

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.

marian" in reference to the special educational work that he did in the England of his day. He might, also, be called the Abbot of Winchester and Abingdon, two of the great monastic centres of the time. It is fitting, therefore, that Mr. Gem dedicates his book "To all readers who desire the promotion of Christian Education."

The volume opens with a brief review of Early Monasticism and Old English Literature, with special reference to the Chronicle and to the disastrous effects of the Danish Wars. After an account of Aelfric's life, the author states some of the Doctrines of the Early English Church and quotes at length from the "Homilies" of Aelfric and from his "Life of Saint Ethelwold", whom he calls "father and noble teacher."

Next to Alfred the Great this Old English Abbot was the most representative man of his time, taking up and carrying on much of the work of his great forerunner, a man as gracious in spirit as he was proficient in learning. Identified with the great monastic revival under Dunstan, he did much to reform the church of his time and point the way to better things for England. Mr. Gem has done the modern world a good service in calling attention to the life and writings of this Early English saint and scholar, and he has done wisely in making his book little else than a collection of quotations from the Abbot's works.

In Aelfric's "Translation of the Pentateuch", there is a "Preface on the Old and New Testaments" nothing less than remarkable from an old Romish monk. The volume may be heartily commended to all Christian students.

Princeton.

T. W. HUNT.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

The Person of Christ in Modern Thought. The first series of Donnellan Lectures for the Year 1911-1912. By E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, M.A., Litt.D. London: James Clarke & Co. 1912. 8vo; pp. 419.

A thorough discussion of the doctrine of the Person of Christ in the light of modern research is just now very much needed. A discussion, that is, which, holding in firm grasp all the elements of the problem, and proceeding with full knowledge of what has been done towards its solution during two thousand years of Christian thinking, shall pass in review and give a well grounded estimate of the suggestions made during the last hundred years towards modifying or elucidating the conclusions in which the Church has acquiesced since the Council of Chalcedon. Dr. La Touche's Donnellan Lectures make a very distinct contribution to this discussion. The scope of the survey they have been enabled to give of modern discussions has no doubt been somewhat narrowed, and the mass of details they have been able to adduce and examine has been somewhat lessened by the mere fact that they are a body of lectures; for in the nature of the

case lectures must be to some extent general and discursive. But Dr. La Touche has cast his eye widely enough over the field, and has embraced in his discussion a sufficient number of the more salient details, to make his survey essentially complete; and he has prosecuted his work in a temper so generous to new points of view as to assure us that nothing of great value in recent discussion has failed of recognition. We feel ourselves, as we read, in the hands of a competent guide, and we rise from the reading of the book with a sense of satisfaction. The result to which it conducts us, it must be confessed, scarcely justifies the description of the last century which Dr. La Touche gives of it in his Preface—"the second great Christological epoch of the Christian churches" (p. 11). Vigorous and suggestive as the debates which have filled its whole extent have been, they have yet, as Dr. La Touche has very clearly shown, left things very much where they were before. After a century of active criticism and attempted reconstruction, the Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ remains, in its integrity, the only construction which the data will permit.

What has characterized the last century as an epoch in Christological discussion is the persistent attempt, which has been made throughout its whole course, to interpret the Person of Christ in terms of humanity. Dr. La Touche is inclined to look upon this as a natural, perhaps a necessary, reaction from a one-sided emphasis on our Lord's deity, and to bid us learn from it a juster conception of our Lord's manhood. "Great as were the excellences of the old theologians of all confessions, and profound as was their thought," he remarks (pp. 214, 216), "they were virtually docetic in their emphasis upon the Lord's Deity to the practical exclusion of His Manhood . . . Now, the labours of the modern age have effectually changed all this. The immense stress laid upon the Manhood of Christ by the negative critics and the forcing of believers to face the facts which has been one of the results of the free discussion of modern times have meant that we have been constantly brought into contact with the fact of the Manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ and that its various phenomena have become part of our daily thinking." We cannot share this judgment in either of its particulars. It seems to us to do injustice to the Reformed divines to say: "It would be quite impossible to say that they paid any attention to the Manhood of Christ as the Subject of development or as a Fact of religious experience. The Christ they knew was a Christ so exclusively Divine that His Humanity was practically devoid of all reality" (p. 215 note). They rather appear to us, in well-guarded reaction from the one-sided emphasis on the deity of our Lord which characterized much of mediaeval thinking concerning Him, and in contrast at once with the insufficient reaction of the Lutheran theologians (to whom nevertheless we owe a great debt for their insistence on the Divine Majesty of Christ) and the radical reaction of the Socinians (who made our Lord as great a man as a mere man could be) to have held the

balance true and to have done justice alike to our Lord's true Godhood and to His equally true and complete Manhood. To whom, for example, has the Manhood been more profoundly "a fact of religious experience" than, say, to Jonathan Edwards, although of course, with him the deity of His Lord is not forgotten either. "We may feel the most profound reverence and self-abasement," we read in one of Edward's numerous illuminating passages (*Works*, Dwight's Ed. I. p. 482), "and yet our hearts be drawn forth, sweetly and powerfully, into an intimacy the most free, confidential and delightful. The dread so naturally inspired by His greatness is dispelled by the contemplation of His gentleness and humility, . . . and the sight of all His perfections united fills us with sweet surprise, and humble confidence, with reverential love, and delightful adoration." Naturally the Reformed divines know nothing of a merely human Christ, but a merely human Christ was never "a Fact," and, had it been a fact, could never be a "Fact of religious experience." We must not be deterred, either by the exaggeration of the Lutheran divinizing of the humanity of Christ through the actual communication to it of divine attributes, or by the current tendency to exaggerate the limitations of the humanity which God the Son assumed into personal union with Himself, from recognizing and realizing the unspeakable exaltation which was conferred upon the human nature of our Lord through its elevation into participation with the life of God. The humanity of our Lord was never an ordinary humanity: even in His infancy He was an extraordinary child (Lk. ii. 40-52) and in His manhood He was not altogether like other men,—for one thing, He was without sin. We do not ourselves indeed like this negative characterization; and we do not think Dr. La Touche well-advised in preferring to speak of our Lord's "sinlessness" rather than of His "holiness" (p. 232). Of course the holiness of His human nature was capable of growth and did grow,—nay, let us say it all, is still growing and will continue to grow for ever, for human holiness can never be all that "the absolute and tideless holiness of the Divine Being is". But our Lord's holiness even in the days of His flesh was holiness in its whole positive idea; and by it our Lord in His human nature met the demands of His own command to His followers that they should be "perfect as their heavenly Father is perfect." Nor does the attribution to Him of this Divine τελείωσις "destroy the reality of His Manhood". It only recognizes the uniqueness of His Manhood. And in this indeed, we take it, Dr. La Touche would fully accord with us, for does he not tell us that our Lord "holds Himself up as the Moral Ideal to His followers . . ." (p. 242)? He who, in His human manifestation, was our Moral Ideal, cannot be fitly characterized by the merely negative predicate of sinlessness.

The formula with which Dr. La Touche serves himself, in attempting to conceive the method of the Incarnation, is accepted by him (with an important correction) from Bishop Weston, and is summed up in the one word "Limitation,"—"limitation not abandon-

ment." "The assumption of a continuous act of Self-limitation on the part of the Word," he thinks, "meets all the demands of Scripture" (p. 389)—"a continuous act of Self-limitation" which is otherwise expressed as "an act of continuous Self-restraint", or "a continuous act of Self-sacrifice." This he sets over against the theories of depotentialization of the Kenoticists including even Bishop Weston's modification of them by the substitution of the idea of self-limitation for that of self-emptying. In this he is undoubtedly on solid ground, for nothing can be clearer from the Gospel record than that our Lord rather voluntarily refrained from employing His divine powers in His walk from day to day than was unable to employ them by reason of an initial act by which He had stripped Himself of them. We think, however, that Dr. La Touche pushes matters too far when He tells us that "the Subject of our Lord's Manhood was not the unlimited Logos" (p. 391); and that our Lord, while certainly conscious of His deity, "seems to have been only conscious of it within the limitations of manhood" (p. 386)—a statement which we find some difficulty in understanding. When pushed so far, the idea of our Lord's *continuous* Self-restraint, *continuous* Self-sacrifice is again lost, and we have in its stead a single act of what Dr. La Touche speaks of not inaptly as "Self-paralysis." We must preserve in our thought of our Lord in the days of His flesh the conception of the Infinite God confining Himself in His earthly manifestation by a voluntary self-restraint within the limits of the human life which He willed to live. He did not make the stones in His pathway bread, not because He could not but because He would not; He did not descend from the cross, not because He lacked the power to do so, but because He willed not to do so. If we would make the conception of "Self-limitation" serve its purpose as our instrument of interpretation we must in all of its applications do justice to it as positing precisely Self-limitation in contrast with Self-abandonment or Self-paralysis.

Dr. La Touche's first series of the Donnellan Lectures consists of four lectures, two of which, however,—the second and third—have been much expanded for printing, and all of which have been supplied with copious notes. The first lecture may be looked upon as a general introduction to the course, designed to establish the point of view. Its title is, "Christianity and the Modern World-view," and its effect is to substantiate the scientific character of theological inquiry. Conceivably there may be some who will not be interested by it: we exhort them to persevere, for when this lecture is over the book becomes undeniably interesting and most rewarding reading. The three remaining lectures investigate successively in the light of modern criticism, the quality of our Lord's humanity, the truth of His deity and the unity of His person. As they do this, however, by means of a broad and sympathetic review of modern discussion the two former ones of the three receive the more descriptive titles, respectively, of "The Person of Christ and the Negative Criticism of the Age," and "The Person of Christ as Revealed in History."

In the second lecture which extends to nearly two hundred pages, the start is taken from the Enlightenment and the conceptions of the human Jesus which are presented by Strauss and Baur, the older Liberalism and the later Liberalism, whether in its German, French, or English representatives, are carefully ascertained, and then criticised, with an earnest desire to accredit to them all that can be justly accredited to them, but also with great penetration and balance of judgement. The verdict passed upon the outcome of the hundred years of criticism is to the effect that with the best will in the world to present us a purely human Jesus, it has not succeeded in drawing a consistently human portrait of Jesus, so that a deep discontent with its results has sprung up, which reveals itself in its own ranks both in an upward movement (Reinhold Seeberg and the Modern Positive School) and in a downward movement (represented by P. W. Schmiedel), and, outside the limits of the Liberal School technically so-called, by a corresponding dual movement, downward (Kalthoff and the whole body of those who can do without any Jesus) and upward (the Eschatological School inclusive of Modernism). A new beginning is taken at this point and the German Eschatologists (Johannes Weiss and A. Schweitzer) and the Modernists (Leroy, Loisy) are carefully studied in the portrait they draw of Jesus, and its reality shown to be inconceivable. As the conclusion of the whole matter, the failure of the long-continued and sustained attempt which characterizes the nineteenth century to eliminate the supernatural from its conception of Jesus is pointed out, and the claim is put in that "the whole course of modern criticism has resolved itself into a negative vindication of the faith of the Gospel." "To-day, it is possible for us to vindicate the character of the Lord Jesus Christ as sinless and holy by the testimony of the negative critics; to assert, with none, to challenge us, the perfect character of His moral teaching; to declare with the full approval of the leaders of the opposing forces that the strength and virtue of the faith is to be found not in teaching; nor even in example, not in doctrine nor in practice, but in the ineffable Personality of our most gracious Lord and Saviour" (p. 225).

The method of the third lecture—which is nearly a hundred pages long—takes us back to the Synoptic Gospels and invites us to survey the Self-witness and claims of our Lord as they are there reported. The conclusion that is reached is that "from the merely human point of view, our Lord's Self-consciousness differed from that of all other men in that It was sinless; that, from the historical point of view, He read His destiny in terms of the Messianic conception, which, however, He transformed and spiritualized at every point; and, finally, that from the point of view of His essential character and Being, He conceived Himself to be the ontological Son of the Most High God, as 'being of one substance with the Father'" (p. 294). In the discussion which leads up to this conclusion naturally a great many of the utterances of our Lord are brought under consideration, and among them His several Messianic titles, the Christ, the Son of David, the

Son of Man, the Son of God. The discussion of the two latter of these is especially interesting and individual. "The Son of Man" Dr. La Touche thinks was neither a Messianic title nor yet an assertion of representative manhood; it was derived from the Isaianic prophecy of the Suffering Servant, and may therefore be considered to embody a soteriological reference. In developing his view of the meaning of "the Son of Man", Dr. La Touche seems to us to speak exaggeratingly of our Lord's so-called concealment of His Messianic claims. According to the record, not only of John but of the Synoptics, our Lord announced Himself as Messiah from the very beginning of His ministry. His charging of His disciples not to make Him known (p. 266) was not a universal prohibition, but belongs to historical conditions in the developing of His ministry. When Dr. La Touche declares that had He published His Messianic claims "His career would not have lasted three weeks," he seems to us to generalise too widely. "The Son of God," on the other hand, Dr. La Touche looks upon as, primarily at any rate, only a Messianic designation; we do not think this can be made good. The conclusions arrived at from a study of our Lord's self-consciousness are supported by adducing certain subsidiary evidence, derived from Christ's self-assertion, His mighty works, and the miracles of His virgin birth and resurrection, and from the Apostolic testimony.

In the final lecture the problem of the union of the two natures in one person is attacked and the chief modern attempts to solve it are examined—the Kenotic theories, the theory of Progressive Incarnation, the Ritschlian Christology, and Dr. Sanday's subconscioussness-hypothesis which Dr. La Touche characterises as conceiving our Lord's deity as a *donum superadditum*. Here too the criticism is acute and illuminating and the construction sound. An occasional remark, no doubt, strikes us as less well-considered than the general drift of the reasoning. We cannot agree, for example, when we read: "There can be no doubt that the older Christological thought of the Nicene type" (why should it be called "Nicene"?), "tended to obscure the greatness of the Self-sacrifice involved in the Incarnation by reading it as Divine condescension instead of Divine Self-sacrifice" (p. 352), nor can we even think the opposition of the notions of "condescension" (*condescensio seu demissio Jesu Christi*, was an old phrase) and "Self-sacrifice" just. A condescension—a stooping to a lower level than our native atmosphere—is in the nature of the case a Self-sacrifice. Nor can we agree that we can take over from the Kenotists the idea that "our Lord's Self-consciousness as Incarnate differs in some sense from the Self-consciousness of the Pre-existent Word" (p. 353) if by our Lord's Self-consciousness as Incarnate be meant the Self-consciousness of the Logos and by the term "differs" is intended that it has suffered some "limitation": if anything different from this is meant, then we do not owe it to the Kenotists. That too much is said when it is said that "as far as man can tell, the means whereby the Spirit of God influences the human soul are precisely

analogous to the means whereby any other personality influences it"; "all that can be said is that the means whereby the Holy Ghost operates in the sub-conscious realm seem to be analogous to those by which any other personality can work in it—by means of impressions which have been received through the consciousness" (p. 385), Dr. La Touche himself confesses by adding in a footnote: "The fact that there is such a thing as the new birth, or change of nature, would, however, point to a special operation of the Holy Ghost, to use the old Puritan phrase, beyond consciousness." We do not quite understand what is meant when it is said that "manhood as such is not personality" (p. 387) or that "human personality is most truly human when most truly divine." (p. 388). These flies in the amber, however, do not in the least destroy the quality of the amber in which they are, here and there, imbedded.

We should note before closing that a valuable Appendix on "Consciousness and the Sub-conscious" from the pen of the Rev. Thomas Chatterton Hammond, M.A., has been added to the volume.

The printing of the volume is not immaculate. We have not been careful to collect the misprints, but we may note a few which we have chanced to mark on the margin: Page 25, line 7 from bottom; "Arbeitszeiles"; p. 141, line 7 from bottom, "our Lord Self-consciousness"; p. 153, line 14, "Geissen"; p. 193, line 4 from bottom, "allow" (for "deny"); p. 211 line 4, "Aufklarung"; p. 231, line 9, end, period (for comma); p. 285, line 16, a superfluous "the". So good a book should early go into a second edition, and perhaps the noting of these slips may help towards their correction.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Is Jesus God? An Argument by GRADUATES OF PRINCETON SEMINARY.
With Introductory Note by Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D. New York:
American Tract Society. [1912.] 16mo; pp. 152.

This little book, written by a number of students (not "graduates" as the publishers improperly say) of Princeton Seminary, owes its origin to an attempt by members of a class engaged in the study of the doctrine of the Person of our Lord during the session of 1911-1912, to give a reasoned answer to a series of inquiries, which, taken in sequence, raise the salient questions which must be faced in a historical investigation of the evidence for the Deity of Christ. These inquiries, in their order, were: Does the Christian Church teach the Deity of Christ? Has the Christian Church always taught the Deity of Christ? Do the New Testament writers teach the Deity of Christ? Do the Evangelists represent Christ as teaching His Deity? Did Jesus teach His own Deity? Is Christ God? As will be seen, essays on these subjects, read consecutively, will constitute a systematic argument for our Lord's Deity. Such a series of brief essays is brought together in this volume. There are nine essays in all, one each on the first three questions, two each on the last three—in which the argument culminates. These nine essays are written by nine several students, but,