

JAN 19 1911

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

JANUARY 1911

NUMBER I

ON THE ANTIQUITY AND THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

The fundamental assertion of the Biblical doctrine of the origin of man is that he owes his being to a creative act of God. Subsidiary questions growing out of this fundamental assertion, however, have been thrown from time to time into great prominence, as the changing forms of current anthropological speculation have seemed to press on this or that element in, or corollary from, the Biblical teaching. The most important of these subsidiary questions has concerned the method of the Divine procedure in creating man. Discussion of this question became acute on the publication of Charles Darwin's treatise on the *Origin of Species* in 1859, and can never sink again into rest until it is thoroughly understood in all quarters that "evolution" cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at best can supply only a theory of the method of the Divine providence. Closely connected with this discussion of the mode of origination of man, has been the discussion of two further questions, both older than the Darwinian theory, to one of which it gave however a new impulse, while it has well-nigh destroyed all interest in the other. These are the questions of the Antiquity of Man and the Unity of the Human Race, to both of which a large historical interest attaches, though neither of them can be said to be burning questions of to-day.

The question of the antiquity of man has of itself no theological significance. It is to theology, as such, a matter of entire indifference how long man has existed on earth.

DIE VERSCHIEDENEN TYPEN RELIGIÖSER ERFAHRUNG UND DIE PSYCHOLOGIE.

Von D. WILH. SCHMIDT, ord. Professor an der Universität Breslau.
Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann. 1908. 8vo., pp. iv, 318.

Dr. Wihl. Schmidt, to whose colleague at Breslau, Prof. G. Wobermin, the German translation of James's *Varieties of Religious Experience* is due, has taken this book as the starting point of an investigation of the relations of psychology to research in the sphere of religious phenomena. His work, as it lies before us, falls into three parts which may be headed in turn, briefly, "James," "Psychology," "Religion," the intention of the whole being to arrive at a well-grounded conception of what may be expected of psychology as an aid to the understanding of religion. That psychology, the sphere of whose observation embraces the whole spiritual world, cannot neglect so great and universal a spiritual phenomenon as religion, goes without saying. That the study of religion cannot afford to turn its back on any source of light upon its problems is equally clear. That the two lines of research should coöperate lies therefore in the nature of the case. The only question concerns the manner of their coöperation. James's book has the value of a first reconnaissance of a great, and hitherto as good as unknown, field of research, and as such has a distinct pedagogical significance. What it chiefly teaches us, however, is how not to do it. We cannot reach the specifically religious feeling by way of examination of merely assumed kindred moods, analogous feelings, fixed ideas, morbid states of mind. When we are saying this, we are setting aside, however, not psychology but James's method, for the study of religion. Nevertheless psychology cannot expect to say the last word with reference to religion; whether in its origin, or in its development and its stages, religion stands outside the reach of science, which always finds religion extant, however far it stretches its investigations,—a thing to be acknowledged rather than dominated by it. No one can pass judgment on such a phenomenon, except one who knows it from his own experience. And it follows from this that there can be no such thing as a universally valid explanation of religion. This is the result of the peculiarity of religion, which, as an actual experience, is and abides an individual thing. So far, however, as this inner experience manifests itself in common traits seen in different cults, and shows tendencies to similar lines of development through the historical evolution of religious cults, it may become the object of scientific study, and here psychology will find an ever enlarging sphere. These are in brief Dr. Schmidt's conclusions, after a very thorough and detailed discussion of the whole field, presented of course from his own particular standpoint, which is fundamentally that of the old mediating theology with an emphasis on individualism and the autonomy of the will peculiarly his own.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.