

REV 31 0

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.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte. Ein Kommentar zu Augustins *De Civitate Dei*. Mit einem Exkurs: *Fruitio Dei*, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Mystik. Von HEINRICH SCHOLZ, Lizentiat und Privatdozent der Theologie an der Universität Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1911. 8vo; pp. viii, 244.

A *Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis*. A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Department of Latin). By JOHN S. MCINTOSH. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1912. 8vo; pp. x, 130.

We wish to say a few words only of each of these excellent dissertations, both of which have originated in academic tasks, and both of which—though in unequal degrees—advance our knowledge of Augustine, the greatest man, Adolf Harnack tells us, that, between Paul the Apostle and Luther the Reformer, God has given to His church. A few words are all that need to be said of Dr. McIntosh's useful attempt to reconstruct the text of Augustine's *Genesis*; and Lizentiat Scholz's *Study of the City of God* requires so much to be said of it to do it justice, that it is best to pass it by in the meantime with only a general intimation of its aim and contents.

It is a pleasure to know that Dr. McIntosh's dissertation is only an earnest of what is to come. He has planned to make a complete study of Augustine's *Genesis*, in its origin, relations, and linguistic character, and he promises that we shall ultimately have the complete work. What he gives us now is the reconstructed text, with its variants, and a study of its Latinity with a view to determining the source of its peculiarities. The reconstruction of the text seems to us to be admirably done. Of course it is right to give the preference to readings from long over those from short quotations; but we do not so clearly see why readings in conformity with the LXX should be preferred to those that diverge from it; and we regret that all the instances of the recurrence of readings have not been recorded. The conclusion which Dr. McIntosh draws from a study of the variations in Augustine's citations is that he used more than one codex, but that these codices were recensions of a single original version, and not representatives of independent translations. This goes to support the view that the Old Latin Version was in essence a single version, though made the object of much reworking. From his careful study of the Latinity of Augustine's *Genesis* Dr. McIntosh reaches the conclusion that it is incorrect to speak of it as "colloquial": "the language throughout is determined by the Greek originals and the popular element from the nature of things is confined in great part to the admixture of words and word-formations common in Vulgar Latin, but found also in much of the literature of this period" (p. 123-4). Dr. McIntosh has not attained to that clearness and precision of style

which is an ornament to the philologist; and his book is badly printed. Misprints, fortunately few in the Latin text, occur far too frequently elsewhere; proper names suffer severely (the Latin form "Remis" p. 1, surely should be modernized, "Reims"; "Hausleiter" p. 2 should be "Haussleiter"; "Reinken", p. 6, should be Reinkens; "McClean", p. 70, should be McLean; "Koffmann", p. 14, should be Koffmane), and there are other disturbing slips (e.g., p. 11, line 16, "volume", should be volumes; p. 121, line 6 from bottom, "Grecism" should be "Grecisms"). We trust both matters will be looked to in the completer study to follow.

Lic. Scholz's is a very important contribution to the better understanding of the thought of Augustine. The title-page advises us that it is "a commentary on the *De Civitate Dei*". It also advises us of the view taken of that great book. It is not, Lic. Scholz thinks, as it is ordinarily spoken of, the first sketch of a universal philosophy of history, but above everything an apology for Christianity—"the last and greatest apology of the ancient church"—which only utilizes the philosophy of history as an instrument of apologetics. "The work of the *City of God* is a universal argument for the truth of Christianity, marshalled with all the resources of the spirit and power, presented under the battle-figure of a giant-struggle (*Gigantomachie*) of faith and unbelief in the world-history" (p. iv): "a philosophy of the forces and activities of faith and unbelief in the world of visible and invisible things" (p. 193). Though he calls his work a "commentary", it does not pursue the method of glossological comment, but takes the form of a systematic study of the presuppositions, fundamental notions, contents, and thematic development of the work with which it deals. "The twenty-two Books of the *City of God*," we read at the end of all, "are the valedictory of a decaying and the prolegomena to a new civilization. The new civilization was Christianity. For it Augustine had striven, to it he had handed on the foundations upon which it could rise on high, higher than he himself had any premonition of. Augustine thought well of his sketch; the echo which his ideas found could teach him that he had not written in vain. But it is the greatness of humility which speaks in his self-judgment; this work so rich in spirit and power closes with a simple confession to the God who made him what he is,—to Him to whom earth and heaven lift their hands." (p. 195).

There is attached to the book at the end an appendix, originally begun as a footnote but expanded into a little treatise, on the "Fruitio Dei", which is described as a "contribution to the history of theology and mysticism" (pp. 197-235). "The exposition of this important, momentous, epoch-making idea", Lic. Scholz remarks, "has never so far as I know been connectedly undertaken. . . . The following treatment is only a first sketch of the matter." It is nevertheless full of details and most suggestive. At one point, however, it is defective. Justice is done to Calvin's emphasis upon the conception (p. 226), but the place it takes in Reformed thought in general is somewhat skimpy.

It is not the Westminster catechisms alone which place the "enjoyment of God" by the side of the "glorifying" of Him, in the declaration of "the chief end of man" (see this REVIEW, Oct., 1908, pp. 565 seq.), and, were it through its catechetics only, the Reformed churches have taught generation after generation not merely to live for God's glory but to find all their joy in life and death, in this life and the next, only in Him.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Elchasai. Ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk. Beiträge zur jüdischen christlichen und allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte, von WILHELM BRANDT. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1912. Pp. vi, 182. M. 7.50, geb. M. 8.50.

The Elkesaites have usually been regarded as a Jewish Christian sect, which has sometimes been held more or less responsible for the Gnostic doctrines of the Ebionites of Epiphanius. According to Brandt, however, the sect was originally not Jewish Christian at all, but simply Jewish. Elkesai, the founder, flourished about 100 A.D. The attempts to discredit the tradition of an early origin of the sect are emphatically to be rejected. For the prophecy with regard to the third year of Trajan, which is attributed to Elkesai, is an unfulfilled prophecy, and could not, therefore, have been invented at a later time. The Elkesai book was compiled soon after Elkesai's death from brief notes for which the founder himself was responsible. Elkesai started from Judaism, but claimed to be the bearer of a new revelation, of which the most characteristic feature was a peculiar form of baptism. The origin of the Elkesaite baptism is obscure. At any rate, the movement begun by Elkesai was no mere Jewish sect, but a separate religion, though its separateness found complete outward expression only at a time considerably after the death of the founder. At first, the movement spread among Aramaic-speaking Jews and Jewish Christians. But soon it made its way also among bilingual Syrians—whether heathen, Christian or Jewish—and by them the Elkesai book was translated, with modifications, from Aramaic into Greek. So active was the propaganda that in the early part of the third century an attempt was made, under the leadership of a certain Alcibiades, to extend it among the Catholic Christians of the West. To this end the book was modified so as to give at least a vague impression of Christian Christology. These Christian elements, therefore, had no place in the original work of Elkesai, and never formed a really fundamental part of the tenets of the movement, but were added merely in the interests of a propaganda among Christians. Elkesai himself, in order to win over the Jewish Christians, had contented himself with a representation of the Son of God and the Holy Spirit as giant figures which had appeared to him in a vision. The propaganda in the West resulted in complete failure, but in the East the religion of Elkesai persisted long, and although it did not