

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1914

KIKUYU, CLERICAL VERACITY AND MIRACLES

Kikuyu, clerical veracity and miracles: it might seem that no three topics could bear less intrinsic relation to one another. In point of fact they are connected by very natural bonds, and it was inevitable that the controversy aroused by the publication of the Bishop of Zanzibar's open letter at the end of last year¹ should run rapidly through stages which raised successively the three issues of intercommunion, the sincerity of clerical engagements, and the supernatural origin of Christianity. The bomb-shell which Dr. Weston cast into the Anglican camp was thus like one of those fire-work bombs of Chinese concoction, which explode first into a serpent, out of which is at once extruded a noisome reptile, while from that in turn proceeds a fiery dragon. Each successive stage of the controversy cuts more deeply and uncovers more clearly the canker which lies at the root of much of our modern Church-life. The question raised in its first stage concerns only the limits of proper Christian communion; the issue in the second stage is just common honesty; while what is at stake in the third stage is the very existence of Christianity. The three issues are necessarily implicated in one another because they are only varying phases and interacting manifestations of

¹*Ecclesia Anglicana*. For what does she stand? An Open Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Edgar, Lord Bishop of St. Albans. By Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar. 1914. Some curious details as to the publication of this letter may be read in the Christmas (1913) number of *The Christian Warfare* (Talbot & Co.), the organ of the Catholic Literature Association.

he defends with great ardor in this essay, a thesis, which is accepted as proved by Professor Sayce, is to the effect that the vowel *i(ai)* is originally passive and the vowel *u(au)* originally active in the Semitic languages. And as it would seem that one of the strongest arguments which he could find in support of this contention would lie in the use of these vowels in the personal pronoun of the third person singular, it is all the more surprising that he should insist on appending the feminine ending of the noun to a form of the pronoun, which according to his own theory is feminine already by virtue of its vowel. This primitive form *haiwatum* consequently not only does not exist in Semitic, but is built up upon a false theory of the origin of the pronouns. Its existence in proto Indo-European is even more doubtful, if possible. His *alvaθ* is clearly merely a graecizing of *haiwath* and its existence is inferred because it can be split up into *al=ḥ* and *τθ*, a most remarkable demonstration! But since this *θ* is merely the feminine ending in Semitic which as we have seen has no place here, the argument rests solely on the identity of *haiw* (Munro's form!) and Old Persian *hauv*, from which *al=ḥ* would be derived, an identification, which is to say the least very problematical, especially as *haiw* is a hypothetical form (see above) and *hauv* seems to be a demonstrative and not a personal pronoun.

Mr. Munro's argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is given in his "Samaritan Pentateuch", although he has furnished a few additional data in this "Essay". It is essentially the argument from archaisms, which was advanced by Keil a number of years ago. The great difficulty with it is our inadequate acquaintance with the essential facts. It may be that in early times the words for *he* and *she* were pronounced so much alike, viz. *hu* and *hü*, that they could be properly and as a matter of fact were written in the same way, viz. *היא*—this view has been ably advocated by König. And it may be that soon after the time of Moses the pronunciation of *hü* was modified to *hi* (written *הי*)—according to Mr. Munro, this change took place under the influence of the new Canaanite environment. If this is actually the case, the argument for the early date of the Pentateuch is undoubtedly a strong one. But unfortunately we are not in a position to affirm definitely the truth of either of these contentions and consequently cannot afford to make unguarded and unwarranted statements. Despite his great erudition, Mr. Munro unfortunately does not sufficiently distinguish between possibility, probability and proof and with the very best of intentions comes perilously near making the conservative view of the Pentateuch appear ridiculous.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

Reden und Aufsätze. Von D. HERMANN GUNKEL. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1913. Pp. vii, 192. Mk. 4, 80, geb. Mk. 5.00.

Eleven essays are collected in this volume which is dedicated to the

Collegium Academicum of the University of Christiania in acknowledgment of the degree of Doctor of Theology conferred upon the author. Like everything that comes from Dr. Gunkel's pen, they are uniformly interesting and suggestive, some of them brilliant pieces of writing. All of them were published before in various periodicals such as the *Deutsche Rundschau*, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, *Christliche Welt* and other more technical journals. Dr. Gunkel's standpoint as a foremost exponent of the *religionsgeschichtliche* school is too well-known to need description here. It colors every page of this book. In the preface he seeks to correct the sense which has come to be widely attached to the term *religionsgeschichtlich*, as if it meant a method which dealt with the history of religions, whereas, he assures us, in its original intent it merely meant to emphasize the history of religion as an ideal development over against the excess of literary criticism, which had unduly forced the chief end of biblical science into the background. This note of protest against overdoing the critical side, especially in its analytical aspect, recurs in several of the essays. We are told that, while agreement in the main results has been attained, it ceases to exist, when an analysis is carried into the region of detail, the uncertainty increasing at each successive step. This is one of the points in which the school to which Gunkel belongs happens to coincide with the conservative opposition to the Graf-Wellhausen methods. That there are others will appear from the following brief survey of the main import of the eleven papers. The first is devoted to the memory of Bernhard Stade. It describes his eminence within the Wellhausen school, and characteristics as a scholar. It is pointed out that the interdependence along the whole line in his work between the view taken of the development of religious ideas and reconstructive literary criticism at times exposed his results and those of the Wellhausenians in general to reasoning in a circle. Stade's non-receptive attitude toward the recognition of extensive Babylonian and Egyptian influence is also remarked upon. Some of the "universally accepted" conclusions of the Wellhausen school are admitted to be on the point of supersedure, but this is coupled with the confident assertion that the basic structure will stand.

The second paper deals with the Aims and Methods of the Exposition of the Old Testament. It takes a noble view of what the work of the Old Testament exegete at its best ought to be. The disconnectedness of the old method ought to give way to an organic attempt to penetrate beyond linguistic, textual, archaeological detail into the personality of the author. The exegete must, of course, be scholarly equipped, but his greatest requirement is that he shall be a creative or at least re-creative artist. These are golden words, but it is a pity that the whole procedure recommended is meant to stop short with the subjective personality of the biblical writers. For ascertaining through this the mind of the Spirit as auctor primarius Dr. Gunkel has no thought, for, as is once and again stated in these essays, the old theory of inspiration is hopelessly discredited. All that the ideal

exegete can hope to attain by his labors is a History of Biblical Religion not a Biblical Theology of the old-fashioned kind.

The third essay unfolds the principles underlying the author's article on Israelitish Literature in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. The ideal held up here is that of a *Literaturgeschichte*. It seems to us that the purely accidental view taken of the origin of the Biblical writings precludes not merely the attainment but even the projection of such an ideal. Such a history of literature is impossible not merely because of our ignorance in the most important matters, but also because of the limited material. A recognition of the factor of inspiration affords the only possibility of organic treatment. Dr. Gunkel has to content himself with the distinction between certain *Literaturgattungen* and the tracing of the history of the same, so far as that is possible.

In the next paper entitled Simson the theory that the Old Testament hero was originally a mythological figure, or Sun-God, is combatted. The stories are legendary in character and reflect the ancient hostility between Danites and Philistines.

The fifth contribution gives a popular exposition of the story of Ruth. It is held that the connection between Boaz and the Davidic family was not original to the narrative but subsequently introduced.

The sixth essay deals with the Psalms. A comparison with Babylonian and Egyptian Psalms yields the result that the production of Psalms in Israel antedates the exile. A comparison with the Psalms in the Apocrypha shows that there is no Maccabean element in the Psalter. The oldest Psalms are collective, not individual, for the Psalms ultimately derive from the cultus. None the less in the Psalms we possess the ego is very frequently individual not collective. But whereas the collective Psalm is pre-prophetic in origin, the individualizing spiritualizing Psalm (*geistliche Psalmendichtung*) stands under the influence of prophetism.

There follows a paper dealing with the Eschatology of the Psalmists. This too was learned from the prophets. But post-prophetic, we are warned, should not without more be confounded with post-exilic.

The two next essays deal with Egyptian parallels to the Old Testament, the eighth more in general, the ninth with special reference to the Egyptian *Danklieder* published in 1911 by Erman from memorial stones in the Theban city of graves. The similarity of the latter to certain Old Testament Psalms is pointed out, but the author is very reserved as to offering a theory for its explanation. A direct dependence on Egyptian models is not favored. It is held to be more likely that this type of songs was already known to the Orient in general from the period of 2000-1000 B.C., and so reached Israel through the mediation of the Canaanites. Whether the origin of the type was in Babylon and passed from there to Egypt is left an open question.

Paper ten deals with Jensen's "The Gilgamesch-Epic in the Literature of the World". The phantastic, unscientific character of Jensen's comparisons is strikingly exhibited.

The concluding article deals with The Odes of Solomon. As in the previously published article in the *ZNTW* Gunkel here takes the view that the Odes are the work of a Jewish-Christian Gnostic about 150 A.D. Harnack's hypothesis of a composite origin, partly Jewish, partly Christian, is rejected. New translations of some of the Odes are given with several important conjectural readings. Two, defects in the Odes, from a Christian point of view, are emphasized: the consciousness of sin and of the need of deliverance from guilt is lacking, and the sacred history of the Old and the New Testament has almost entirely passed into oblivion. The singer of the Odes lives far from every thought of historical happenings in a world of spiritual concepts and transcendental processes. Hence the Church rightly cast off his work, "for the prophets and Jesus are more than the Odes of Solomon."

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christenthums bis Irenaeus. Von D. WILHELM BOUSSET, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Göttingen. Göttingen Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1913. Pp. xxiv, 474.

A treatise on the term *κύριος* as applied to Jesus would seem to deal with a sufficiently specialized subject. But, as the sub-title of Dr. Bousset's work informs us, we receive in it no less than a History of Christological Faith from the Beginnings down to Irenaeus. And even this scarcely covers what the book actually offers, for in reality it approaches to being a sketch of the earliest history of Christian belief in general, including some aspects that are not technically Christological, although the author in the preface disavows this wider purpose on the ground that the time is not ripe as yet for describing the origin of Christianity in the milieu of the Hellenistic-Roman civilization. The value of the book—and it is great irrespective of one's agreement or disagreement with its conclusions—is due largely to this breadth of outlook proceeding from a point that by common consent was of central importance and of propelling force in the earliest development of Christianity, the view taken of and the relation sustained toward Christ as Lord. As might be expected Dr. Bousset writes as a consistent "*religionsgeschichtler*". He repudiates the distinction between Biblical Theology and History of Doctrine not merely, but is eager to obliterate the lines of demarcation between the Christian religion and the surrounding spheres of faith and practice in the midst of which it grew up. He further brings to the front more seriously than has been attempted by anybody before, at least in such a comprehensive way, the principle that the forms of religious belief to a large extent took their rise and shape from the cultus, in other words that doctrine grew out of worship, rather than the reverse, as is usually assumed to have been the case. If to this be added the fact, that the general principles just stated are applied on the basis of a thorough belief that Hellenistic syncretism (the mystery-