

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII

APRIL 1910

NUMBER 2

MODERN POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

During the last few years considerable interest has been aroused in theological circles in Germany over a movement which goes by the name of "Modern Positive Theology" or "Modern Theology of the Old Faith". This movement has originated in the conservative camp. Its demand is for a theology which shall preserve the Gospel or the "Old Faith", and restate it in terms of modern thought. It is contended that the modern liberal theology has really destroyed the Gospel in its attempt to modernize it, while the old evangelical theology has erred in identifying the Gospel with worn out forms of theological thought in which from age to age the Gospel has found expression. The Gospel or the Old Faith, it is said, can be maintained in its integrity and given a theological formulation which shall render it intelligible to the "modern consciousness"—whatever that may be. The leaders of this movement are General Superintendent Theodor Kaftan, and Professors Seeberg of Berlin, Grützmacher of Rostock, and Beth of Vienna.

In order to understand this movement it is necessary to take a brief survey of the theological situation in Germany.¹

¹On this subject *vid.* F. Traub, *Aus der dogmatischen Arbeit der Gegenwart*, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* XVI, pp. 429-483; also E. Troeltsch, *Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theol. Wissenschaft*, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jahrg. 51, N. F. 16, Heft 2, pp. 97-135.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

PHILOSOPHY.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M. A., D. D. Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Member of the Council of the Palestine Exploration Fund, Editor of 'Dictionary of the Bible' and 'Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels'; with the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M. A., D. D., and other scholars. VOLUME II: ARTHUR-BUNYAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910; 4to; pp. xxii, 901.

The first volume of this great undertaking, which appeared in the autumn of 1908, was noticed in the number of this REVIEW for April, 1909 (VII, ii, pp. 326-332). If any of our readers are as yet uninformed of its general features and character, they must be referred to that notice; where also they will find suitable admiration expressed alike for the comprehensive conception of the work and the general excellence of its execution. Here we can only say that the second volume fully sustains, perhaps more than sustains, the promise of the first. If we can trust the catalogue given in the list of authors (and our rapid counting), there are something like 265 separate articles in the volume, which yields the large average apiece of three and a third pages of about 1,500 words each, that is to say of about 5,000 words to the article. These 265 articles have been written by about 169 authors, the majority of whom (125) are represented by only a single article apiece. These authors belong to no single nation, though the majority of them are, as is natural, British. About twenty of them are Americans: G. A. Barton, J. B. Carter, J. L. Gerig, L. H. Gray, H. D. Griswold, T. C. Hall, E. W. Hopkins, A. V. W. Jackson, T. B. Kilpatrick, D. B. Macdonald, W. T. Marvin, J. C. Murray, L. B. Paton, Josiah Royce, C. G. Shaw, G. Showerman, E. D. Starbuck, B. B. Warfield.

Having mentioned our own name here, we take the liberty of pausing to ask the reader to correct an error which has crept into the article — that on "Augustine" — which we have contributed to the volume. On p. 223, first column, line 7, instead of "William of Occam's *Defensor Pacis* and", read: "William of Occam, the *Defensor Pacis* and". As we correct this error, we are led to remark on the exceedingly good proof-reading which the volume exhibits. In some rather extensive

reading in it we have not chanced upon another instance of obvious typographical error. The whole workmanship of the volume is, indeed, very fine. We make an exception of Professor Von Dobschütz's long article on the "Bible in the Church", which has been very disagreeably translated. A certain inconsequence in the consecution of the sentences in the former half of this article, making the sense obscure, we conjecture to be due to the translator. We can safely attribute nearly anything to a translator who makes his poor author speak of a "concordance" when he means a "Harmony" (p. 588a), and of "Alcuin's interchange of letters", when he means his whole "correspondence" (p. 595b), as well as reproduce *suggestio rerum et verborum*, by "the matter and the method" (p. 589a), represent "Passover" as a Hebrew derivative (Dr. von Dobschütz means "Pask") (p. 611b), and talk of Griesbach and Hug "labouring more fully the scheme of text-recensions" (p. 594a, *cf.* p. 590a)—whatever that may mean. We have not noted similar incompetences in the translation of other foreign articles.

The strength of the volume—perhaps this is characteristic of the whole work—does not lie in its articles on subjects connected with the Christian religion. These do not take a place in the volume proportionate to the importance of Christianity among the religions; nor are they always written with the objectivity which characterizes those which deal with topics connected with other religions. The great article in this volume appears to us to be Professor Otto Schrader's comprehensive and careful study of "Aryan Religion" (pp. 11-57). Contrast with this, whether in method or in presentation, the articles on the "Bible"—the chief articles on a Christian theme in the volume. There are three of these, all written from the same one-sided standpoint of hostility to the Bible's own account of itself and the historical belief of Christians as to their Sacred Books.

The fundamental one of these three articles, bearing the simple title of "Bible", is from the facile pen of Dr. William Sanday, and is written with all his wonted grace and skill. It is, nevertheless, let us say it frankly, a most disappointing article, presenting merely the current "critical", that is to say, destructive, view of the composition of the Bible, punctuated here and there with an individualism of Dr. Sanday's. In working out his view of the origination of the Bible, Dr. Sanday does not hesitate to invent facts when he needs them in order to "naturalize" supernatural occurrences: "Just as there survived throughout the East the indistinct memory of a great destructive flood of the Euphrates or the Tigris, so also within a narrower circle there must have survived the memory of some portentous volcanic eruption, which the folk-lore of Israel came to associate with the greatest event in its religious history" (p. 565a). Probably it does not mean quite so much in his mouth as it would in other circumstances, therefore, when he remarks of the codifiers of Israel's law: "The writers do not hesitate to set down not only what is, but what they think ought to be" (p. 566b). Nor does it seem to shock him as it shocks us when he feels bound to say that when Moses gave out his own decisions and laws as

"oracles of God", this was true of them only as it is true of the decisions and laws of all legislators; that is to say, as the immanently working God is in all attempts to do righteousness: "The laws given by Moses were not given in his own name but in the name of God, and they were accepted in the same sense by the people as coming from God. In precisely the same way Hammurabi is represented as receiving his laws from the seated sun-god Samas, 'the judge of heaven and earth'. . . . It is the common ancient conception to which all the habits of thought are adapted; and who shall say that it does not express substantial truth" (p. 565b-566a)? That Dr. Sanday still attaches to such a book as he conceives the Bible to be the quality of "Inspiration", means, thus, very little: of course, he reads out of that term all that it has been understood hitherto to express. To speak of such a book as infallible were absurd: nor can it be thought of as "in the strict sense authoritative" (p. 578a). But it may remain to us a religious book, even an intensely religious book. And that is the fact which Dr. Sanday wishes "to express in the doctrine of Inspiration". We may be thankful that he leaves us even so much, and we gladly cite the very strong words in which he asserts the uniqueness of the Bible's religious character: "There is impressed upon the writings which make up the Bible a breadth and variety, an intensity and purity of religious life, that are without parallel in any other literature in the world" (p. 579a). Dr. Sanday does not, of course, in this article tell us how he conceives the religion of Israel to have come into being. Readers of his article "God" in the *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* will be prepared to meet, however, with hints that he looks upon the process as essentially a naturalistic one. We quote a single passage in which he expresses the remarkable view that idolatry is not a natural but an artificial crime, created only by positive law: the religion of Israel "began, like the religions of the nations around, with the cult of sacred stones and trees; it tolerated the use and worship of images. . . . These things should not be thought of as idolatry. They did not begin to be idolatry until the revelation contained in the Second Commandment had been clearly given and clearly apprehended" (p. 564a). How little this accords with the Bible's own view of the matter, those who remember the philosophy of idolatry set forth in the first chapter of Romans will not require to be reminded. If we conceive all religions as the product of the functioning of the religious nature, and all functioning of the religious nature as intrinsically admirable, we cannot avoid coming into flat contradiction with the whole Biblical point of view which sets in sharp contradiction to one another God-given and man-made religions.

By the side of Dr. Sanday's article is placed the extensive article on the "Bible in the Church" (pp. 579-615), by Professor Von Dobschütz, the bungling translation of which we have already been led to mention. The scope of this article is very wide, essaying no less a task than the exhibition of the whole "influence which the Bible has exerted upon the Christian Church and the life of Christian peoples as a whole"; and the mass of interesting facts which it accumulates is very

impressive. But it is not only badly translated, but ill-organized, and cannot be said to rise to the height of its great argument. In its earlier sections it parallels Dr. Sanday's article, the views of which on the origin and authority of the Bible it repeats. Near the end it has a section on "Misuse of the Bible", which is in turn paralleled by the third article on the Bible, Professor A. Dorner's article on "Bibliolatry" (pp. 615-618). On p. 616b, near the bottom, "Reformed Churches" should be "Reformation Churches".

Next to the articles on the Bible, the most extensive articles on a Christian subject are those on "Baptism". There are three of these, too, and the division of the subject here too has not been managed without some lapping. To Professor J. V. Bartlet has been assigned "Baptism" in the New Testament (pp. 375-379); to Professor Kirsopp Lake, "Early Christian Baptism" (pp. 379-390); and to Mr. Herbert G. Wood, "Later Christian Baptism" (pp. 390-406): while articles on so-called Baptism among other religions precede and follow. Professor Lake has interpreted his commission in such a manner that he traverses again the whole ground covered by Professor Bartlet, and, indeed, formally divides his article into two almost equal parts, treating respectively of Baptism in the New Testament and Baptism in the first and second centuries. It is curious to note the agreements and divergencies of the two writers, each working on strictly "scientific" lines in the same field. They are agreed that baptism was derived by the Christians from the Jews, through John the Baptist, and very decidedly that it was not instituted by Christ, both writers appealing to 1 Cor. i. 16-17 as a decisive proof that Christ could not have spoken the words attributed to him in Mat. xxviii. 19,—a view which overlooks the double fact that baptising is a subordinate matter in Christ's commission and the denial by Paul that he was sent to baptise is only relative. Professor Bartlet thinks that with the stress laid on the family as the social unit in New Testament times, it is perfectly certain that infants were baptised,—the only possible doubt being whether the child might not be regarded as vicariously baptised in the baptism of the parent. Professor Lake holds, on the contrary, that "there is no indication of the baptism of children" in New Testament times. With respect to the mode of baptism, the two writers agree that not much stress was laid on it in New Testament times: Professor Lake considering that, though immersion was doubtless "regarded as an ideal", "it must remain doubtful whether it was ever actually practiced", while Professor Bartlet holds that, though "the form was not held essential", yet "immersion seems to have been the practice of the apostolic age". In the course of his remarks on Later Christian baptism Mr. Wood makes it evident that he believes primitive Christian baptism to have been by immersion and not to have been administered to infants, sketching what he believes to be the rise and progress of the practices of affusion and of infant baptism in later ages. In these sketches he mistakes phases of the later history of these practices—as, for example, the legislation in the fifth century making infant baptism obligatory, in correction of the reaction against it due to the deep sense of the

pondus baptismi which had grown up—for signs of the late origin of practices the antiquity of which they presuppose.

Besides these articles, there are few of doctrinal interest in this volume. These include a somewhat rambling article on "Atheism", a very informing article on "Asceticism", excellent articles on "Blasphemy", "Body", and "Blessedness", interesting articles on "Brotherly Love", "Book of Life", and "Assumption and Ascension", and a mediocre article on "Backsliding". The articles on "Belief" treat it purely from the philosophical and logical standpoint, "Faith" being postponed for later discussion. There is a short descriptive article on "Beatification". On the whole, the impression is received that the *Encyclopaedia* is not particularly strong on the doctrinal side.

On the other hand, the biographical articles strike us as particularly attractive. Some of these—perhaps relatively too many—are given to Oriental names. "Buddha" was, of course, inevitable, as likewise "Bab", and so possibly was "Asoka": and all of these are treated interestingly. We might possibly have spared "Asvaghosa" and "Atisa" and "Badaragama", "Al-Ashari" and "Baquilani", if they were to crowd out greater names of the West. Of the leaders of Western culture, we begin with "Berosus", of whose *History of Babylon* a serviceable brief account is given. A good article is given to "Basilides" and the "Basilidians" (pp. 426-433). Among the Church Fathers only "Athanasius" (a careful rather than striking article) and "Augustine" find a place; and among the mediaevals, only "Berengar" and "Bernard",—both good articles,—together with the Arab philosophers "Avicenna" and "Averroes". An informing article is given to "Jacob Boehme", a disappointing double-headed one to "Richard Baxter", and an altogether admirable one to "John Bunyan". "Bacon", "Berkeley" and "Bain" among the philosophers are adequately dealt with. And finally there is an interesting account of "Banerjea". We do not profess to possess the clue to the principle which has governed the selection of names for insertion, by which, for example, in an *Encyclopaedia* of this kind, Berengar and Bernard alone of the mediævals are chosen, and Bonaventura, say, is left,—Alexander Bain and K. M. Banerjea alone of moderns are chosen, and Jeremy Bentham, say, for example, left. We confess we expected to find Boetius among the chosen; perhaps also Baius and Balmez and Bellarmine and Bossuet, and Baader; certainly Joseph Butler, and indeed even Beza and Butzer.

It is to be acknowledged that if we are deprived of some articles we might have expected, we are given in this volume, too, a number of articles we should scarcely have anticipated would find a place in an encyclopaedia specifically of religion and ethics. The very interesting article with which the volume opens, on "Arthur, Arthurian Cycle", is one of these, its interest lying purely in the region of literature. The article on "Biology" (pp. 621-635) is one of the most informing conceivable; but we are sorely puzzled to know on what grounds it claims a place for itself in an encyclopaedia of religion and ethics. We would not have missed reading the instructive article on "Blindness", but we should never have looked for it here. The same must be said

of the admirable articles on "Atomic Theory", "Axiom", "Attraction and Repulsion"; of such purely psychological articles as those on "Association" and "Attention", and of such purely biological ones as those on "Atavism" and "Biogenesis". We are not saying that the editors may not have a reason for including such articles and excluding others which to us seem more proper to the particular scope of this encyclopaedia. We are only saying that our stupidity has not divined this reason. We frankly confess it—were we editing such an encyclopaedia we should have made a place for an article on "Beatific Vision", even at the expense of the no doubt very excellent article on "Atrophy".

We must not close without saying a word in appreciation of the care with which the "Literature" which follows each article has been compiled—a care which extends not only to the choice of the books which are recommended to notice, but to the accurate indication of the bibliographical details.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

THE CHILD AND HIS RELIGION. By GEORGE E. DAWSON, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy. 8vo.; pp. ix, 124. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1909.

"The material of this" attractive little "book is largely drawn from magazine articles and addresses already given to the public." Nevertheless, it does not, as the author fears, lack unity. "To bring the so-called natural processes of life and education into harmony with the religious processes" is manifest throughout as "the central aim of the writer".

Chapter I discusses "Interest as a Measure of Values" and shows how important it is that in education generally, and particularly in religious education, the likes and dislikes of children should be considered. This is not to overlook the fact that much of life must be uninteresting. It is to recognize that "interest increases effort"; and that "if the life has been made strong through achieving its ends along the lines of its desires, it will face the occasional hard and uninteresting tasks in the joy of mastering difficulties". To us this doctrine, while easily and often abused, breathes the same spirit as the petition which our Lord taught us to offer, "Lead us not into temptation".

Chapter II treats of "The Natural Religion of Children". It finds in them an instinctive belief in spirits, in God, in immortality, and in faith and goodwill. There could scarcely be more striking illustration of the universality of the religious nature than we observe in these pages. It is interesting, too, to note that it is in the instinct of causality that the author discovers the root of the child's belief in a personal God. Thus one at least of the often depreciated theistic proofs is confirmed at his hands.

Chapter III treats of "Children's Interest in the Bible". After the manner of the psychologist of religion, it presents a mass of statistics setting forth the preferences of children of both sexes at different ages for different parts of the Bible. These statistics are fairly con-