

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1914

GENESIS *

Our study of Genesis is purely homiletic. Questions of higher and lower criticism, of text and unity and authorship, do not concern us here. It is our purpose simply to inquire how the book as it lies before us may be studied in the closet and treated in the pulpit, and how the truth which it is designed to teach may be most clearly and effectively presented.

Genesis means beginning. The origin of all things is here disclosed—the heavens and the earth, man, sin, salvation, arts, industries, society, government, civilization, the church.

Genesis portrays the beginning as the Revelation portrays the end of all things. One unveils the eternal past, the other the eternal future. Scripture opens and closes with the vision of paradise. Here is the earthly paradise, soon forfeited by sin; here is the heavenly paradise, the home of the children of God, from which they shall go out no more forever. Here is man created, fallen; here is man redeemed, restored. Here is God the Creator, with the world in rebellion against Him; here is God the Redeemer, with the universe prostrate at His feet. Here the divine purpose is declared, the divine promises are given; here purpose and promises are fulfilled.

The account of the creation is not scientific but pictorial. So far as we can see, this is the only way in which the story could be told so as to convey essential truth, and at the same time be understood by men of every age. If it had been written in terms of modern science, it would have

* A lecture delivered at the Princeton Seminary Summer School of Theology on June 3, 1914.

pretensions and aims, and erratic. Breaking down under the burden of his own thought, he ended his tragical career in an insane asylum. The mental derangement of Nietzsche may be an unhappy accident but it appears to have come as the natural result of his philosophy. Nietzsche, by nature modest and tractable, almost submissive, was, as a thinker, too proud to submit to anything, even to truth."

We cannot agree, however, with the author when he would have us find "the truth" in "the over-God", "the superpersonal God", "the norm of scientific truth, the standard of right and wrong, the standard of worth." Such abstractions are meaningful only as they reflect concrete being. "The living God" is "the truth", and it is only in him that truth has reality. It was because Nietzsche had no theology that his philosophy was that of the madhouse long before he entered it.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

GENERAL THEOLOGY

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen, and Louis H. Gray, M.A., Ph.D., sometime Fellow in Indo-Iranian Languages in Columbia University, New York. Volume VI; *Fiction-Hyksos*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1914. Large royal 8vo, double columns; pp. xvii, 890.

With this volume the first half of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, as originally projected, is completed; and it has become somewhat impertinent to speak further of the quality of so well-known a work. It has nevertheless become ever more evident with each volume published that a great work in the anthropological survey of religion and ethics is being successfully accomplished in this *Encyclopaedia*; and, as we have turned over the pages of volume after volume, we have been led more and more to congratulate future students of this subject upon the rich and exact mass of data here accumulated for them. The present volume strikes us as in important respects even more satisfactory than its predecessors. There are inequalities no doubt in the authoritativeness of the articles, as inequalities are inevitable; but on the whole the volume impresses the reader who samples it here and there as especially satisfying.

The volume opens with *Fiction*, under which caption (certainly a somewhat unexpected caption to find a place in this *Encyclopaedia*) we have two articles of moderate length. The former is a no doubt serviceable compilation on Primitive, Oriental, and Graeco-Roman fiction which suffers from the necessity of covering so wide and diversified a field in such narrow space. It is written by Dr. Louis H. Gray whose name appears on the title-page for the first time as an

assistant editor, and who has contributed to the pages of the *Encyclopaedia* a number of articles, chiefly on Iranian and (American) Indian subjects. The second article on *Fiction* deals with Mediaeval and Modern Fiction in a somewhat more cursory manner. The closing article of the volume is a sober account in compressed space of all that is really known of the *Hyksos*.

The article in this volume to which a student of theology naturally turns first is, of course, that on *God*. This is a composite article of fifteen parts, covering more than sixty pages, and is purely a survey of the ideas of God held by various peoples and religions: the fundamental philosophical discussion is postponed to the caption *Theism*. The opening section, written by the late Andrew Lang, on Primitive and Savage ideas of God, confines itself to once more summarizing the evidence for "high-gods of low peoples". Professor D. J. Margoliouth, following immediately on this with an article on Pre-Islamic Arabian ideas of God, suggests, apparently without conscious intention, a new instance of the Creator, recognized but neglected in favor of subordinate deities, to which Mr. Lang's evidence points, in the Pre-Islamic Meccans (p. 248a bottom). On this follows an odd little article by J. D. Prince on the Assyro-Babylonian conception of God, the professed purpose of which is "to illustrate the real oneness of deity as conceived by the Assyro-Babylonians" (251b), "the henotheistic-monotheistic tendency of the Assyro-Babylonian religion". Its most striking characteristic perhaps is an apparently almost morbid preoccupation with parallels or quasi-parallels with Biblical religion. We are told that in the Assyro-Babylonian religion we can trace "the origins and evolution of that perfected Hebrew monotheism which was later to become the mother of both Christianity and Islam"; that perhaps even the idea of a Trinity may be found in it; that it brings before us an "all-powerful creative Word, which is here undoubtedly the prototype of the Logos of the Gospel of John"; that much of its religious poetry "reads like a Biblical psalm",—and the like; not one of which statements, we take leave to say in passing, though made with great confidence, is beyond dispute. What, by the way, is the exact meaning of this curious clause: "the Hebrew JHWH, whose name is most appropriately vowelled Jehovah, with the vowels of the Hebrew word *Adonai*, and equivalent in use to the word *Elohim*, literally 'gods'" (pp. 252-3)? The treatment of the Biblical and Christian Doctrine of God is entrusted to the competent hands of Dr. W. T. Davison, and a new attitude, at once more modest and more wide-minded, meets us as we proceed to it. It is a good sketch, somewhat over "modern" in tone, but informed with a true conservatism of spirit. It is merely a conventional statement, however, which meets us when we read (p. 258a): "There is no 'doctrine' of the Trinity in the New Testament. But there are in it all the materials out of which such a doctrine came inevitably to be built up, together with evidence of the way in which that teaching arose out of certain central facts of history and experience, proclaimed by the Apostles and accepted by all believers as

integral parts of the Gospel." These words seem scarcely consistent with what we read later on (p. 259b) of the Apostles: "The Apostolic writings attempt no metaphysical explanation of the new conceptions of God which unquestionably dominated the whole experience and life of the earliest Christians. The doctrine of Father, Son, and Spirit, as embodied in the baptismal formula implied triunity. The threefoldness of the Divine manifestation and operations as well as the underlying unity of the Divine essence, is recognized throughout the Epistles." And these later words are the more exact. The fact is that the doctrine of the Trinity is not explicitly taught in the New Testament, only because it is presupposed: it is possible to say therefore that it is not so much heard as overheard in its pages, but that too must be understood to mean that it is just assumed as already the common property of Christians—if, that is, we wish to be true to the records.

Next to the article, *God*, the student of theology is apt to turn to the article, *Gospels*. Here he will find nothing new: the article is by Dr. F. C. Burkitt; and Dr. Burkitt, has told us elsewhere all that he has told us here. From many of his opinions on the origin and significance of the Gospels we decidedly dissent. We do not believe that Luke drew from Josephus and is to be dated about A.D. 100, or that Matthew either is so late as that: we believe that all three Synoptic Gospels belong before A.D. 70. That disagreement carries with it many others. We cannot say for example that "the Gospel record passed through a full generation of pious reflection and meditation before it began to be written down and so fixed for all time" (p. 335b). That indeed can be said only on the further supposition that Mark, written according to Dr. Burkitt between 65 and 70 A.D., was absolutely the earliest essay at reducing the Gospel narrative to writing. And that also is in our judgment an utterly untenable notion. If Luke was written before A.D. 70, Lk. i. 1 ff. alone is needed distinctly to contradict it. And it can hold in any case only if we look upon Mark as the immediate source of the matter common to it and Matthew and Luke. This too we hold to be an untenable hypothesis: we must assume an earlier narrative Gospel from which Mark, Matthew and Luke alike draw. In that case we must postulate both a Narrative Source and a Discourse Source lying behind our three Synoptics, themselves all earlier than 70 A.D. and that "full generation" of interval between the events and the written record is no longer tenable. We dissent again when we read that "Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used", though this is said to be "the one solid contribution made by the scholarship of the nineteenth century towards the solution of the Synoptic problem" (p. 336). There is no reason to believe that Mark has transfused into his narrative all that he found in the Narrative-source used so freely by all three. Nor can we agree that "a discussion of the general historicity of the evangelical narrative must start from Mark and not from Matthew and Luke" (p. 33). This is only

a corollary from Dr. Burkitt's erroneous critical conclusions. Correct them, and there remains no basis for such a pronouncement. There are manifest advantages in starting, for instance, from Luke. We know who Luke was; we know something of the opportunities he enjoyed for obtaining trustworthy information on the matters about which he wrote; we have from him a much more extensive document and can subject what he tells us to more external tests. But we need not go further. It is inevitable that Dr. Burkitt's entire article should need rewriting from any other viewpoint than precisely his own rather individual one. We agree heartily, however, when he writes as follows (p. 344a): "The history of Christianity was not a simple advance from an original unitarian 'philanthropy' to the ultimate recognition of the Deity of Christ. Naturally it took many generations of Christian thought to evolve a form of words which should satisfactorily define the exceptional nature of the Founder of the new religion in terms of current philosophical conceptions. But from the first there existed the sentiment of devotion, the temper of mind which was assured that no title was too high to give, no homage too high to pay, to the Son of God, who had been sent from heaven to overcome death and open the gates of everlasting life to those who believed on Him." We must recognize that Jesus was the Divine Son of God come to earth on a mission of saving mercy, which involved the giving of his life as a ransom for men—if, that is, we wish to be true to the records.

Immediately before the article *Gospels* a short article (two pages) is inserted on *Gospel*, by Mr. James Strahan. It is a good article and fairly covers its subject; but it is not without some shortcomings. The first and larger portion of it is taken up with an account of "the content of the Gospel", as preached by the disciples and by Jesus Himself. We are very truly told that it is now generally agreed that "the good tidings preached in the very earliest Apostolic Church was a gospel regarding the incarnate, atoning, judging, redeeming, glorified Christ"; and if we understand Mr. Strahan aright he wishes his readers to understand that he himself accords with the contention that there is no antithesis to be drawn between "the religion of Jesus" and "the gospel of Christ". But in his further remarks on the Gospel whether of the disciples or of Jesus Himself, he appears to permit the very core of it to slip through his fingers—what Dr. Denney has so strongly insisted on under the broad name of "the death of Christ": and the emphasis is shifted to the personality of Jesus, in the manner of the Ritschlians. Not what Christ *did* but what He *was*, we are led to believe is the essence of the Gospel: which is distinctly not the case,—if, that is, we wish to be true to the records.

Ernst Troeltsch gives us an interesting and instructive article on *Free-Thought* in which the origin of the Free-Thinking Societies is traced and the reason for their existence pointed out. The following sentences near the close of the article are suggestive: "It stands to reason that, if modern thought should continually prove unable to

remodel the Churches, and find itself totally incapable of coming to terms with them, it must find something to take their place. The alternative organizations which it has hitherto produced have been mainly imitations of the Church in one or other of its aspects, and a really sufficient substitute has not yet been found." It will probably be long before "modern thought" can invent a cement with the cohesive power of the blood of Christ: those who have shared the common great experience of redemption in the blood of Jesus do not need to be made into a society,—they are already and intrinsically one Body of which the Living Lord is the Head. Troeltsch writes also a characteristically profound (and somewhat heavy) article on *Historiography* in which he endeavors to reduce the whole historiographic process to an exact science, as the causal explanation of all happenings. With much that he says we are in the fullest accord. We grant that the truly scientific character of historiography must be strictly guarded, and we should not draw back when we are told that "the sole task of history in its specifically theoretical aspect is to explain every movement, process, state, and nexus of things by reference to the web of its causal relations." But somehow we do not feel greatly enlightened by Troeltsch's labored article, and are conscious of wishing for some things and some emphases which we do not find in it. There is a teleology in history as well as in nature and its unitary character cannot be preserved when this teleology is excluded: neglected it may be and yet present, but excluded it cannot be without chaos.

We observe with satisfaction a marked tendency in Professor George A. Coe's article on *Moral and Religious Growth* to recede from the extravagances which have attended most writing on this subject in the recent past. The "culture-epoch" and "recapitulation" theories of mental and moral growth, the exploitation of which has formed such a feature in a certain class of paedagogical theorizing, are repudiated (pp. 446a.b.), and the "puberty" theory of conversion is decisively rebuked (p. 448b). These are encouraging symptoms where encouraging symptoms are much needed.

This volume has its quota, naturally, of Biographical Articles. Passing by some Oriental names, we note here articles on Goethe, Green, Grotius, Halevi, Hegel, Heine, Heraclitus, Herodotus, Herder, Hesiod, Hillel, Hobbes, Homer, Hooker, Horace, Hume. They are in the main good and sufficing articles. One comes with a kind of shock on such names as Heine and Horace in such an *Encyclopaedia* and is inclined to ask if they also are among the prophets. The excellence of the two articles goes far, however, to reconcile us to their inclusion in a list of religious and ethical leaders, notable for the omission of names which we should have thought must have been included. Francis of Assisi will no doubt find some mention in the article or articles on *Religious Orders* where we are bidden to look for an account of the Franciscans. George Fox is dealt with in the article on *Friends, Society of*. But not to go out of the F's, might not Francis de Sales put in a claim to mention equal to that of Heine; Theodore Fliedner,

Sebastian Franck or August Hermann Francke, one almost equal to that of Horace? We note in passing the excellence of the summary of the religion and ethics of the Iliad and Odyssey given in the article on *Homer*, and the well-advised entire passing over of the literary question. We have been attracted too by the article on *Grotius*, although the author, Dr. G. C. Joyce, stumbles over the definition of "Satisfaction" in his account of Grotius' theory of the Atonement (p. 441). "Satisfaction" does not differ from "Solution" in offering something less in value than enough to meet the needs of the case (which would be in conflict with the very term, "*satis-factio*"), but something other in kind than what the bond requires. It is as Grotius puts it briefly, distinctively "a *refusable* payment"—a *payment* indeed, but a *refusable* payment. "Solution" is a payment which, because it is the exact thing nominated in the bond, cannot be refused; but "when another man pays for a debtor and *pays another thing than what was due*, a double act of will is required to liberate"—as Grotius elaborately explains, endeavoring to cover the Satisfaction of Christ in all its elements. Mr. Joyce's definition of "Satisfaction" confuses it with what is commonly, but not quite accurately, known as "acceptilatio", and thus assimilates Grotius here with the Scotists, which is unjust to him.

We have touched, of course, on only a few of the articles in this well-packed volume; and those we have touched on have been selected on no other principle than that we have been led by our natural interests to read them first. No doubt they will provide a fair sample of the whole; at any rate from the point of view of the student of theology. It must be borne in mind, however, that it is not to the student of theology merely, or indeed mainly, that this *Encyclopaedia* appeals. It may be enough to say of it here, therefore, that to the student of theology who would keep abreast of his science, too, it is indispensable.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

Der religiöse Unsterblichkeitsglaube. Sein Wesen und seine Wahrheit, religionsvergleichend und kulturphilosophisch untersucht. Von LIC. THEOPHIL STEINMANN. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1912. Pp. viii + 166. M. 3.60. Second edition.

The first edition of this work, published in 1908, limited itself to a description, according to the method of Comparative Religion, of the belief in immortality; the second edition (1912) is a reprint of the first with the addition of ninety pages given to a consideration of the "truth" of this belief.

The first half of the book is an interesting account of the "Phäno-