

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 52—October, 1902.

I.

PERSONALITY THE SUPREME CATEGORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

MODERN philosophy began with an emphatic assertion of dualism. The primary contrast in our experience between subject and object, self and not-self, mind and matter, was construed, by both the great men with whom modern philosophy took its rise, as an opposition not to be overcome.

Although Descartes started from the assumption of the competency of pure thought to explain reality, independently of observation—his principle being that everything must be true which is clearly and distinctly conceived—he failed to deal satisfactorily with the question as to the relation between the material and the spiritual. To him the world seemed to fall apart into two alien and unrelated realms. Mind has as its essential attribute thought, and matter has as its essential attribute extension; these predicates do not imply each other, but are mutually exclusive, and hence the substances to which they belong can have no natural basis of connection. On the one hand, Descartes wished to make due provision for the ethical and religious life of man, and, on the other hand, he desired to recognize the reign of law in nature, and the only way of securing these two ends seemed to him to be the making a sharp division between the world of mind, in which the free will of man is supreme, and the world of nature, which is subject to the sway of mechanical laws. Accordingly Descartes held that everything in the universe, except the mind of man, is explicable on mechanical principles; the whole world of nature, including the world of animal life, can be accounted for under laws of matter and motion. The two factors of

VI.

REVIEWS OF

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., and chiefly in the revision of the proofs, of A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh; S. R. Driver D.D., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford; H. B. Swete, D.D., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. VOLUME IV.: PLEROMA—ZUZIM. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902. 4to, pp. xi, 994.

With this volume a great work is worthily brought to its conclusion. A supplementary volume is promised, "to contain Indexes and certain subsidiary articles of importance." But the alphabet has been covered from A to Zuzim and the plan has been fully accomplished of setting forth a "Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its language, literature and contents, including the Biblical Theology," after a fashion which should bring together the results of recent investigation. Nobody can turn over the pages of these volumes without a growing admiration for the diligence and skill exhibited by the editors, and the learning and, in the main, prudence exhibited by the writers. There are shortcomings, to be sure, which the careful reader will discover; some that will strike even him that runs sharply in the face. The worst of these is the general critical attitude of the book: and this is most distinctively in evidence with regard to the Old Testament. It is a thousand pities that we could not have had given us a thoroughly believing Dictionary of the Bible: it is something to be thankful for that we have one which is at least not thoroughly disbelieving. We do not conceal from ourselves, and we would not conceal from our readers, that the critical attitude of this Dictionary differs from that, say, of Dr. Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica* more in practice than in principle. Meanwhile, what Dr. Cheyne would look upon as the timid inconsistencies, what we would look upon as the saving remainders of good sense, in the critical opinions here expressed preserves to the book a fundamentally reverent character and enables its great mass of learning to make its due impression on the student.

The peculiar feature of the work, among Dictionaries of the Bible, is per-

haps the attention it pays to the teaching of the Bible—surely the most important part of its contents. This feature is perhaps particularly prominent in this closing volume. We are not able to recognize all the articles on topics in Biblical Theology as giving us either good exegesis or good theology. But in the main they are carefully and thoroughly done, and in the mass they provide a very valuable series of discussions which no one should neglect who would wish to know what the doctrine of the Bible is. Their shortcomings are due not more to the ecclesiastical affiliations and theological traditions of their authors—though these have had their obvious effects—than to the influence of the destructive Biblical criticism which, as we have said, is, by way of eminence, *the* vitiating element in the whole work. We find the matter neatly expressed in a sentence that occurs in one of the most instructive, because one of the most philosophical, articles in the volume,—Dr. William P. Patterson's article on "Sacrifice." "Because," says he (p. 530*b*) "of modified conceptions as to the range of the authoritative in Scripture, there has been a growing indisposition to use the Scriptural material as a basis for a dogmatic pronouncement." These words are used with reference only to a specific point,—the origin of sacrifice : but they are very applicable to the whole field, and one feels their applicability strongly as he reads over the theological articles of this volume. Their authors are only too often found sitting loosely to the Scriptural material—looking elsewhere for their safest guidance to truth—and inclined to build their *dogmata* rather on the comprehensive data supplied by "comparative religion" than on the "Thus saith the Lord" of the Biblical declarations.

When we turn to the department of Scriptural history the matter is more flagrant still. It may almost be said that to many of the writers of this Dictionary the historical declarations of Scripture as such have lost all authority. Even Dr. Patterson proceeds to deny to "primitive man" that knowledge of God and sense of sin which are explicitly attributed to him by the Scriptural narrative, and to treat theories of the origin of sacrifice founded on their assumption as by that very fact put beyond the consideration of men of discretion. For the rest, as Professor Archibald R. S. Kennedy, of Edinburgh, somewhat sharply puts it, "the attitude of modern Old Testament scholarship," which denies historicity to large stretches of Old Testament "history," "is patent on every page of this Dictionary" (p. 666, *cf.* 653*b*, 840*b*). At the place quoted, Dr. Kennedy is speaking of the Tabernacle, the "historicity" of which he utterly scouts ; or rather he treats it as ludicrous to speak of its historicity. Nevertheless he is ready to allow that "the idea of the Tabernacle, with its Aaronic priesthood and ministering Levites, lies at the very foundation of the religious institutions of Israel, as these are conceived and formulated in the Priestly sources" (p. 613*b*)—that is in a large section of the Pentateuch ; and further that "several of the New Testament writers see in the Tabernacle the foreshadowing of spiritual realities" (p. 668). To such a pass of contempt has he come for much Biblical data of professedly historical character that he can write : "Little need be said of the views of older scholars, whose method of research was vitiated by their taking the representations of the Priests' code as decisive for the nature and use of these objects [the Urim and Thummin] in the historical period" (p. 840). We shall not raise the question here whether Dr. Kennedy is right or wrong in his estimate of the Priests' code as an historical authority. But there are two things which seem too obvious for discussion. The first is that there is nothing to choose in principle between his attitude towards Scripture as history, and that of, say, Dr. Cheyne : any differences that may exist between his conclusions and Dr. Cheyne's are mere matters of detail in the personal application each makes of common principles. The second

is that the gulf that yawns between Dr. Kennedy's view of Scripture and that of the Christian Church as expressed in its creeds,—say, in the Westminster Confession, which is Dr. Kennedy's own creed—is simply impassable: any agreements in conclusion which may exist here are mere accidents of detail and essentially insignificant.

Dr. Kennedy's attitude towards Scripture is, as he truly says, the attitude of the Dictionary as a whole, and he scarcely exaggerates when he says that this is evident on every page of it. From his article on the Tabernacle we turn for example to the cognate article on the Temple, which is written by Prof. T. Whiton Davies, of the Baptist College at Bangor. Our eye catches at once this sentence about 2 Chronicles: "The history in this book, however sincere and pious, is constructed from the point of view of a Jerusalem Levite of the time after the exile and represents events as they were *regarded*, not as they *were*" (p. 696*b*—the italics are his). Nor is it of Chronicles alone that Dr. Davies treats thus contemptuously. The books of Kings as well as Chronicles tell of certain parts of the Temple being overlaid with gold. "It is probable," writes Dr. Davies, "that the statement about gilding is a late addition in all the above instances, and that in Solomon's temple it had no place. . . . In post-exilic times the wealth of Solomon was greatly exaggerated, just as his wisdom and power were, among Arabs as well as Hebrews, in yet later days" (p. 701*a*). The assimilation of the Biblical histories to Arab folklore in point of trustworthiness does not fall far short of Dr. Cheyne's attitude towards them! Not to multiply other examples let us hear further only from Dr. Driver. "The question which was formerly much debated," he says, "whether the Sabbath was instituted at the close of the creation, or whether it was a purely Mosaic ordinance . . . in the light in which the early chapters of Genesis are at present regarded by scholars . . . has become irrelevant. It is plain that in Gen. ii. 1-3 the sanctity of the seventh day of the week is explained unhistorically and antedated: instead of the Sabbath, closing the week, being sacred, because on it God 'desisted' from His six days' work of creation, the work of creation was distributed among six days, followed by a day of rest, *because*" [italics his] "the week, ended by the Sabbath, existed already as an institution, and the writer (P.) wished to adjust artificially the work of creation to it" (p. 319*b*).

With such passages as these standing on "every page" of this Dictionary: with similar assumptions underlying the great mass of its constructions of history and theology alike: what is the effect, we may well ask, which this Dictionary is likely to have on those who go to it not merely to see how it conceives of and puts things, but to learn from it how men ought to think of what they had fondly believed was the Word of God, and how they are to deal with it in its declarations and assertions, in its threats and promises? If the generations *instructed* by works of this character do not prove generations of unbelief, it will not be the fault of these works. The hope of the church of the future, speaking *sub specie temporis*, lies only in this: that men read and will continue to read the Bible more than the Bible Dictionaries; and that men will come from their experience of life (and of "scholars") more inclined to believe it than them!

We have already said that this volume of the Dictionary is notable perhaps above its fellows for the number of articles on theological themes it contains. These are of varied quality; but are invariably interesting. An opportunity, which has not been fully taken advantage of, was offered the editors in this volume to give us a thorough discussion of the religious life, external and internal, of God's people under both covenants. Within its limits fall the captions Religion, Worship and many subsidiary ones belong-

ing to the same general category, such as Tabernacle, Temple, Synagogue; Sabbath, Sacrifice, Sanctuary; Priest, Prophet, Scribe, Rabbi, Presbyter; Praise, Prayer, Preaching, Teaching. It must be confessed that most of these topics are treated rather perfunctorily and from the scholastic instead of the religious point of view. Mr. Selbie's treatment of "Praise in the Old Testament," for example, is largely philological and archæological; Mr. Lock's of "Praise in the New Testament" is topical and theological; neither gets to the depths of the matter. The scheme of Canon Bernard's article on "Prayer" is historical and we miss in it any real account of the Bible idea of prayer. Dr. Adeney's article on "Preaching" is very slight; and his article on "Teacher, Teaching" adds little to it. The article on "Religion" is a purely formal note on the term by Dr. Hastings. Under the general caption "Worship" we have for the Old Testament nothing but the reference: "See PRAISE (IN O. T.) and TEMPLE." For the New Testament we have a comprehensive but scarcely adequate treatment of the externalia by Dr. Adeney. It is a pity that much more was not made of these great topics and a thorough treatment given us not merely of the objective forms of religious service but of subjective religion as it lies revealed in the pages of Holy Writ.

It is incident to a work made up of articles by several hands that different writers should often announce different opinions on the same subject. This happens in matters small and great alike. We may adduce a single instance in which the difference is not great but is significant. We refer to the divergent views as to the presence of direct Messianic prophecies in the Psalms expressed by the late Dr. A. B. Davidson and Dr. W. P. Davison respectively. Dr. Davidson considers Psalms 2, 72, 110 at least directly Messianic, and sets aside the notion of *typical* prophecy altogether. "The exegesis of Calvin," he remarks, "gave vogue to this method of interpretation, and applied it to passages to which it is scarcely applicable—*e.g.*, Ps. 2, 72. According to this interpretation, Ps. 2 is supposed spoken of some actual King of Israel; but as its language transcends what was verified in any ordinary King, it had a more proper fulfillment in Christ. Ps. 2, however, could hardly have been spoken of an actual King; the universalism of its ideas. *e.g.*, 'The Kings of the Earth' who oppose Jehovah and His Anointed, the extent of the King's inheritance as the Son of Jehovah, viz., 'the nations' and 'the ends of the earth,' and the final kindling of Jehovah's anger, all mark it out as an eschatological and Messianic passage. The same is true of Ps. 72. Very confused language is used by interpreters in regard to these so-called typical prophecies" (p. 124*b*). Dr. W. P. Davison, on the other hand, writes: "The question whether certain Psalms are rather to be considered directly or indirectly Messianic is one for the exegete. It may, however, be admitted that the number of direct prophecies is at most very small, and it may well be that the Psalms contain hardly a single instance. For though Psalmists and prophets had much in common, there were important differences between them. The very attitude of the Psalmist makes it unlikely that he will look directly into the future. The 2d and 110th Psalms are those which partake most of this character, and the 2d Psalm in almost any case (the 110th if the theocratic King is not the speaker but the person addressed) can be most easily understood as only typically Messianic. But the monarch of Israel was a real type, and could seldom or never be considered as the Psalmist considered him, without reference to the substance of which he was but the shadow, etc." (p. 160*b*). We may take it as we like, and think of Davidson vindicating the reality of the direct and of Davison vindicating the reality of the typical prophecy,—so that between them they give us both: or of the one discrediting the one

form and the other discrediting the other,—so that between them they take away both. In any case we shall get little comfort out of it, for neither appears to allow to prophecy anything like all that the prophets claimed for it. The article on "Prophecy" by Dr. Davidson has, indeed, received high encomiums. In these we cannot share. It does not appear to us to represent Dr. Davidson at his best in any way: and as an exposition of the nature of prophecy it is fatally naturalistic in tendency and, if taken at its word, would reduce it in principle to the level of manticism.

We must not, however, linger longer on a book so rich and varied in contents that it would supply occasion for almost endless remark. Besides the editors some 105 writers in all have been occupied in gathering the material here presented us. Two of these are well-known Jewish scholars, Mr. Israel Abrahams and Dr. W. Bacher, of Budapest (who contributes the long article on "Synagogue"). Of German scholars, Baudissin (the article on "Priests and Levites"), Budde (art. "Poetry, Hebrew"), König, Nestle ("Septuagint," "Sirach," "Text of New Testament," "Syriac Versions"), Nowack, Rothstein ("Song of Songs"), Siegfried, and Strack ("Text of the O. T.") have been drawn upon. Their contributions are marked by German thoroughness: but on the whole we think the topics would have been better treated by English-speaking scholars—with less learning perhaps, but more faculty of proportionate estimation. Some twelve American writers appear in this volume: Drs. Willis J. Beecher, Frederick J. Bliss, W. Adams Brown (theological articles treated in a semi-Ritschlite spirit), Selah Merrill, W. Max Müller (Egyptological articles), F. C. Porter (the very long article on the book of Revelation), Harvey Porter, G. Post (Natural History), I. M. Price, G. T. Purves ("Prætorium," "Preparation Day," etc.), G. B. Stevens, B. B. Warfield. The volume contains a map of Canaan as divided among the twelve tribes, and a few illustrations (*e.g.*, under "Pottery," "Tabernacle," "Temple" and the very excellent article on "Writing" by Dr. Kenyon).

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THE HOLY BIBLE, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues; being the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881-1885: Newly edited by the AMERICAN REVISION COMMITTEE, A.D., 1901. Standard Edition. Large 8vo, pp. xvi, 970+xviii, 295+8 and twelve maps. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons [1901].

The issue of the Revised English Bible in the form preferred by the American Committee—twenty years after the appearance of the Revised New Testament and sixteen years after the appearance of the Revised Old Testament in the British form—at last puts before the public the results of the labors of the Revision Committee in their completeness. The long delay in issuing this American revision, as everybody knows, has been due to an agreement with the University Presses of England. Its final issue is due to a natural desire on the part of the American Committee that the results of its labors should be given the world in some completeness and consistency. The points of difference between the British and American revisions are enumerated with some fullness in the Appendices attached to each Testament. In one point of view, of course, they are not very important: and we must always guard ourselves against hysterical overestimation of minute differences, as if the Word of God were not competently transmitted through the ordinary channels of translation through which it has reached the hearts of the multitude of English readers since the Reformation. Lan-