

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X.

JULY, 1912.

NUMBER 3.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

By the "Social Question" we mean those "scattering problems", such as "the family, philanthropy, industrial life, racial divisions and collisions", which grow out of the relations of men to each other. The inquiry, then, before us is, What is the duty of the church with regard to this group of questions?

Few subjects could be more important, and certainly none could be more pertinent. Prof. Stein has remarked¹ that as the fifteenth century had for its task the renaissance of art, and the sixteenth century the reformation of religion, and the seventeenth century the development of science, and the eighteenth century the promotion of democracy; so the task of the twentieth century is to be the reformation and reconstruction of the social world. "A new renaissance," he says, "must break upon the modern world, a deliverance from the gloom of pessimism, which is the symptom of an overworked and weary period; a transformation of the instincts of social evolution into rational laws; a quickening of the glad and confident service of the social world as it is and as it is to be". Such a prophecy Prof. Francis Greenwood Peabody pronounces² "too restricted to cover the infinitely varied life of the twentieth century". "Other problems", he rightly says, "are pressing besides that of social redemption." 'Art seems likely to receive fresh attention. Religion is more widely applied than it was. Democracy must be redeemed by more democracy.'

"Yet even if one may hesitate to prophesy about a cen-

¹ *Die soziale Frage im Lichte der Philosophie* 1897, p. 773.

² *The Approach to the Social Question*, p. 1.

tiful illustrations which ornament the earlier volumes, naturally, are lacking in this—which deals with Calvin's thought; we have only, as a frontispiece, the fine Rotterdam portrait of Calvin. But the proof-reading has fallen perceptibly off too. This is not so noticeable in the main part of the volume (though foreign proper-names are too often misspelled there too) as in the Appendix. Here there are a great many misspellings of foreign proper names, some also of foreign common nouns, and indeed some confusions of nationality in the text itself. An "auteur anglais" is very apt to prove to be an American; a "professeur americain" to prove to be a Briton. The greatest fault we have to find with the volume, however, is that it has no Index!

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

MONUMENTA REFORMATIONIS POLONICAE ET LITHUANICAE. Pages xiv, 201. Wilna. 1911.

This volume contains a number of documents concerning the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania, ranging in date from 1561 to 1599. It is the first of a proposed series, edited by members of the Reformed Synod of Wilna. The first document is a reduced facsimile of Calvin's letter to the Synod of Wilna, occupying the first page, dated Geneva 9 Octobris 1561. The neat penmanship indicates an amanuensis, with Calvin's own signature in conclusion, in a very different hand. The letter is a courteous but faithful warning against George Blandrata. The address is: Eximiis Christi Servis Ministris et Senioribus Ecclesiae Vilmensis, fratribus mihi conjunctis et vere honorandis; and his concluding words are—Valete fratres ex animo dilecti et colendi. Dominus vos spiritu suo gubernet, virtute invicta sustineat, donisque omnibus locupletet. Such documents have a present practical value, in convincing Presbyterians of Anglo-Saxon antecedents, that this venerable Reformed Synod of Wilna or Vilna, with an unbroken history since Calvin's day, deserves our sympathy and co-operation.

Troutons, Missouri.

CHAS. E. EDWARDS.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS AND THE THEOLOGICAL CHRIST. By J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., D.Theol. Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1912. 12mo, pp. 231.

The Unitarians must seem to themselves to be coming to their kingdom. All the world appears to be now of their way of thinking; the weapons of their warfare are forged to their hand in the traditional workshops of orthodoxy, and they scarcely need even to furbish them to fit them for their polemic. The volume now before us is issued by the American Unitarian Association, and is enlivened here and there by a turn of phrase which preserves the flavor of the old Unitarian controversialists and reminds us that their son is still engaged in the

old battle. But for the substance of it, it might emanate from any of the schools of "scientific" theology which serve the so-called "evangelical" churches. It is significant of the breaking down of the barriers which used to divide essentially different points of view, that this Unitarian controversialist, in the preface to his story of the origins of Christology, sends those of his readers who wish a fuller account of the matter than he has been able to give in his four addresses, to a Jew's commentary on the Synoptic Gospels and a German Lutheran's philosophical estimate of Jesus Christ. Throughout the volume the material is drawn from the leaders of thought in the "orthodox" churches, and there is even betrayed in the treatment of the general theme a comfortable sense of moderation, as of one who is able to set himself between two extremes and to tread safely the path of a *via media*. The old radicalism has become the new conservatism.

The four addresses of which the volume is composed are intended, as we are told in the Preface, "to give to those unacquainted with the details of historical study some insight into the results of modern investigation in the Gospel-field, and some knowledge of the process by which the ecclesiastical conception of the person of Jesus Christ was slowly formed." They are entitled, respectively, "the Historical Jesus", "Jesus and the Kingdom of God", "the Theological Christ", and "the Doctrine of the Two Natures"; and in their sequence they survey the development of Christology up to the Chalcedonian decree, with a sort of Appendix on recent views. The first two addresses deal with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels who is interpreted as an admirable teacher of morals and religion—so admirable that His "figure is still central in the history of religion" (p. 14), though His life has been enveloped, by those who have preserved accounts of it for us, "in a radiant haze of myth" (p. 15). The two subsequent addresses undertake to trace the process by which this admirable teacher, who in the form of His teaching did not transcend His own time, has been transmuted by His followers into a divine Being. The former of them traces the process of His deification, from Paul to Nice; the latter recounts the efforts which have been made to adjust to the human character which belonged to Him the new divine dignity which had come to be ascribed to Him, from Nice to our own day.

In dealing with the "historical Jesus" of the Synoptics Dr. Carpenter feels impelled first of all to establish the reality of such a being. Here he joins issue with the new radicalism which has found its most winning expounder for the present in Arthur Drews. Jensen he brushes with little ceremony aside; Drews' high religious purpose he recognizes, but laments his tendency—in common with his companions in his undertaking to abolish Jesus from history—to depend on broken reeds. The mythical veil is already cast over the figure of Jesus in the Synoptics; but even a mythical veil must have a substantial figure beneath it to support it. Mark comes from a time shortly after the overthrow of Jerusalem in A. D. 70; Matthew and Luke were probably written before

A. D. 100—though Matthew may have received additions even later—and behind them were a collection of teachings, doubtless earlier than Mark. None of the three is, properly speaking, a life of Christ; they are all “edifying narratives explanatory of the origin and claims of the church.” But through their idealizations a real figure looms, and “the large mass of the teaching which the first three Gospels contain” may be confidently held “to proceed from a real person.” The nature of this teaching is its own credential; much extraneous matter has no doubt “been absorbed into the Evangelic traditions,” but there is an individual note running through it and nothing could be more absurd than to speak of it as a mass of “Jewish commonplaces”. “The ultimate guarantee for the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth” lies indeed in this teaching, and “the victory of Christianity over the Roman empire was won implicitly when the first collection of Jesus’ words was written down.” Certainly Jesus of Nazareth was a man of His time, and “the time-form” of His teaching has been “shattered”. But it was “the vehicle of an immense moral impulse” and “it does not lose its worth when its time-form has been shattered.” “Be it that He accepted the title of Messiah; be it that He announced the speedy coming of the Son of Man; be it that the end of the age did not arrive—this may prevent us from worshipping Him as God ‘out of God,’ it does not impair the elements of His thought and word, His character and work, which experience confirms.” In them there is a moral and spiritual force which is unspent to-day, and “it is the task of modern liberalism to disengage this force from the ideas and hopes through which it was first conveyed, as well as from the dogmatic forms by which it was subsequently circumscribed.” What has been abiding in Christianity and has “preserved it from being stifled by a vast mass of alien importations.” has been “its moral and religious ideal, the constant challenge of a higher and holier character, impersonated in a great historical figure so that all could see.” And “the spirit of life which was in Jesus Christ, will continue to inspire man’s best efforts for human progress.”

Unfortunately the church has not been content with this. It has transmuted the “prophet of Nazareth” into “true God out of true God”; the process has been long but it has advanced steadily and very surely. We may see its beginning very clearly in Paul. He does not indeed make Jesus God; but He “raises the exalted Messiah above every other superhuman rank.” Even John does not make Him quite God; according to him, “His being was not indeed absolute or self-existent, it was bestowed on Him by the Father”, but “the Son, though he expressly affirms the superior greatness of the Father (xiv. 28) is nevertheless in some high sense a partner in the divine life.” It remained for Origen to invent the doctrine of “eternal generation”, and thus to make Him partaker of the divine immortality and sharer in God’s substance; and from Origen to Nice the path was short. But after Nice there did not come peace; rather “a fresh crop of theological problems.” How shall this essential deity of the Son be adjusted to the humanity

of Jesus? Men are still struggling with the puzzle. Here is the theory of Kenosis, with its accumulated absurdities. And last of all here is Dr. Sanday with his supraliminal humanity and subliminal deity—a theory which Unitarians indeed “might welcome with sincere good will.” Such endeavors to explain the inexplicable, to reconcile the irreconcilable, are well-meant; and they bear their testimony to the supreme value to the world of Christ—and the Christlike. If God is to reveal Himself to us it must be through our humanity. “Paul saw the divine glory in the face of Jesus Christ; and many a lowly disciple, doubtless, as he listened to the unwearied preacher of God’s love for man, saw the same glory shining in Paul’s face. God, said the apostle, was reconciling the world in Christ unto himself. Was not the work extended in the ambassador who pleaded his Lord’s cause; in martyr and confessor, and in the humble and lowly of heart who have all added their contribution to the great process? For wherever thought and life are spent in loving service for the simplest ends of human good, there the ministry of Jesus is continued.”

To this running account of the course of the argument of the book we shall add no comment. We are interested to observe the criticisms passed on the modern theory of Kenosis, which are in the main sound; and the estimate placed on Dr. Sanday’s subliminal theory—the humanitarian character of which is quickly detected. There is little that is individual in the general discussion; what is presented is just the current “liberal” interpretations, in a somewhat crass form but in unusually sprightly language. As in other “liberal” writers, the evolutionary schematization is given preference over the facts of the record. A single instance may be adverted to. It is provided by Rom. ix. 5. Paul is explained as not yet making Christ God. But there stands Rom. ix. 5! This is the way Dr. Carpenter deals with it: “In the face of these and other facts it seems impossible to believe that the apostle could have intended to identify the Messiah with ‘God blessed for ever’ (Rom. ix. 5). As he elsewhere applies this adjective only to ‘the God and Father of the (our) Lord Jesus (Christ)’ (2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3), and to the Creator (Rom. i. 25), I cannot think that in this passage he departs from his usual practice. More than half a century ago Prof. Jowett pointed out that as the apostle nowhere else calls Jesus God it is extremely unlikely that he did so in this solitary passage. Had he so regarded him, he would have used the designation more frequently.” In point of fact, however, Paul does call Jesus “God over all, blessed for ever” in this passage. Dr. Carpenter does not attempt to find another meaning for it. He merely declares that he cannot believe it means this. Nor is this the only passage in which Paul calls Jesus God. Dr. Carpenter does not tell us how he understands the language of Phil. ii. 6. Nor does he cite in this connection Col. ii. 9. Oddly enough he cites instead Col. i. 19 and comments as follows: “The statement of Col. i. 19 that the Fulness was pleased to dwell in the Son”—which is not the most likely construction of the passage—“cannot identify him with

Deity, as he is expressly called 'the first born of creation'—which again is not the most likely application of the words. "Even in his pre-human state, therefore, he belonged to the order of created beings, preceding the rest of the powers and objects of the world." We must pronounce this shrewd exegesis rather than sound exegesis. One of the odd views expressed is to the effect that, with John, the incarnation takes place at the Baptism (Jno. i, 32, 34) and is the same as the endowment with the Spirit. "If this interpretation be correct, the Son of God enters the human scene when Jesus of Nazareth becomes the Messiah through the gift of the Spirit without measure (Jno. iii. 34) from above. It is in virtue of this endowment that Thomas can address him as 'my Lord and my God.'" This is to ascribe to John what Dr. Sanday teaches,—as Dr. Carpenter sees (p. 226).

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

THE SOCIAL TASK OF CHRISTIANITY. A Summons to the New Crusade. By Samuel Zane Batten, D.D., Professor of Social Science, Des Moines College, Chairman Social Service Commission Northern Baptist Convention. 8vo, pp. 234. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1911.

"This little book has a twofold object. It seeks, first, to appraise the changes that are taking place in the world and to interpret the will of God for this generation as it is revealed in the processes of human society. And it seeks, second, to define the special task to which the Christian discipleship is now fairly committed, and to suggest the program and method by which the purpose of God as expressed in Jesus Christ shall become a FACT in the life of humanity. It is written in the confidence that Christianity is essentially a social religion, that the kingdom of God in the Christian conception of things never means anything less than a human society on earth, that the supreme task before the men of good-will to-day is the creation of a better and more Christian type of human society, that the needs of the world in this time demand that men's personal, social, industrial and political life as a whole be transformed and Christianized, that, in a word, the superlative duty of men to-day is the Christianization of Christendom" (p. 8). With much in Professor Batten's conception of and summons to "The New Crusade" just outlined in his own words we find ourselves in heartiest sympathy. Certainly Christendom needs to be Christianized. That is, our civilization, though inspired by the Spirit of Christ, waits to be dominated by Him. Certainly the civic corruption and the social evils in even our own most favored land demand radical reformation. We do not think that our author exaggerates them. Indeed, he has stated them, particularly the vice and injustice and cruelty and poverty that are rampant in our great cities, more temperately than we could have done. Certainly these appalling social conditions must create an atmosphere most adverse to both civic and personal righteousness. We should go so far as to say fatal to either without the intervention of the omnipotent Spirit. Certainly the attack