

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 4—October, 1904.

I.

THE GREAT AWAKENING AND ITS RELATION TO AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY.

JONATHAN EDWARDS and John Wesley were born within a few months of each other in the year 1703. The recent celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of their births has recalled attention to the great religious revival in the English-speaking world in which they were central figures. This remarkable movement derives also a practical interest from current discussion on the subject of revivals, and from the systematic effort being made by our own and sister Churches to revive aggressive evangelism.

The term Great Awakening has long been applied to that revival of religion in the American colonies which was contemporary with the beginnings of the work of the Wesleys in Great Britain. The chief personal bond between the two branches of this evangelistic movement was George Whitefield. And the date usually given as central to the revival in America is 1740, the year in which Whitefield made his first tour through New England. Then the two branches of the movement, independent in origin, came into friendly contact and coöperation, and thereafter their essential similarity was generally recognized.

Although the Great Awakening is usually regarded as having begun at Northampton, yet revivals identical with it in spirit had been in progress for a decade or more under the ministry of Dominie Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, who in 1720 began his fruitful labors among the Dutch settlers along the Raritan.

At the beginning of their career the Wesleys were much influenced by the Moravian Pietists, and it would seem that Frelinghuysen

been accustomed to say that pure Lockean empiricism in epistemology is reducible to blank agnosticism. Empirical science, stripped of all *à priori* metaphysical presuppositions, is not science but nescience. Plato may have gone too far with his *Ideas* and Kant with his *Forms*, but that the mind has its active part in cognition, which, although not creative, is formative and systematizing, is a principle which twentieth-century philosophy will be very reluctant to surrender. But how much Mr. Walter is willing to yield to that principle, and how much and how well he resists it, does not fully appear in this volume; doubtless he has stated his views more fully elsewhere.

Trenton.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

II.—APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY.

EVOLUTIE OF REVELATIE. Rede bij de overdracht van het Rectoraat aan de Vrije Universiteit op 20 October, 1903, gehouden door Dr. H. H. KUYPER. Amsterdam en Pretoria: Hóveker en Wormser [1903]. 4to, pp. 131.

They cast their Rectoral-addresses in large moulds in Holland. Dr. H. H. Kuyper, following the example of his illustrious father, whom we have all learned to honor and love, has chosen a large subject and has treated it largely. The address itself occupies only forty-eight pages of the book in which it is printed: the remaining pages are closely packed with an immense body of "notes," supporting the statements of the text and revealing a wide learning and a thorough ransacking of the literature of the subject. Dr. Kuyper expresses, indeed, his regret that he could not leave to a specialist the handling of the topic he has felt drawn to deal with, and asks the indulgence of his readers for the spectacle he feels he must present after pushing through a very thorny pathway over which few tread without torn garments. His modesty does him credit; but so does the result of his incursion under the stress of a duty to his special public into a region not quite his own. No specialist could have shown a fuller acquaintance with the literature of the special topic undertaken: and we may be allowed to add that no specialist could have found his way better among the multitudinous details to the really salient facts or have thrown up into higher relief the really important lessons.

The subject that has attracted Dr. Kuyper's attention so powerfully is that "Panbabylonism" that has recently thrust itself so forcibly into notice, and on the basis of which we are threatened not only with a reconstruction of the whole history of culture, but with a new form of naturalism in religion of indefinitely more speciousness than that which it is striving to replace. For Dr. Kuyper fully accepts Friedrich Delitzsch's brusque "either—or": "Either Divine Revelation in the sense of the Church, or gradual historical (human) development." And he fully recognizes that the new naturalism has this great advantage over its predecessor, that it at least roots itself in objective facts rather than in subjective criticism, and therefore makes an appeal to reason which the so-called Higher Criticism could never attain. He does not suppose, to be sure, that the ideas of Evolution and Revelation are necessarily mutually exclusive: he is quite ready, on the contrary, to contend with Prof. Zenos in the *Princeton Theological Review* for July, 1903, that Revelation itself exhibits an organic development. But he is not at all inclined to permit himself to be blinded by that fact to the direct contradiction to the whole conception of Revelation presented by the new presentation of Christianity as an evolution from Babylonian beginnings. Granted that Christianity may be conceived as the endpoint of a long development, the question is whether this development is the result of God's

reaching down to men, revealing Himself to them and leading them by slow stages, as they were able to bear it, to the full knowledge of Himself; or of man's reaching upward to God, creating for himself his own religion, until he could at last declare to his God, "I have made thee in my own image." Dr. Kuyper recognizes that the latter standpoint is the standpoint of the new "Panbabylonism," and sets himself to exhibit and test the basis on which it rests.

One of the most engaging features of Dr. Kuyper's treatment of his subject is its excellent balance. Though clearly and firmly taking his standpoint from the full revelation-character of the Christian religion and the Scriptures on which it is based, he does not permit himself to exaggerate the methods or results of the process of either revelation or inspiration. He protests rather against the mechanical conception of either. Only in one single passage does he seem to us, even in the slightest degree, to fall away from this admirable poise. That is when, in the midst of a justly conceived and finely expressed protest against the tendency abroad among us to overestimate the importance of extra-biblical attestations to faith, he adduces the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* in what seems to us an unguarded because too undefined a manner. "The evolutionary-hypothesis," he remarks, "by common consent stands or falls with the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of Israel's traditions. And although for God's children this trustworthiness does not depend on a clay tablet from Babylon or a papyrus roll from Egypt, because they have in the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* an immovable foundation for their faith in the Scriptures, it is, nevertheless, a powerful weapon for Christian apologetics that thus far these discoveries have in a most brilliant way vindicated the *fides historica* of the Old Testament." It might be possible to gain the impression from this allusion that the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* was delivered to the heart of the child of God independently of all other evidence, and not (as is really the fact) concursively with other evidence. Nowhere else, however, is there the slightest tendency to exaggerate the supernatural elements of religion in their modes of operation.

Nor is there anywhere the slightest tendency exhibited to minimize the nature or the amount or the value of the discoveries of modern research. If nothing else, Dr. Kuyper's firm grasp of the Reformed doctrine of Common Grace would have preserved him from temptation to do this. "As to the affiliation of Israel's language, culture, coinage, measures and weights with Babel, I say nothing," he remarks. "Even here, no doubt, the school of Delitzsch speaks exaggeratedly; but this matter is of no importance for Revelation. Such an affiliation might be inconceivable for the Anabaptist conception of Israel as a new creation, standing entirely outside of the life of the peoples; from the Reformed standpoint it raises no difficulty whatever. The *gratia specialis* rests on the *gratia communis* and takes it up into itself." Accordingly we find him careful to recognize not only all the facts brought to light by the new investigators, but also all the truths involved in them, making the most of them, and building up his argument for the revelatory character of the Christian religion in their full light. It is not because he sees in the new theories the silliest of all theories of the evolution of Christianity, for which least can be said, that he makes them the occasion of a renewed defense of the Christian religion; but, on the contrary, because he sees in them the most specious of all theories, for which the most can be said. "If I pass by other hypotheses of derivation," he remarks, "and confine myself to Babel alone, that is because I, too, am convinced that in Babel lies the key of the position. . . . Make what discount you please on account of the perverse overpressure of Panbabylonism; there nevertheless lies in it a kernel of truth, which we must not disavow. . . . Babel is the mother of the peoples. And however far her children may have wandered from her, they bear still the family likeness." Prof. Kuyper is accordingly generous in his recognition of the facts established and gains made. He has no wish to underestimate the wonders

wrought by the human intellect and skill of Babylon. He only denies that human intellect and skill can account for the divine content of the Christian religion, and gives his compelling reasons for denying it.

When we speak of the scientific value of Dr. Kuyper's illuminating discussion we must take account of the "Notes" as well as of the text of the discourse itself. These notes are in compass much greater than the text, and several of them attain a length which gives them the value of separate discussions. They cover a very wide field and give the reader not only a pretty full bibliography of the Panbabylonian debate and related questions, but a succinct discussion of most of the important points involved in this debate. The readers of this REVIEW will be gratified to know that its contributors have not been neglected by Dr. Kuyper in his study of the question before him. In particular, he pays a high tribute to Dr. Wilson's article on "Babylon and Israel," in the number of this REVIEW for July, 1903. From this article Dr. Kuyper draws repeatedly, and when speaking of its main contention adverts to it as follows: "I refer here only to the admirable article of R. D. Wilson in THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, where, on the basis of comparative philology, it is shown how little Israel was dependent on Babel in its world of thought. In very truth this proof is 'striking.' When spiritual dependence is found, then men borrow—as our own language shows—along with things and ideas, also the words. The fact that Israel, for its jurisprudence and culture, its psychology and religious conceptions, used entirely different words to Babel, shows that in Israel, on the common basis of Semitism, a wholly peculiar life was built up." We have allowed ourselves to quote this judgment not only to gratify our proper pride, but to illustrate the care and discrimination with which Dr. Kuyper makes use of the authors quoted by him in his notes. This feature of his work renders his notes very valuable to the reader who would fain find his way in the voluminous literature of the subject. He could scarcely find a better guide than Dr. Kuyper.

We thank Dr. Kuyper for his admirable address and we congratulate the Free University of Amsterdam upon securing to its service such a son to a distinguished father, as Dr. Kuyper's published writings shows him to be. With him we join heartily in the wish *Vivat, crescat, floreat academia!*

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

ULTIMATE CONCEPTIONS OF FAITH. By GEORGE A. GORDON, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1903. 8vo; pp. xix, 399. \$1.30 net.

We have here the Yale Lectures for 1902 on the Lyman Beecher foundation, although generously enlarged and supplemented for the printer. Dr. Gordon's theological position as that of a leader of the newer thought is well known. His message is substantially unchanged, and the reader who has read his former books and is acquainted with his point of view can predict with pretty fair accuracy what he would have to say upon any given subject. It hardly seems to us that the title of this volume correctly indicates its theme. It suggests final categories and raises expectations of abstract and comprehensive generalizations. But we do not find these. Dr. Gordon addresses himself to preachers and views the theological landscape from the place of the man he himself is—not the dry speculative or analytical thinker, but the minister of the Gospel, in contact with men, the pastor whose business it is to commend truth and comfort to his own flock.

He says there are two kinds of theologians, professional and non-professional; and while he concedes a large place and work to the former, yet he holds that the latter are always the leaders in religious thought as well as in religious life. Mere scholarship may embarrass productive activity and may impair real efficiency