

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII

APRIL 1910

NUMBER 2

MODERN POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

During the last few years considerable interest has been aroused in theological circles in Germany over a movement which goes by the name of "Modern Positive Theology" or "Modern Theology of the Old Faith". This movement has originated in the conservative camp. Its demand is for a theology which shall preserve the Gospel or the "Old Faith", and restate it in terms of modern thought. It is contended that the modern liberal theology has really destroyed the Gospel in its attempt to modernize it, while the old evangelical theology has erred in identifying the Gospel with worn out forms of theological thought in which from age to age the Gospel has found expression. The Gospel or the Old Faith, it is said, can be maintained in its integrity and given a theological formulation which shall render it intelligible to the "modern consciousness"—whatever that may be. The leaders of this movement are General Superintendent Theodor Kaftan, and Professors Seeberg of Berlin, Grützmacher of Rostock, and Beth of Vienna.

In order to understand this movement it is necessary to take a brief survey of the theological situation in Germany.¹

¹On this subject *vid.* F. Traub, *Aus der dogmatischen Arbeit der Gegenwart, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche XVI*, pp. 429-483; also E. Troeltsch, *Rückblick auf ein halbes Jahrhundert der theol. Wissenschaft, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, Jahrg. 51, N. F. 16, Heft 2, pp. 97-135.*

47); but to Otto himself must be charged the inaccuracy in statement of fact when he says of Matthew's account of the resurrection (p. 12; German edition 1902, p. 17): "Already the disciples themselves as well as the women go to the grave, see the risen one, and receive instructions from him to go to Galilee."

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

DER LESERKREIS DES GALATERBRIEFES. Ein Beitrag zur urchristlichen Missionsgeschichte von DR. ALPHONS STEINMANN, Privatdocent in Breslau (NEUTESTAMENTLICHE ABHANDLUNGEN herausgegeben von Dr. A. BLUDAU, Heft 3-4) Münster i. W. Verlag der Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung, 1908. Pp. xix, 251.

The present work is a continuation of the author's *Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes* which appeared in 1906, and exhibits the same mastery of the sources and of the recent literature as well as the same admirable sanity of judgment. After an invaluable nine-page bibliography, Dr. Steinmann occupies the body of the work with a learned defense of the North-Galatian theory. But the value of the treatise is by no means confined to that belonging to a skillful argument even with regard to such a vexed question as the destination of the Epistle to the Galatians, for in support of his position the author has brought together a great mass of information which is useful in the solution of questions even more important than the one which is directly in view. No historian can neglect what Dr. Steinmann has to say about the history of the Roman province Galatia and of the Galatians of Asia Minor; no student of the New Testament can fail to be instructed by the careful and extended review of Paul's activity in North Galatia and in South Galatia. Of course the criticism might perhaps be made that some of the information that the author brings is not strictly germane to the subject indicated by the title, but in view of the circumstances such a criticism would be a criticism of the chief merit of the book. Students of the New Testament have been confused rather than helped by many of the special pleas on one side or the other of the Galatian question; what was most needed was a well-ordered collection of all the material which could by any chance be used in arriving at the solution.

Dr. Steinmann's investigation of the use of the terms "Galatia" and "Galatians" in inscriptions and secular writings leads to the conclusion that both terms were used to refer to North Galatia as well as to the entire Roman province. In the investigation of the Biblical usage, the Pauline Epistles naturally claim the largest share of attention, and here, too, the result is favorable to the North-Galatian contention. Dr. Steinmann thinks there can be no question of a painfully accurate adherence in Paul to the Roman division of provinces. In the section that is devoted to Paul's activity in North Galatia, Dr. Steinmann shows that Acts xvi:6 and xviii:23 must mean that Paul visited North Galatia twice and engaged in preaching there; the other interpretations are examined in detail and convincingly refuted. If, therefore, Paul is using the term "Galatia" in the address of the Epistle in the Roman

official sense, he must at least include the North Galatian Christians. But the Epistle clearly presupposes that the "Churches of Galatia" had a common origin and a common life. They cannot therefore have included the churches both of North Galatia and of South Galatia. Therefore they must be identified with the churches of North Galatia alone.

On p. 15, note 4, line 3, read *Δαράνδοις* instead of *Δαράνδοις*; on p. 139, line 2 from the bottom, read *ἤκουεν* instead of *ἤκουσεν*; on p. 151, note 7, read Act. 11, 26, instead of Act. 11, 27; on p. 184, line 16, insert *οἱ* before *πρεσβύτεροι*.

Of course, a number of details in Dr. Steinmann's book might give rise to criticism. For example it may well be doubted whether Dr. Steinmann is correct in interpreting Acts. xv:38 as meaning that what Paul objected to in Mark was his lack of sympathy with the freedom with which Paul offered the Gospel to the Gentiles without requiring observance of the law. But even where the author's suggestions cannot be definitely accepted, they are instructive. Dr. Steinmann's book simply compels attention from all branches of the Church, and will help to put a stop to the indifference with which Protestant scholars have too often received the work of their Roman Catholic brethren.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES. A CRITICAL STUDY. By ROBERT SCOTT, M.A., D.D., Bombay. (The Literature of the New Testament). Edinburgh; T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street. 1909. Pp. 376. (Imported by CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, New York. \$2.00 net.)

According to Dr. Scott, I Cor. (except xv. 20-34), II Cor. (except vi. 14-vii. 1, xiii. 13-14), Rom. i-xi, Galatians, Philippians, and Rom. xvi. 1-16, 21-24 were written by Paul; Ephesians, Hebrews, I Peter, I Thess. iv-v, II Thess. i-ii, Rom. xii, xiii, xv, I Cor. xv. 20-34, II Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 were written by Silas, to whom is due also the Gospel of Matthew in its final editing and perhaps some slight elements in Acts; I Thess. i, iii, II Thess. iii, Colossians, Philemon, and probably also Rom. xiv were written by Timothy, who is also responsible for the final form of Mark; II Timothy, I Timothy, and Titus were written by Luke, the author of the Third Gospel and Acts. The average reader will probably be somewhat startled at the boldness of the theory, but such a feeling will receive no sympathy from the author. Dr. Scott is apparently unaware that he has said anything revolutionary, or anything that requires special proof. The widely accepted results of modern criticism are treated with as scant consideration as the tradition of the first centuries. Neither is deemed worthy of any very elaborate refutation.

Dr. Scott's re-arrangement of the New Testament writings "rests exclusively on internal data; mainly on theological ideas and literary style". Criticism has here become astonishingly uncritical. A criticism which is keen enough to separate four chapters of the Thessalonian Epistles and three chapters of Romans from the genuine writings of Paul should have been sufficiently keen to prevent the assignment of