

NOV 17 1913

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.

"interpretation" of Christ and Christianity will "work" as the old has worked? And what justification is there derivable from history for calling the new Christ, Christ, the new Christianity, Christianity? The new "interpretation" stands out of all relation to fact,—whether the facts of history or the facts of experience. The Christ which it offers us is not the Christ of the historical tradition; the Christianity it teaches is not the Christianity which has conquered the world; nor can the Christ and Christianity which it provides meet the needs of sinful men. Its idea of sin must be deepened, its idea of salvation must be heightened, its conception of the function of Christ in salvation must be illimitably enlarged, before this "Christianity" can possess the slightest historical claim to that name, or become in the slightest degree glad-tidings to a sin-cursed race.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Historic Jesus. Being the Elliott Lectures delivered in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. By the Rev. DAVID SMITH, M.A., D.D., Professor of Theology in the McCrea-Magee College, Londonderry. New York and London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1912. 12mo; pp. iv, 119.

The Western Theological Seminary is to be felicitated upon the admirable course of Elliott Lectures which it has shared with the world in this delightful volume. Professor Smith has chosen a living subject and has treated it, if somewhat slightly, yet with insight and grace. Readers of *The Expositor* will recall, in its volumes for 1901, a series of articles from his pen bearing the general title of "Recent New Testament Criticism" in which the topics here dealt with are discussed at somewhat greater length, and, from which indeed the present lectures have been extracted and popularized. They were worth repeating; and in their repetition here a greater unity has been given them and a wider appeal. What Professor Smith has undertaken to do is to vindicate the Jesus of the Evangelists against the attacks of modern naturalistic criticism, as the really historical Jesus; or, as he himself puts it, "to reassure ourselves of the trustworthiness of the evangelical records, that we may enjoy the certainty that their testimony is true, exhibiting our Lord as He appeared to the eyes of His contemporaries." Addressing, however, a general audience, he has eschewed "the intricate and fascinating problems of New Testament Criticism," and elected rather "to pursue a line of argument, which," as it rightly seemed to him, "is at once simple and effective, instituting a comparison between the Evangelic portraiture as it stands and the pictures which the decadent imagination of the second century produced." Two of his five lectures, at least, are devoted to this comparison, the former of them adducing for this purpose the Apocryphal Gospels and the latter, the heathen religious romances of the time. These are preceded by a brief account of the critical contention, which supplies the starting-point for the argument, and are followed by lectures in which the self-evidence of the

uninventible Evangelical portraiture and the evidence of the experience of the living Jesus are adduced. The whole forms an apologetic of great attractiveness and it is worked out with the aid of a rich body of literary illustrations and in a charmingly simple and flowing style.

We shall not attempt to follow Professor Smith's argument throughout. We need not deny ourselves the pleasure, however, of calling attention to one or two passages of exceptional beauty. Such is, for example, the appeal to the success of the Evangelists in depicting a supernatural life as a proof of its reality (pp. 34-35). The writers of the Apocryphal Gospels were no mean artists. They exhibited a fine imagination, not unworthy of comparison with that of Dante or Raphael. But for the task they had undertaken imagination will not suffice. "It was not for lack of art that the writer failed, but rather for this—that he attempted the impossible task of dealing imaginatively with the supernatural." How then "did it come to pass that when others with every resource of genius and art disastrously failed, our Evangelists have so conspicuously succeeded? The reason is simply this—that they were not creators but historians; they were not dealing imaginatively with the supernatural but reporting an actual manifestation." A similar passage sets aside finally the notion that our Jesus was the creation of Paul (pp. 87-88). "When men make themselves a God they always fashion him in their own likeness—St. Paul was a Pharisee, and, had he been the Creator of the Evangelistic Jesus, he would have made Him in the likeness of a Pharisee. It is unthinkable, and contrary to all our knowledge of him, that he should have risen so far above himself as to conceive that transcendent ideal. . . . To conceive so divine an ideal he must have been himself no less than divine, and it remains that we should transfer to him the adoration which we have paid to Jesus." The evidence of experience is treated with unwonted caution and convincingness. "Here," Dr. Smith concludes (p. 117), "lies the supreme and incontrovertible evidence of the historicity of the Gospels. The final decision rests not with the critics but with the saints; and their verdict is unanimous and unfaltering. They know the Divine Original, and they attest the faithfulness of the portrait." Decidedly this is a book to enjoy.

As no human work is quite perfect it is our duty to point out, in closing, that Dr. Smith's Elliott Lectures are not impeccable. Here and there there is a slight slip; here and there a phrase or a statement which we deprecate. It is not quite fair to Schmiedel to speak of his nine "foundation-pillars" as "all that is left—this shattered remnant of that precious heritage the Evangelic Tradition" (p. 11); Schmiedel's nine passages are only his starting-point in seeking credible elements in the Evangelical narrative, not his ending-point. Luke does not speak of the Evangelical writers who preceded him in the depreciatory tone which Dr. Smith attributes to him (p. 27). The Evangelic miracles can not be said with strict accuracy to have been "always works of mercy and compassion" (p. 38). The legends

of the Apocryphal Gospel of Thomas cannot be properly described as "rank Docetism" and "a denial of the Incarnation" (p. 40): they are examples of the grossest kind of mythologizing, but they have nothing to do with docetism and they assert the incarnation in the strongest way. To say that "our Lord in the days of His flesh was not God walking the earth in the semblance of a man," comes perilously near (when taken in Dr. Smith's sense) to contradicting Paul's "being made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man" (Phil. ii. 8): the whole passage, as also one or two others, asserts the Lord's true manhood in the days of His flesh with too little regard for His coexistent true Diety. There is an unhappy passage (p. 41) of which we cannot say less than that it slanders the God of Israel as "jealous" and "vindictive," with proof texts from Exodus and 2 Samuel; after which it is a small matter to add that the closing words of the same paragraph (p. 42) slander the Pharisees; it is bad enough that the Pharisees accused our Lord of working His miracles by Satanic help without asserting that the reason why they thought these miracles Satanic was that they were deeds of mercy—nothing was to be looked for from God except terrible things. We see no justification for the crude criticism of the Gospel text illustrated in the note at the foot of p. 74: and we doubt the justice of certain remarks on p. 83, and strongly deprecate the insinuations on pp. 84-90 that the Evangelists "frequently misconstrue" our Lord and possibly "were liable to error and subject to the deflections of contemporary opinion and personal prejudice" in their reports of Him. It is an odd use of terms when we are told (p. 93) that "demonstration" "can never attain to more than probability;" and we do not think that Dr. Smith quite exactly apprehends Calvin's and the Reformed doctrine of the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti* (pp. 105-106). That is to say, there is some chaff mingled still with Dr. Smith's wheat, and the reader must winnow it away, if he desires only good grain.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Resurrection and the Life. A Study of the Resurrection and Ascension Narratives in the Gospels, and of the threefold Version in the Acts of Christ's Appearance to Saul on the Way to Damascus. By G. HANSON, M.A., D.D., New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1912. Pp. xi, 372. \$1.00 net.

"The purpose that the author had in view in writing this book was to lead all, whom his words may reach, to a deeper and firmer sense of Christ's victory over death, and of His close comradeship with men to-day as yesterday." After a characterization of various naturalistic theories of the resurrection and a statement of certain preliminary considerations touching the general subject of miracles, the relation of body and soul, the hypothesis of coma, and the honesty of the Apostles, the historical objections urged against the New Testa-