

NOV 17 1913
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITORS

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
JAMES OSCAR BOYD
KERR D. MACMILLAN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD
JOHN DE WITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
JOSEPH H. DULLES

HENRY W. SMITH

VOLUME XI

1913

Published Quarterly for
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION
by
THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, N. J.

meaning of the names John and Judah (pp. 63, 239, 241), the confusion regarding the work of Ashurbanipal (78), the statement that logarithm is an Arabic word (p. 94), the inference that the order of narration must be the chronological order and consequently the event recorded in Gen. xxv. occurred after the death of Sarah (p. 138), the remark that Christ was born during the reign of Tiberius (p. 168), and the like; delight in reading the experiences and impressions of the boy as he rode about Palestine in company with his distinguished father or ranged the hills with his gun in search of game; gratitude at the faith in the Scriptures awakened and confirmed in the author by reason of the minute correspondence between the land, its life, its customs, and the Book, a contagious faith as the reader is apt to find; and joy at the light flashed from nearly every page upon the biblical narratives. Chapters i and ii prove to be the boy's recollections of the trip which the father describes in chapters xxv and xxvi of *The Land and the Book*.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

God's Oath: A study of an Unfulfilled Promise of God. By FORD C. OTTMAN. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, George H. Doran Company, 1911. Pp. 278.

This product of the pen of a lover and diligent student of the Bible, and one whose power as a preacher of it has been proved in many lands, is designed to lead its readers to share the author's view of the fulfillment of predictive prophecy. He is very positive in his own convictions, frankly confesses his inability to understand the point of view of those who disagree with him, and even betrays impatience with equally evangelical interpreters of Scripture, who seem to him by their erroneous opinions to be misleading others and bringing the Word of God into ridicule and abuse. In a word, Dr. Ottman holds that "the kingdom to be established here upon the earth by the Lord Jesus when He returns in glory is the kingdom that God promised to David." Owing to Israel's sin, culminating in the rejection of Jesus at the First Coming, the promises to Israel are suspended and as yet unrealized. With these promises the establishment and spread of the Christian Church have nothing to do. Only when the Church shall have been removed from the earth—caught up to be with the Lord—will the kingdom of David be established, with Jerusalem as its capital and the Holy Land (including Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Syria and part of Egypt and Arabia!) as its seat; then shall be literally fulfilled all the visions of prophet and seer concerning Israel and Israel's King. The author's treatment of our Lord's parables furnishes an excellent illustration of the literalistic type of biblical interpretation.

Princeton.

J. OSCAR BOYD.

ARTHUR DREWS. *Die Christusmythe: Zweiter Teil. Die Zeugnisse für die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu.* Ein Antwort an die Schriftge-

lehrten, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der theologischen Methode. Nebst einem Anhang: Ist der vorchristliche Jesus widerlegt? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Weinel, von W. B. Smith. 1-3. Tausend: verlegt bei Eugen Diederichs, Jena. 1911. 8vo; pp. xxii, 452.

The Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus. By ARTHUR DREWS, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy in the Techn. Hochschule, Karlsruhe (author of "The Christ-Myth", etc.). Translated by Joseph McCabe. Issued for the Rationalistic Press Association [Limited]. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1912. 8vo; pp. xii, 319. \$2.25.

The occasion of this notice is the publication of an English version of the book issued by Drews early in 1911 as "the second part" of his *Die Christusmythe*, which had first seen the light two years before. We have placed the German title also at the head of the notice, not at all as if it were our intention to enter into an extended review of the book itself with respect to its material contents—a proceeding scarcely called for in a notice of a translation; but only as intimating from the outset that the notice of a translation involves some comparison of it with the original. This translation, prepared by that doughty anti-Christian controversialist, Joseph McCabe, and issued as one of the tractates in its anti-Christian propaganda by the Rationalistic Press Association of London, has been imported in sheets and reissued on this side of the water by our most vigorous American anti-Christian publication society, the Open Court Publishing Company, of Chicago. Its shortcomings as a translation are to be charged, therefore, to the British rather than to the American house. These shortcomings are many.

It is doubtless not worth while to dwell on the less attractive form in which the book is issued in English than in German. It is only necessary to remark in passing that, while the German edition is artistically pleasing, of the British and American it can only be said that a serviceable volume has been produced. With reference to the contents, the English edition professes to be "an abbreviated and amended version, for English readers" (p. 14). We have not made a sufficiently precise comparison of the two volumes to detect the amendments. They doubtless concern minutiae here and there. The abbreviation lies open to view. The amount of it is perhaps not unfairly indicated by the difference in the number of pages (nearly 150) between the two volumes, though the English page seems to contain a little more matter than the German. It is at once apparent in the omission of the long and very interesting German preface and of the long Appendix by W. B. Smith in defense of his *Der vorchristliche Jesus* against the strictures of Weinel. It is operative, however, throughout the volume, in the omission here and there of a paragraph, and more frequently in a general compression of the language.

This compression takes not infrequently the form of the elimination of direct allusions to opponents by name, or of fragments of

their remarks incorporated in the argument. Drews wields a keen and tireless blade, and incorporates into his discussion numberless more or less direct and more or less indirect thrusts at his opponents. This sword-play may or may not be deadly, but it adds gaiety to the page, and the elimination of a considerable part of it gives flatness to many a passage which is as far as possible from being flat in the original. This flattening process extends further, however, than is demanded by the compression which has been attempted. It is a general fact incident to Mr. McCabe's method as a translator. For Mr. McCabe does not attempt an absolutely literal version; he allows himself—very properly—a certain freedom in reproducing his author's thought in another tongue. Unfortunately, however in this freedom of reproduction he not infrequently substitutes general for specific terms and phrases, and thus takes away much of the freshness and precision of Drews' language. Thus, to adduce but a single instance, Drews crisply writes of Weinl (p. 185): "He seems not to know that it was not by a Bruno Bauer and Kalthoff, but already by the philosophy of the Enlightenment more than a hundred years before Bauer, in the circle of a Bolingbroke and of the English Deists, that the question of the existence of the historical Jesus was first raised and denied." Mr. McCabe transmutes this into: "He does not seem to know that it was not Bruno Bauer and Kalthoff who first questioned or denied the historicity of Jesus but philosophers who lived a hundred years before Bauer, Bolingbroke and the English Deists" (p. 130),—which preserves no doubt a plain statement of the main matter but loses all the touches which give that statement life.

We must go even further and say that Drews' sense is not always conveyed to the English reader. Thus, for example, when we read (p. 37): "As regards the passage in Tacitus, the simple credulity with which it had hitherto been accepted led to a sceptical attitude—," we have to turn to the original German to learn that Drews is not here assigning an originating cause to the sceptical attitude in question, but only harmlessly recording the historical fact (as he thinks it is) that the simple credulity which has hitherto reigned in this matter "has now given place to a sceptical attitude." So again when we read (p. 13), relatively to the well-known passage in the tractate "Sabbath" of the Babylonian Talmud: "It is possible that we really have here a reference to the text of Matthew—," Drews of course has said not "the text," but "a text;" and when we read on p. 14 that "Jesus, on the contrary, often expressly dissuades from mingling in these quarrels about inheritance," Drews proves to have more truly said only that "Jesus rather expressly refuses to interfere at all in disputes about inheritance." Still again when we read (p. 1) that Trypho said to Justin of the Messiah: "If he was born and lived somewhere, he is entirely unknown," we are not surprised to find that Drews wrote rather: "If he has been born and is sojourning somewhere, he is nevertheless entirely unknown." The matter is made worse by the circumstance that the proof-reader has been somewhat careless, so

that typographical errors enter in further to confuse things. On the page before the Preface three *errata* are noted, and the prominent notification of these bare three may give the reader a very misplaced confidence in the general soundness of the text he is to face. In their immediate vicinity he will find Strack spelled "Strach" (pp. 13, 15), Joël repeatedly spelled Joel (without the diaeresis) (pp. 15, 30, 32, 44, 54), "lost" printed "last" (p. 43 note), "Zeuge" printed "Zewge" (p. 74 note), and such havoc made with a footnote (p. 19)—if indeed it is the printer who is responsible here,—that we have to go to the German edition to learn what it is all about. The reader may perhaps infer that we do not think Drews' book has been placed satisfactorily before its English readers.

This is the more a pity that Drews needs—and deserves—to be placed satisfactorily before his public. It is of course impossible to take his argument seriously. It is not only crowded with absurdities, but it is itself an absurdity from beginning to end. But Drews is the prince of special pleaders and there is a certain pleasure to be derived from following him as he takes his brief and pleads to it up to the hilt. Not a single point is left uncovered, and not a single point but what is covered with layer on layer of reasoning. Paul, for example, knows nothing of an actual man Jesus; but it is not left at that,—Paul's epistles are of doubtful genuineness anyhow. He who undertakes to refute Drews in detail must not expect to triumph by refuting a single line of reasoning. He must refute patiently one after the other every possible and impossible supposition which on the hypothesis that it is true—generally a most violent hypothesis—could make at all for the truth of the main contention. The shiftiness of the man is past belief; you may put your finger on him a score of times only to find that—he is no longer there. In the present volume in which he pays his respects to the assailants of his *The Christ-Myth* his resourcefulness in fence is in full manifestation and compels a reluctant admiration. The reader feels that if only he had a thesis to prove which was capable of being proved, and materials to work with which were real, he would make a master reasoner. A doubt, it is true, insinuates itself. It is after all easy to build "castles in Spain"; and it is not every one that can illimitably weave gossamer who can build at all in solid stone.

We are not suggesting that Drews may be safely neglected. His assault on the historicity of Jesus may be safely neglected; and this elaborate second volume in which he takes up the witnesses to the historicity of Jesus—the extra-Christian witnesses, the witness of Paul, the witness of the Gospels—and "deals with them" *suo more* one by one, only makes it the more clear (if that were possible) how safely it may be neglected. But Drews is not fairly represented by his unfortunate assault on the historicity of Jesus; and, it may well be believed that he will himself after a while look back upon it as the mistake of his life. It is all froth; but in it he is for the moment the most prominent representative of a movement which has real

significance in the confused conditions of our modern life, and beneath it there lies something which has body enough. The contrast between the reception accorded to the assault on the historicity of Jesus of a Bruno Bauer little more than half a century ago, and that which the same assault receives now in the hands of a Kalthoff and a Kautsky, a Jensen and a Drews, gives one, as the French say, furiously to think. A change has taken place in the attitude of thousands to Christianity. There was always unbelief; now there is something more than unbelief,—there is enmity. There was always some enmity,—in a narrow circle of “emancipated spirits”; now there is passionate hate diffused through wide circles of the masses themselves. There was always violent enough attack on this or the other element or aspect of the Christian faith; now the assault is delivered with the *élan* of anticipated victory on the whole Christian position. Possibly there is some exaggeration in the picture of the present situation, which Rudolf Eucken paints in the Introduction to the tractate he has published under the significant title of *Können wir noch Christen sein?* But there can be no doubt that the unchristian world has become in large part distinctly an anti-Christian world; that it no longer stands on the defensive but has aggressively taken the offensive; and that Drews’ *The Christ-Myth* is only a symptom of this general movement. “In this relation,” remarks Eucken, in the midst of his sombre sketch of the present situation, “the Monistic agitation is a significant sign of the times.” It must be borne in mind in any estimate passed upon Drews’ *The Christ-Myth* in either or both of its parts, that this work is to him merely an incident, and merely a negative incident, in his general propaganda. In it he is only trying to clear an obstacle out of the path of the march of his philosophical faith to its inevitable victory. He has been ill-advised in turning away from the positive commendation of the monistic conception of religion to do this piece of clearing work. It is an excursion into a region with which he is unfamiliar and in which he lacks the equipment necessary for successful activity. But it would be a mistake to judge him solely by the flimsiness of his performance here. It is not Drews the credulous retailer of fantastic etymologies and grotesque historical combinations with which the Christian apologist has really to do, but Drews, the leading living disciple of von Hartmann, the strong reasoner from idealistic premises. It is remarkable how even in a book like that before us the tone subtly changes when the last chapter is reached and Drews puts off the armor of Saul and appears in his own person for a few closing words armed only with smooth stones from his own familiar brook. Here there at last comes into view some measure of dignity, sincerity, and strength.

It is no doubt difficult for the reader of the two volumes of *The Christ-Myth* to believe it, but it is important that we should understand that Drews is animated by an earnest and even religious purpose. Yes, even—hard as it is to credit it—in writing *The Christ-Myth*. He conceives himself to be engaged in a struggle in behalf of

the freedom and independence of the human spirit, and indeed for the very existence of religion (p. 4). "The religion of the future" he is assured "will either be a *belief in the divine nature of the self*, or will be nothing" (p. 307); and that there can be "no other redemption of man than redemption of himself, *by the spiritual and divine nature of the self*" (*ibid.*) he feels certain. Filled with zeal for this high—"mysticism," we may be permitted, for the purposes of effect, to call it, though of course it is too purely pantheism to be properly called "mysticism"—he finds Christianity with its emphasis on the separation of man from God, its proclamation of redemption in Another than one's self, its "historicism" as opposed to his "idealism", athwart his path. It must be got rid of at all hazards. "I insist," he declares "that the belief in the historical reality of Jesus is the *chief obstacle to religious progress*; and therefore the question of his historicity is not a purely historical, but also a philosophic-religious question" (p. 307).

We must even go so far as to allow that there is a certain measure of justification which may be pleaded for Drews' berserker rage against "Christianity", and for his violent arraignment of it as an obstacle to religion, perhaps the chief obstacle to religion in our day. For we must bear in mind that it is not the Christianity of Christ and the Apostles, of the suffering and triumphing church, which he has in his thoughts, but that so-called "Christianity" of the "Liberal Theology", which has usurped its place in the German academic circles in which he lives and moves and has his being. We shall never understand Drews until we fully realize that the notion against which he is directing his shafts is that which holds not only that the whole great religious movement which we call Christianity is rooted in a mere human life that was lived in Palestine two thousand years ago and then, like other human lives, passed away, but that men are still to-day dependent on the influences of that merely human life for their religious inspiration and vitality. It is this that he has in mind when he exclaims, "What a situation it is when the deepest thoughts of the modern mind must be measured by the teaching of Jesus, and referred to a world of ideas that has nothing to recommend it but the antiquity of its traditions and the artificially engendered appreciation of everything connected with it" (p. x)! Against such a notion he has the right to protest, and as against it his protest is sound. He is perfectly right when he declares: "The earlier Christian literature is acquainted with a Jesus-God, a god-man, a heavenly high-priest and Saviour Jesus, a metaphysical spirit, descending from heaven to earth, assuming human form, dying, and rising again; but *it knows nothing whatever* about a merely human Jesus, the amiable author of fine moral sentiments, the 'unique' personality of liberal Protestantism" (p. 59). He is perfectly right when he asserts; "There is not one single early Christian document that speaks not of the God-man Jesus Christ, but unequivocally of the mere man Jesus, which modern liberal theology conceives him to have

been" (p. 131); and adopts Ernst Krieck's plea: "Precisely because the liberal theology has constructed its Jesus in contradiction to the entire Christian tradition, we have a right to ask for the proof; precisely because, as Weinel admits, records are lacking for its Jesus, such as are ordinarily used to prove the reality of historical personages, the demand for proof is not so absurd as Weinel represents it to be" (*ibid.*). He is perfectly right when he explains more at length; "From the first Christianity meets us not as the religion of the historical man Jesus, but as the religion of *the superhistorical God-man Jesus Christ who has only passed through history*. He it is who is represented as having appeared to a Paul and revealed Himself to him as the true Saviour. His figure also shines clearly enough through His human clothing in the Gospels, the purpose of which is certainly not 'subsequently to lift to a heightened sphere the life of the historical Jesus, by means of imaginary myths and stories of miracles, but vividly to bring home the superhuman divine nature of Jesus by a historical presentation.' That God Himself exchanged His heavenly glory for earthy humility and lowliness, that Christ was the 'Son of God' and descended to the earth, that God stripped Himself of Himself, took the form of man, led a life of poverty with the poor, suffered, was crucified, was buried, and rose again, and thus mediated also to men the possibility of resurrection, the forgiveness of their sins, and a blessed life with the heavenly Father,—*that is the mystery of the figure of Christ*, that is what this figure has brought to the hearts of believers, what has stirred them to ecstatic reverence for this deepest divine revelation" (p. 297). Of course Drews in accordance with his extreme Idealism, which makes nothing of personalities in history and finds the "idea" all-sufficient for every effect sublimates this figure of a Divine-human Jesus into a mere idea; this is his fatal error. But he is perfectly right in insisting that it is this Divine-human Jesus or nothing: that there is not a particle of historical justification for the merely human Jesus of the "Liberal" theology, and that it is a degradation of Christianity and a deadly blow at religion to find in this purely imaginary merely human Jesus the central point and impelling source of all of our religious life.

Professor Shirley Jackson Case of the University of Chicago has lately warned us against making common cause with "the extremists who would wipe the historical Jesus entirely off the slate" (*The Historicity of Jesus*, 1912, pp. 29-30). "When the conservatives rejoice over the fate which the Jesus of liberal theology has met at the hands of these modern radicals," he writes, "they would seem to be sounding the death knell of their own Christological views. For if the earthly Jesus must go, how much more completely must any supposed reality of a supernatural Christ be abandoned!" This reasoning lacks a little in stringency. It is not "the earthly Jesus" which "must go" but only the *merely* earthly Jesus. And the reason why the merely earthly Jesus must go is that there is not the smallest

scintilla of historical evidence that he ever existed and there is not the smallest necessity for his assumption discoverable in the religious development of the race or the religious life of the individual. The reason why the Divine-human Jesus does not "go" with him is that His existence is historically testified to by evidence which is overwhelming, that He is historically necessary to account for the religious life of the world for two thousand years and indeed for the whole course of historical development since His life on earth, and that His real existence is historically verified in the experience of thousands of men living in every region of the earth to-day. The possibility of the denial of the existence of Jesus is dependent upon the obscuration of the Divine-human Jesus by the merely human Jesus of modern "Liberalism": Drews and his compeers are the legitimate offspring of the "Liberal theology." Without the discrediting in wide-circles of the evidence for the existence of the Divine-human Jesus for whom alone is there historical evidence this new radicalism could never have arisen; and the "Liberal theology" must not be permitted to repudiate the fruit of its own loins. It is a great evil that this obscuration has taken place and men have been led to imagine that a merely human Jesus is the only Jesus whose actual existence in the world it is worth while to consider. But it is a good work that Drews and his compeers have wrought when they have called men's minds sharply back to the realization that there is no evidence that such a merely human Jesus ever existed. That therefore no Jesus ever really existed is a violent *non sequitur*, which may safely be left to take care of itself. Why should the Jesus whose existence is certain be discarded, because the Jesus whose non-existence is certain is freshly perceived to be impossible?

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Historicity of Jesus. A criticism of the contention that Jesus never lived, a statement of the evidence for his existence, an estimate of his relation to Christianity. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, of the Department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press. 1912. 12mo; pp. vii, 352. \$1.50 net; \$1.62 postpaid.

The descriptive sub-title sets forth the purpose of this volume as threefold. It is "a criticism of the contention that Jesus never lived, a statement of the evidence for his existence, an estimate of his relation to Christianity." We learn from the Preface that the emphasis is to be thrown upon the second item: "The main purpose of the present volume is to set forth the evidence for believing in the historical reality of Jesus' existence upon earth" (p. v). The first item is included only "by way of approach" to this; the third only in order briefly to indicate "the practical bearing of the discussion." The book thus finds its occasion in the contention that Jesus never lived to which considerable vogue has been given during the last decade, and undertakes to refute it. We must confess to some surprise