classed as a belated example of the same anti-critical animus and unscientific method.

And, first, let me say, that I do not deem it a reproach to have produced "a typical example of the harmonistic method," which is one of the most serious charges brought against me by Professor Fullerton; but that I fail to see that I have used this method as distinct from the "historical" method, whatever that means. Words break no bones, it may be; but since Professor Fullerton evidently aims to put me in the wrong at the very start and, by necessary implication, all through my studies, by affirming that in my method I am harmonistic as distinct from historical, it is well to pause just here in order to come to an understanding

in the Church are deeply concerned to have the Bible taught and chairs of religious education founded in our schools and colleges. The aim is very commendable, the need is urgent. But of far greater importance is it that the Bible when it is taught be properly taught, by men and women who believe it to be the Word of God. There are still many young people who go to college from believing homes, who still retain the "faith of childhood" in the Bible as the Word of God. There are others who know little about the Bible. It is better, far better that they be let alone, left without any training in the Bible, terrible as such an alternative is to contemplate, than that they should receive a course of "modern" teaching which if they are honest and frank will logically and almost inevitably lead them to answer with an emphatic negative the query of the Berlin student: "You don't believe those old yarns, do you?" In view of present conditions several courses are open to Christian parents. They can bring pressure to bear upon these "liberal" institutions, many of which were founded and fostered under distinctly Evangelical auspices, to cease their "crusade" against orthodoxy and deal fairly with the Bible; or, unsuccessful in this, they can refuse to allow their children to take "destructive" Bible courses; or even at the risk of a real loss of "cultural" advantage, they can send their children to institutions where the religious training is such as they can conscientiously approve. That the situation is a serious one cannot be denied. The Christian faith of young America is at stake!

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

Is Mark a Roman Gospel? By BENJAMIN W. BACON, Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University. Harvard Theological Studies, VII. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1919. Pp. 107. Price \$1.25.

In this monograph, the neo-Tübingenism of Professor Bacon (see PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, xix, 1921, pp. 686 f.) appears with especial clearness. The Second Gospel, it is here maintained, is a Roman product of a "strong" Paulinism, which was characterized by an ultra-Pauline hostility to the Jews. Such a Paulinism, Professor Bacon believes, had been rebuked by Paul himself, who in the period subsequent to the writing of Galatians attempted to bring about a reconciliation with Jewish Christianity. Thus the gradual compromise between Petrine and Pauline Christianity, which was placed by Baur late in the second century, is attributed by Professor Bacon partly to Paul himself; and the Second Gospel, far from being regarded as exhibiting an "irenec tendency," is thought to be an ultra-Pauline writing which failed to heed the conciliatory teachings of the Epistle to the Romans.

In harmony with this modern tendency-criticism, Professor Bacon of course rejects the tradition which bases the Second Gospel upon the actual teaching of Peter. The connection between Mark and Peter, Professor Bacon believes, did not really extend later than the point of time reached in Acts xv., the contrary view in the early Church

being based upon I Peter v. 13 (which of course Professor Bacon regards as pseudonymous) and upon Papias' misinterpretation of the words of "the elder."

The tendency-criticism of Professor Bacon, like that of Baur, is based upon a radical misinterpretation of Gal. ii. 1-10, which passage, far from attesting an antagonism (however soon overcome) between Paul and Peter, attests the direct contrary. And Professor Bacon's exhibition of an ultra-Pauline antagonism to the Jews in the Second Gospel is characterized by all the subjectivity which invalidated the tendency-criticism of the original Tübingen school. Moreover, the root problem of the New Testament is left by Professor Bacon's reconstruction entirely unsolved. How is the origin of Paul's religion to be explained? It can be explained if the supernatural Jesus presented in the Gospel of Mark was the real Jesus, who is presupposed by Paul's belief in the divine Redeemer. But if the picture of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark is due to post-Pauline development, then the religion of Paul is left entirely uncaused. Professor Bacon has attempted to solve the problem in his *Jesus and Paul*, 1921. He has there attempted to bridge the gulf between the purely human Jesus of modern naturalism, and the divine Redeemer of the Epistles. But the attempt results in failure. The documents of the apostolic age (the Pauline Epistles) which are regarded by modern criticism as the primary sources of information really presuppose just such a supernatural Person as is presented in the Gospel of Mark. The representation in Mark, then, is not the product of late development, but a true reflection of the facts, and all the tendency-criticism of Professor Bacon as of the older Tübingen School falls to the ground.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

Mensch und Gott. Betrachtungen über Religion und Christentum.

Von HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN. München: bei F. Bruckmann A.-G. 1921. Pp. viii, 305.

The author of this book is not a theologian or a trained student of ancient history, and although he expresses great respect for the opinions of experts he never succeeds in handling the instruments of historical research with any great degree of skill. The book therefore possesses little direct value as a contribution to historical science, so far as the origin of Christianity is concerned. But it is interesting in another direction.

The interest in Mr. Chamberlain's book is due to the very fact that the author is not a scientific historian. For, being unhampered by a historian's respect for the sources, the author can construct the "liberal" view of Jesus and of Christianity with a consistency which no historian can ever attain. Mr. Chamberlain believes that the real Jesus taught an absolutely pure, undogmatic, undefined religion, to which humanity should now and always return. Such an idea of Jesus has been influential in the whole course of modern liberalism. If we could only get back to the real Jesus, it is supposed, we should be free from all