

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

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

dogma and all metaphysics. But unfortunately the sources reveal in the real Jesus certain of the elements which are most repulsive to the modern mind, notably the Messianic consciousness. The fact has to be recognized by the liberal historians. Despite a great deal of subjectivity in their reconstruction of Jesus, they have not been able so completely to emancipate themselves from the sources as to imagine that the real Jesus was exactly what they could have wished Him to be. But Mr. Chamberlain is hampered by no such scruples. In him, subjectivity has absolutely free course, and hence he is able to reconstruct a Jesus entirely free from all those elements to which modern liberalism finds objection. Mr. Chamberlain, therefore, shows what the slogan, "Away with theology, and back to Jesus!" would mean if Jesus only had been what the liberal theologians would desire.

Mr. Chamberlain's *Mensch and Gott* may be summarized briefly as follows.

There is in all races, Mr. Chamberlain believes, an idea of one supreme God, one "all-father." It is a mistake to suppose that this idea represents a development from a primitive polytheism or animism. On the contrary, it is a necessary correlative of the idea "man," and it arose whenever mankind became conscious of its distinctness from the rest of nature. But in its pure and original form the idea "God" was absolutely undefined; all definition meant degradation.

In addition to the universal ideas, "God" and "man," Mr. Chamberlain continues, there has arisen, with almost equal necessity, the idea of a "mediator" between God and man. The mediator has not always been conceived of as a person; in the lower stages of civilization mediation is found rather in an action, such as sacrifice. But in higher stages, the thought of a personal mediator or of personal mediators has arisen. The trouble with such thoughts, however, is that they are merely aspirations, not realities. In Jesus, on the other hand, the aspiration became reality; Jesus, Mr. Chamberlain believes, was really the Mediator between God and man. Unfortunately, this conviction as to the uniqueness of Jesus does not become consistent, in our author, through any acceptance of the supernaturalism of the New Testament.

The pure religion of Jesus, Mr. Chamberlain believes, was soon polluted by attempts at definition. The first step was taken by Peter at Caesarea Philippi, when he applied to Jesus the Jewish category of Messiahship. That step, in the estimation of our author, was a disaster; it represents the entrance of Jewish ideas. And since Mr. Chamberlain is a bitter anti-Semite, he regards Judaism—for example, the Old Testament idea of God—as a most fruitful root of evil. Another step, according to our author, was taken by Paul, who introduced the categories of pagan religion. That step, it is admitted, though it was unfortunate, was necessary; for if the religion of Jesus had not been clothed in the customary forms it could never have been received by the Gentile world.

And so, Mr. Chamberlain continues, the process of definition and degradation went on apace, until it culminated in the absurd subtleties

of the creeds. The consequence is that "Jesus and the Christian Church are religious opposites" (p. 290).

What should now be done, according to Mr. Chamberlain, is to return from degrading definitions to the pure, "formless" religion of Jesus. The finest instrument to lead men to such a formless religion will be art, particularly music. Pure religion will, indeed, it is maintained, have to be found outside the existing churches, and should form a new religious community of its own.

In placing a creedless church thus altogether in the future, Mr. Chamberlain is apparently unaware that the thing has been tried—for example, in the Unitarian Church in America. But in the first place, the creedless churches display a singular lack of power, and in the second place the church which Mr. Chamberlain advocates is not really creedless, but differs from the Christian Church only in having a false creed, chiefly negative, instead of a true one.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The Style and Literary Method of Luke. By HENRY J. CADBURY, Lecturer in the New Testament, Andover Theological Seminary. Harvard Theological Studies, VI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1920. Pp. xi, 205. Price \$3.

In the former part of Dr. Cadbury's extensive monograph, which deals with "the diction of Luke and Acts," the author discusses the size and literary standard of Luke's vocabulary and the alleged medical language. In the first section, on the basis of the count undertaken by Professor J. Ritchie Smith in 1891 ("The Vocabulary of the New Testament," in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* II, 1891, pp. 647-658), Dr. Cadbury points out the comparative richness of the vocabulary of Luke-Acts. With regard to the literary standard of the double work, the conclusion, on the basis of very extensive researches, is that "the vocabulary of Luke [of course the name is used for convenience to designate the author of Luke-Acts without settling the question whether he is to be identified with the Luke mentioned in the Pauline Epistles], while it has its natural affiliations with the Greek of the Bible, is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists as to be beyond comparison with them." The author says further: "The question may be pertinently asked whether the gulf between New Testament Greek in general and Attic or Atticistic Greek is not being exaggerated in our day owing to our fresh knowledge of the vernacular Greek through the papyri." With regard to "the alleged medical language of Luke," Dr. Cadbury comes to a negative conclusion. The style of Luke-Acts, he believes, does not show that a physician wrote the double work, but on the other hand it does not show that a physician did not write it.

In the second part of the monograph, the author stands altogether upon the basis of the two-document theory—use by Matthew and Luke (1) of Mark and (2) of a lost source usually called Q—and supposes that the "Mark" which Matthew and Luke used was of essentially the same form as our Second Gospel. The differences between Luke and