



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1915

THE CONTINUITY OF THE KYRIOS-TITLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In one sense or another the title *Kyrios* is applied to Christ throughout the New Testament. It occurs in all the documents with the exception of the Epistle to Titus.¹ And this literary phenomenon means to be expressive of a true historical continuity. It claims to exist not merely in the minds of the various writers, but to reflect the actual usage of the successive periods of our Lord's life and of New Testament history. It has been commonly assumed that this claim is in accord with the facts, that from the beginning onward and uninterruptedly ever after Jesus called Himself or was called *Kyrios*. Besides this it has also been commonly believed that the continuity observable was more than a mere chronological one. The usage in the days of our Lord's flesh was taken to have prepared the way for the usage in the mother-church after the resurrection, and this again to have given rise to the Pauline usage. An unbroken line of development according to the generally accepted view connects the earliest with the latest use made of the title within the New Testament period.

Bousset in his recent book entitled *Kyrios Christos* calls this continuity in question.² Though not the first one to take this view,³ Bousset for the first time has made the

¹ Its absence here seems to be due to the pointed preference for *Soter* as a title of Christ, i. 4; ii. 13; iii. 6.

² Cp. the notice of Bousset's book in this *Review*, 1914 (xii), pp. 636-645.

³ Predecessors of Bousset in this assumption were Heitmüller, *Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus* in ZNTW, 1912 (xiii), pp. 320-327, and Böhlig, *Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus* in ZNTW, 1913 (xiv), pp. 23-37; cp. also the review of Bousset's work by Brückner in *Theol. Rundschau*, 1914 (xvii), pp. 169-182.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE

Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society. New Series. Vol. XIV.

Containing the Papers read before the Society during the Thirty-fifth Session, 1913-1914. 8vo, pp. 438. Published by Williams and Norgate, 4 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, W. C. 1914. Ten shillings and sixpence, net.

This goodly volume contains the following elaborate papers:

I.—"Appearance and Reality." By G. Dawes Hicks.

II.—"On Feeling." By J. A. Smith.

III.—"William of Ockham on Universals." By C. Delish Burns.

IV.—"Philosophy as the Coördination of Science." By H. S. Shelton.

V.—"Intuitionism." By N. O. Lossky.

VI.—"Some New Encyclopaedists on Logic." By J. Brough.

VII.—"Discussion—The Value of Logic." By A. Wolf and F. C. S. Schiller.

VIII.—"The Psychology of Dissociated Personality." By W. Leslie MacKenzie.

IX.—"The Notion of a Common Good." By F. Rosamond Shields.

X.—"The Treatment of History by Philosophers." By David Morrison.

XI.—"Freedom." By S. Alexander.

XII.—"Symposium—The Status of Sense-Data." By G. E. Moore and G. F. Stout.

XIII.—"The Principle of Relativity and its Importance for Philosophy." By H. Wildon Carr.

As its predecessors, this volume does credit equally to its writers, to its publishers and to the Society under whose auspices it is issued. The cause of philosophy, which is the cause of truth, cannot fail to be advanced by such publications.

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 VII: Hymns—Liberty.* New York: Charles Scrib-

ner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1915. Royal 8vo, pp. xx, 911.

This volume of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* is interesting, perhaps, above its fellows to the student of Christian Theology. It opens with a comprehensive article on "Hymns" and closes with a sketchy one on "Christian Liberty"; while in its midst is buried a considerable article on the central theme of Christianity—"Jesus Christ",—flanked by what seems, on a cursory view at any rate, to be an unusual proportion of articles on specifically Christian themes.

The article on "Hymns" is one of those composite ones which form a specialty of this *Encyclopaedia*. It extends to fifty-eight pages and consists of sixteen parts, each dealing with the hymns of a particular people, or cult, or period. Naturally these parts vary somewhat in value. Among non-Christian hymns, the Vedic hymns seem to be most adequately treated. Among Christian hymns, the sections on Greek hymns by Dr. A. Baumstark and on Syriac hymns by Bishop A. J. Maclean deserve to be singled out for especial praise: they not only cover their ground but illuminate their subjects. The section on Modern Christian hymns is too skimpy to be very useful. That on Latin hymns by Fr. Guido M. Dreves is more adequate. It is unfortunate that its Roman Catholic author should have thought it necessary to go out of his way to describe John Hus (in this, the year of the world-wide celebration of his martyrdom too) as that "unfortunate fanatic" (p. 24a). It is "a common fault of American hymns", Mr. T. G. Crippen tells us in his sketch of Modern hymnology, that they show "a too great tendency towards sentimentalism; and many of them seem to owe their popularity to the light jingling tunes to which they are wedded" (p. 37a). One wonders whether this judgment is founded upon the total serious output of American hymn-writers, or upon the widespread use (and usefulness) of the popular collections of "Gospel Songs". There is a little fragment on "Cumanic and other early vernacular hymns" (p. 37b), of merely bibliographical value, tucked away in an odd corner where it cannot hope to be consulted by any one in search of such things but only to be lighted upon by accident.

The article on "Christian Liberty" with which the volume closes is chiefly notable for its complete ignoring of the fact that the term "Christian Liberty" has a history and a definite significance fixed by this history. For all that we find here Luther might have never written his epoch-making tract, *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* or Calvin the famous nineteenth chapter of the Third Book of his *Institutes*. Mr. R. M. Pope, the author of the article, prefers to go his own way in assigning a meaning to the term "Christian Liberty", and in determining the limits of Christian liberty and defending its rights within the definition which he assigns it: and it does not seem to us a good way. Incidentally we may observe that when it is said (p. 910b) that "Christ's general attitude towards heterodoxy was that of tolerance"—much depends on what is meant, indeed, by "tolerance"—the remark is in the sense in which it is made quite beside the mark; as much

beside the mark as when it is said shortly afterwards that to Christ, "faith" was not assent to an intellectual proposition or formula, but the spirit of receptivity in relation to Himself and His teaching." Faith with our Lord, was neither the one nor the other of these things; but an humble entrusting of oneself to the God of mercy and grace. And as for "heterodoxy", Jesus really "tolerated" nothing but the pure truth,—He that was Himself the Truth.

Most Christian readers will go at once, however, on turning over the pages of this volume, to the important central article on "Jesus Christ", which is written by President W. Douglas Mackenzie of the Hartford Seminary Foundation. Nor in point of ability or comprehensiveness of treatment will the article disappoint them. It is written moreover with a notable independence and freshness of judgment which raises it at numerous points out of the ruts in which most recent writing on Jesus Christ runs. On the critical and historical sides it is especially strong and it contains many illuminating passages and numerous fine sayings are scattered through it. There is, for example, a notable vindication of the central place which Jesus gave His own Person in the worship of His followers. "The matter before us is one of fact. It would seem that, according to the earliest tradition, Jesus did, without formality of claim"—we enter a caveat upon this clause—"but constantly, on all sides of His self-expression, in word and act, draw to Himself the faith and obedience of His disciples, and present Himself to them as the standard of moral worth—in fact became to them the object of a religious regard. The effort to prove that this worship of Christ arose only after His death and is reflected into the story of His ministry has been prolonged, painstaking, and futile" (p. 515b). "The real question is whether we have proof that Jesus became to His disciples a 'religious object' during His earthly life, and whether their experience in that matter was the effect of His conscious will, as He by teaching, miracle, example, and direct moulding of their life formed them into the nucleus of that community in which He intended the Kingship of God to be realized" (p. 521b, cf. 523b). There is also an excellent treatment of the matter of the sinlessness of Jesus (pp. 509f.). When turning to speak of the Christology of the early church a beginning is well taken in a fruitful insistence upon the immanent logic of history (p. 533), and on that basis the development of the doctrine of the Person of Christ in the early church is successfully defended, against, for example, the Ritschlian attempt to make it out only a disaster which the church suffered at the hands of intruding Greek philosophizing (p. 534). It is tellingly asked in this connection what would have happened to the church if the modern "Liberal" conception of Christ had become the ruling one in the early centuries (p. 534b). Good use is made again of this "logic of a 'circle'" at a later point in criticism of the development of the modern "Liberal" and "Post-Liberal" theories of the Person of Christ (p. 547). Such a remark as the following is an oasis of refreshing good sense in the

midst of the arid waste of nonsense which stretches around us on the subject of the Two Natures: "A protest should be entered against the frequent yet absurd suggestion that the 'two-nature hypothesis' first arose at or just before Chalcedon. The very idea of an incarnation involves that of two natures somehow made into one life. The idea dates back to the New Testament, to the combination of 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man', of 'existing in the form of God' and 'found in fashion as a man'. And the entire course of Christological speculation presupposed this hypothesis from the beginning" (p. 538a). Despite these admirable features, however, the article is eminently unsatisfactory as a whole. The constructive element in it falls far behind the critical and historical; and its ultimate conclusion, we regret to say, is lame in the extreme.

That the hand which handles critical matters so firmly trembles when positive construction is attempted, the reader is not long in becoming aware. He is soon startled, for instance, by the fumbling touch with which the predictive element in Jesus' teaching is dealt with (p. 512). Jesus' eschatological sayings were not thoroughly understood by His disciples, and were accordingly very naturally confused in their reports of them (pp. 512, 518). Jesus' own prophetic vision was incomplete (*do.*). And, in any case, predictions of future events, dependent for their fulfilment on the acts of men, necessarily contain elements of uncertainty (p. 512). An attempt is made to limit these elements of uncertainty to "form and date". But this is obviously nugatory. If the form and time of the fulfilment of such predictions are necessarily uncertain because the human action on which they depend is incalculable, we cannot escape the conclusion that the fact of their fulfilment, which equally hinges on the acts of man, lies under the same uncertainty. If Jesus could not know the time of His second coming because its occurrence rests on the acts of man which are uncertain, He could not know that it would ever occur. We would better believe in predestined events, not indeed unrelated to man's conduct, but not conditioned on man's indeterminate conduct,—if we wish to believe in any certain events at all in the sphere of human history. An event cannot be certain to occur the occurrence of which is contingent on other events which are intrinsically uncertain. As we read, thus, we gradually acquire an attitude of mind which prepares us for the unsatisfactoriness of the Positive Statement with which the article ends (pp. 548-550). We have read this Positive Statement with what care we might, but remain in very considerable uncertainty of exactly what view it commends to us of our Lord's Person. That a superhuman element in our Lord's Person is contended for is clear; but not what this superhuman element is, or what its relations are to God on the one hand or to man on the other. Language is sometimes used which might lead us to suspect that only a kind of super-man was presented to us in Christ. "This is a new type of personality which has arisen within the processes of human life. It is human, yet more

than human, somewhat as man is truly animal and more than animal, yet not a 'monster'". But it seems clear that it is not conceived of as a product of merely earthly forces coöperating towards the production of a new type. It is a visitant from another sphere. But so, we are reminded, may every man that comes into the world also be. And this other sphere, we are also punctually reminded, cannot "without careful discrimination" be identified with God. Confusion is increased by the repeated paradox that whatever is "spiritual" or "personal" is by reason of that very fact human, so that, at bottom, God (who is "self-conscious will") and man (who is "conscious will") are the same—although, the paradox, on every occasion of its announcement, is, of course, at once contradicted. In Jesus Christ, we are told (p. 587a) "we have a unique type of personality. It is at once human because it is conscious will, and yet more than human because it has invaded the course of human life from a range of conscious being and life above the human." There is something "more than human" in Him, we are told again: "But the 'more than human' is human. And this must be possible if God and man are spiritual, conscious beings" (p. 549a). Nevertheless we are immediately told that "the idea of the identity of original type between the divine and human natures must not make us imagine that the gulf between the Creator and the creation is abolished, or bridged, or even lessened" (p. 550b). It is all very puzzling. Perhaps we shall find our way best by abiding strictly by the somewhat precise statement: "The self-conscious being, the pre-existent Christ, the Son of God, entered as an individual, vital, and mental organism into the process of physical, organic history in the womb of His earthly mother, and grew up among men as a new type of human personality" (p. 550a). The announcement of this position unqualifiedly in this place seems to intimate that, of the two alternative forms of statement presented a little afterward (p. 550a, bottom), this one represents President Mackenzie's preference. In that case his view would seem to be a form of Kenoticism not essentially different from that of W. F. Gess, which had nevertheless been described at an earlier point (p. 545) without obvious intimation of fundamental sympathy with it: even the Arianizing implications of Gess are present in it, although entering it after another fashion. The alternative view suggested, but apparently not preferred, is presented as a fuller working out of the view advocated by the present Bishop of Zanzibar in his *The One Christ*. It seems to be essentially Kenoticism of the Ebrardian type; although, of course, in Dr. Mackenzie's case it would be burdened with his apparent unwillingness quite to identify "the Son of God" who is supposed to have become incarnate after this fashion, with God.

If Dr. Mackenzie is thus to be read as on the whole commending a Kenotic view of the Person of Christ, the corrective of his reasoning may be found in the companion article by Friedrich Loofs on "Kenosis". This article begins with a most discouraging statement of the extent of our possible knowledge of Paul's meaning in Phil.

ii. 5ff, but then proceeds to give a very careful account of the theories of Kenosis while have been held during the history of the church, and ends in the expression of a definite and a very definitely wrong opinion of what Paul did mean in Phil. ii. 5ff. In the meantime, however, it pronounces afresh the modern Kenotic theories of the incarnation pure mythology and gives solid reasons for this opinion.

Two further pendants to the article "Jesus Christ" are provided by short articles on "Jesus Christ in Judaism" and "Jesus Christ in Zoroastrianism." The former, although from a Christian hand is so defective as almost to appear pro-Jewish: from its opening words one might imagine that whatever hatred Jews may have shown towards Christians has originated solely in the persecutions of Jews by Christians—that Jews were persecutors of Christians at the first seems to have fallen out of mind. The latter gives some brief account of Zoroastrian polemics against Christianity.

The excellent article on "Josephus" by the late Benedict Niese, is interpolated by Louis H. Gray with an account—not altogether complete—of recent defences of the genuineness of the famous notice of Christ in *Antt.* xviii. 63f. Dr. Gray expresses himself as agreeing with Burkitt, Harnack and Barnes (who are the writers whose arguments he reports upon) in pronouncing for the genuineness of the passage. The history of opinion on this matter is very instructive. The passage is found in all the MSS., but it has become almost an axiom of criticism that it is an interpolation. The insufficiency of the grounds on which this judgment rests became apparent, so soon as the critics needed the passage enough to counterbalance their desire to eliminate so apparently striking a testimony to the supernaturalness of Christ's apparition. Thus the action of their critical judgment was released from the pressure of prejudice sufficiently to function somewhat normally.

We may mention in passing that the article on "Liberal Judaism" by I. Abrahams reads much like a manifesto. There are no articles on "Liberal Christianity" or "Liberal Protestantism." This seems a pity. For it tends to the identification out of hand of Liberal Christianity and Liberal Protestantism with Christianity and Protestantism, whereas, of course, "Liberal Christianity" is no more "Christianity" and "Liberal Protestantism" is no more "Protestantism" than "Liberal Judaism" is "Judaism." The way it works may be seen in a flagrant example in the treatment of the topic "Inspiration." Two articles are given to "Christian Inspiration." The one is headed "Protestant Doctrine"; the other "Roman Catholic Doctrine." There is no essential difference, however, between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic doctrines of Inspiration. This is one of the points in the doctrine of Holy Scripture on which all the great historical branches of the church are agreed. There is an immense difference, however, between the "Liberal Protestant" and the Roman Catholic doctrines of Inspiration; and what is given

here under the caption of the "Protestant Doctrine" is not in the least the Protestant doctrine but the "Liberal Protestant" doctrine. There is no question what the Protestant doctrine of Inspiration is. It is embodied in the great Confession of the Protestant churches; it is expounded by their accredited dogmaticians; it is set forth in the histories of Protestant doctrine. One may read it in his Schmid, or in his Heppe; in his Otto Ritschl; or, if he chooses, in his Haering or in his Wendt, under the name of "the Old Protestant doctrine". But he will not read it in Mr. James Strahan's article on the "Protestant Doctrine of Inspiration." That article, too, like Mr. Abrahams' on "Liberal Judaism" is a manifesto; a manifesto for the Liberal Protestant doctrine of Inspiration (or of no-Inspiration); it gives the doctrine not of the Protestant Churches, but, as itself says, of "Protestant scholars of the present day, imbued with the scientific spirit." The result is that the Protestant doctrine gets no statement and no hearing at all in this *Encyclopaedia*. This *Encyclopaedia* itself becomes thus a manifesto for Liberal Protestantism; and thereby its historical character is lost. There is a sense in which orthodox Protestantism receives less consideration in this *Encyclopaedia* than any other system of religious thought.

When we turn to the composite article "Images and Idols" and look down the list of sub-topics, we come to this one: "Christian." But if we expect to find here a thorough and candid treatment of the place "Images and Idols" have taken in the history of Christianity, we shall be disappointed. No article on the subject is provided. We are merely told: "See Iconoclasm, Images and Idols (General and Primitive), Worship (Christian)." The article on "Christian Worship" is not yet before us; we shall have to wait to see what we shall see in it. The other references are sadly inadequate. Count Goblet D'Alviella's article, "Images and Idols (General and Primitive)," has in it no doubt a number of allusions to Christian use of these objects. He classifies Images into three types: "purely representative images," "magical images," and "idols", *i.e.*, "conscious and animated images," or somewhat glorified fetishes. Christian images he naturally speaks of most distinctly in the first class,—in which Christian images hold a prominent place: "No religion can rival Christianity in the multiplicity of its images." It is incidentally plain enough, however, that magical images and "idols" proper have had a part to play in the history of Christian worship. It is a pity that a full and candid account of the part they have played in it has not been given; at least as full and as candid an account of it as has been given of the part they have played among the Buddhists, say, or among the Greeks and Romans. The lack of such an account is not supplied by the article on "Iconoclasm." This is by a Roman Catholic writer and is written very distinctly from the Image-worshipping point of view. A number of other articles on Roman Catholic topics have also been assigned

to Roman Catholic writers, not with the best results. Among them is the article on "Jesuits," which is a pure apology. We wish it could have been written by a George Tyrrell! That on "Immaculate Conception" by Joseph Turmel is more frank. That on the "Inquisition"—that is, the Inquisition of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries against the Cathari and the Waldenses, the later history being reserved for a later article—also makes a manifest effort to be fair. Abuses due to the fault of individuals are discriminated from the institution itself; the faults inherent in the inquisitorial procedure (as distinguished from the accusational), however, are not glossed. The political and social side of the heresies prevalent during the periods surveyed is emphasized, and the forwardness of the civil power in punishing them is insisted upon, but the implication of the church in the death penalty is not wholly denied. On the whole the Inquisition is pronounced a good thing, marking an advance in dealing with heretics and making for social progress. The clear article on "Invincible Ignorance" is by a Protestant writer.

✓ The penultimate article in the volume is a bright discussion of "Libertarianism and Necessitarianism" by Professor Donald Mackenzie of Aberdeen. It abounds in illuminating statements, as when T. H. Green is said to have "seen clearly that states of consciousness would never account for consciousness of states", or as when the fundamental fact which raises all the pother about freedom is summed up in the declaration that "we find new individuals appearing who were never there before, a fact which no bare singularism can ever explain". Professor Mackenzie sees no outcome without the postulation of a truly creative power for the will; but so far as we can see he discovers no ground for such a postulation beyond the extreme desirability that a new and better world should be somehow created. "Surely", he exclaims, "the real question is: Can the tree itself be made good? not, Can grapes grow on thorns?" He certainly is on solid ground when he adds: "If any libertarian holds that good fruit can come from a bad tree without changing the tree itself first, then libertarianism is a lingering chimera." But as certainly he has lost his footing on the rock when he contends that libertarians must, in the nature of the case, therefore be able to point to a "possibility of changing the bad character itself". True enough, "for Christianity, at any rate, the possibility of new creatures and a new world is basal". But it is equally basal for Christianity that this is a possibility for God (with whom "all things are possible") and not for man himself. It is therefore that Christianity is a religion of Salvation. It is a faulty exegesis which reads our Lord as exhorting us ourselves to make the tree good that the fruit may be good: and the Kantian doctrine that every "ought" implies a "can" is but an *obiter dictum*, which Kant himself confessed had to be taken on faith and could not be rationally justified. Creation is not such an easy thing that we can lightly assume that it lies in our daily, nay momentarily, power, because

without it we cannot escape from our evil selves—except by an act of God. It were better to abide in the *obiter dictum* of a greater than Kant: “Ye must be born again.” //

We have, naturally, touched in this notice only upon a few out of the multitude of articles which fill this rich and bulky volume, and that merely at random, as we have chanced to turn them up. Perhaps enough has been said, however, to serve as a sample of its contents.
Princeton. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Bible: Its Origin, its Significance, and its Abiding Worth. By ARTHUR S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D., Rylands Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester. New York and London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1913. 8vo. Pages xxxvi, 517. \$2.00 net.

In laying this book aside, we are not altogether satisfied what it would have us understand when we speak of the Bible as the Word of God. It is something like our idea of a river. Usually we mean a depression in the earth's surface, with more or less water in it that has a source somewhere, exists for some purpose, and is making its way to some ocean. But how much water, or whether it is all really water, and what is the nature of its source and the character of its channel, and where the ocean is to which it flows,—if we go too much in detail into these things we might discover either that the river is not a river at all, or that it is the kind of a river that must not be studied too closely. Yet we call it a river because, well, just because it has a fluid in it which we know to be bona fide H₂O, and while it is not much, what there is of it is real water, and it is going in the right direction, so what does it matter? Do not demand too much of it, and don't forget that there are some rivers, *e.g.*, the Rio Grande and the Los Angeles, which sometimes in the year do not have any water. If you think that water is essential to a river, you are “in error of mortal mind”.

We should not want it inferred from the above analogy that Professor Peake stands for a superficial study of the Bible. Far from it. The point of the analogy is just how much of the Bible we actually possess as a result of its study. He believes that the Bible has irretrievably lost the place it once had in Christendom (p. vii), and his aim is to restore it to an ever higher because truer and, as he thinks, more defensible place in our Christian affections (p. III. Cf. p. 190). This can only be done, according to Professor Peake, by accepting in the main the chief results of the more liberal criticism, by breaking forever with what he terms “an atomistic view of the Bible” (p. 468). This involves sweeping denials. Verbal inspiration is, of course, to be “heartily repudiated” (p. 483. Cf. pp. 102, 310-311, 380, 397-399). There are proved errors in the Bible (pp. 83-87, 126-127). The Old