

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VII

JULY 1909

NUMBER 3

## JOHN CALVIN—THE MAN.\*

One could scarcely have assigned to him a task more difficult than that of selecting, out of a crowded and influential life, the most salient acts and events for narrative; choosing, out of the congeries of traits which constitute the character of a great man, those of the first importance for portrayal; so combining them in presentation that those who hear will carry with them at least an impression of a great historical figure; and doing all this within the limits of a manuscript which will employ for its delivery not more than thirty minutes of terrestrial time. Yet this is the duty which those responsible for this celebration have devolved on their first speaker.

But who, if he were offered the opportunity, would not seize it with avidity, to do honor to the memory of one to whom our civilization, in all its highest interests of civil government, education, morality and religion, owes a debt so incalculable as it does to John Calvin? And it is therefore with great joy and with a lively sense of the honor that is mine in being permitted to speak of him, even under these difficult conditions, that I rise only to refresh your memory concerning his career and character and the elements of his greatness.

He was born at Noyon, in Picardy, in northeastern France, on July 10, 1509. His father was apostolic notary

---

\* One of three brief addresses delivered at the Calvin Celebration, Princeton Theological Seminary, May 4, 1909.

there were, so to speak, many Aristions, or disciples of our Lord. This being the case, had the early Church shared Dr. Gregory's standpoint, it would be passing strange that it should pass by all the utterances of the many Aristions, and content themselves with the gospel of Mark.

The simple fact is that it is time that "scientific theology" were outgrowing some of its petty *apriorism*, and were getting the courage of the habit of looking fully in the face *all* the facts with which it is called to deal. And surely it may do this without fear of becoming "orthodox". It has only openly to break with the history of the Christian Church, not as history, but simply as history that is in any way entitled to shape present day beliefs. If its representatives are not willing to take the humble position of disciples under the old regime, what is to prevent them from themselves becoming the apostles and prophets of a new order? One cannot avoid the feeling that there is justice in what Canon Cheyne says, when he virtually charges them with mistaking moral cowardice for modesty or for becoming caution. Surely they have among them the material, first and last, by and large, for a very "goodly fellowship of prophets", and—though it must be confessed that none are at present in sight—who can say that they will never develop a "noble army of martyrs"?—though, to be sure, when one stops to think of it, they have not much that is really worth witnessing for, at least at any great personal cost.

But I must close, and I cannot do so without again expressing the very great pleasure I have had in reading Dr. Gregory's valuable book. True, he has not added much—at least directly—to our knowledge either of the nature or the origin of the canon of the New Testament. But he has, in his own delightful way, made accessible to us much material that can be used with fine effect for that purpose.

*Columbia, S. C.*

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

A SHORT GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT for students familiar with the Elements of Greek. By A. T. ROBERTSON, A.M., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3 and 5 West 18th Street, near Fifth Avenue, New York, 1908. Pp. xxx, 240. Second edition, 1909.

Dr. Robertson's book is intended to be "an intermediate handy working grammar for men familiar with the elements of Greek both in school and in the pastorate", but in reality he has not confined himself to such a limited sphere. The frequent observations upon questions of comparative philology, especially the abundant use of the Sanskrit, make the book something more than an elementary text-book. Indeed it may well be questioned whether the author has not sometimes gone farther afield than is advisable for any work on New Testament grammar, whether elementary or not. The contribution of a New Testament grammar to the history of the Greek language should be limited to an exposition of the changes that took place between the classical period of prose literature and the first Christian century; ear-

lier changes should be discussed only where they throw light upon these problems.

The book contains many good observations, evidently the result of independent thought as well as of a diligent employment of the literature of the subject. But it is perhaps a stimulating book to be read through, rather than a convenient book of reference. It has a place among the discussions of the language of the New Testament, but that place is hardly the "definite and unoccupied field" of "the last year in college and the first in the seminary." The beginner is unfortunately only too likely to be confused rather than stimulated by Dr. Robertson's references to the ablative, locative, associative-instrumental, and the like.

On p. vi, the author remarks that "it is a satisfaction to note how commonly the excellent critical text of Nestle agrees with that of Westcott and Hort." This agreement is hardly surprising, in view of the fact that Nestle's text is simply a combination of Westcott and Hort with the texts of other modern editors. Dr. Robertson's arrangement of material is at times faulty; for example, on p. 24, the number of verbs with neuter plural subject is discussed under "declension of substantives," whereas it certainly belongs under syntax. On p. 89, the author speaks of "the practical equivalence" in the New Testament "of εἰς and accusative and ἐν (the locative) with verbs of rest and motion". This is misleading. If the blending occurs at all, it occurs only in a very small proportion of cases. On p. 90, we read, "But instead of the predicate nominative we often have εἰς and the accusative as in the Attic Greek." Something is wrong here. The usage mentioned is of course not Attic. On p. 153, the author underestimates rather than overestimates the intelligence of his readers when he warns them that the Greek τοῦ which is used with the infinitive to express purpose is not our English "to"!

The style of the book is hardly what might have been expected from the author of the admirable *Epochs in the Life of Jesus*. It is at times abrupt almost to the verge of crudeness, and is not always clear. At times, one is almost tempted to suppose that the author has jotted down detached notes without revision. Thus, on p. 79, second line from the bottom, "either" is used for "any". On p. 131, it is said that "the doctors much disagree". On p. 133, we read, "That is another matter to be raised on other grounds." On p. 179, l. 9, the use of "alone" for "only" obscures the sense. What is the meaning of the following sentence that occurs on p. 12: "The hiatus was not considered so objectionable after the manner of the Ionian writers"?

A bibliography which embraces such widely different works as Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek* (inaccurately called *Greek New Testament*) and Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, would better have been subdivided. On p. 60, Deissmann's *Philology of the Greek Bible* is called "the best single handbook of the new knowledge from the papyri and the Septuagint." Such high praise would lead one to expect something more than a modest little collection of four popular lectures, which makes no pretence whatever at anything like detail. The

usefulness of Dr. Robertson's book would be increased by the addition of an *index rerum*.

The early appearance of a second edition indicates the usefulness of the work. Typographical errors have been corrected, but no important changes have been introduced.

Princeton.

J GRESHAM MACHEN.

JESUS UND DIE HEIDENMISSION. Biblisch-Theologische Untersuchung von DR. MAX MEINERTZ, A.O.Ö., Professor der Neutestamentlichen Exegese in Braunsberg. Münster i. W. 1908. Verlag der Aschen-dorffschen Buchhandlung. (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. A. Bludau, Münster i. W. Heft 1, 2.) 8vo.; pp. xii, 244. Mk. 6. 40.

The question of Jesus' attitude towards universalism and missions, while ever of supreme importance, especially in a missionary age like ours, has acquired new interest from the manner of its treatment in Harnack's work "The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries". The chapter devoted to "Jesus Christ and Universal Missions" marks undoubtedly a weak spot in an otherwise exceptionally strong and able book. True, Harnack's position on the negative side does not differ from that of many recent critics. He denies the authenticity of the great missionary commandment recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19 and of the more or less parallel passages at the close of Mark and Luke. But, in characteristic consonance with his general disposition to treat the tradition as gently as possible and to remove difficulties rather by skillful exegesis or textual reconstruction than by violent critical measures, he maintains that in the body of the Synoptic Gospels there is on a fair interpretation comparatively little to be found that puts Jesus in a false historic light. The Synoptists have, in his opinion, exercised great self-restraint in not to any large extent carrying back the missionary idea and missionary sentiment of their own time into the sayings of Jesus. Now other critics who on the historical question share the negative attitude of Harnack, yet fail to observe this self-restraint in the Synoptical record. Johannes Weiss, to mention only one writer, while just as sceptical as regards the great commission, succeeds in discovering much more material steeped in the missionary-spirit in Jesus' teaching. Harnack tones down and puts a minimizing exegesis on such statements, so as to bring them in line with the view that Jesus' universalism was confined to the "intensive" kind and to the O. T. eschatological forecast of the ultimate inclusion of Gentiles in the kingdom of God, neither of which called for positive missionary effort. Weiss, on the other hand, gives the statements their full force, thus explaining them, so far as their missionary import is concerned, from the outlook of the later church. Harnack recognizes more as authentic, Weiss more as influenced by the missionary-principle. Only in regard to Jesus' historical position they practically agree.

In view of the new interest thus imparted to the discussion, Meinertz'