

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1923

THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Before entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe including man it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is

his engaging descriptions of churches, mosques, palaces, baths, religious rites and state ceremonials, and the like—especially his elaborate account of the Holy City itself—all help us to account for the popularity of the work in the stirring times in which the writer lived, and reveal elements of enduring value in the narrative as a historical source for our own day.

The reader's interest is greatly stimulated by the sixty-nine illustrations scattered through the volume; nearly all of them contemporary cuts, never before published, which not only help us to visualize many of the very things the author describes, but also require us to correct erroneous statements often made in later publications about such matters as the state of architectural remains, religious observances, and national customs in the lands of the period traversed in this narrative.

But the special excellence of this edition is found in the erudite biographical sketch of the author, and the general introduction to his work, contributed by the Rev. August Waldburger, and above all, in the comprehensive *Anmerkungen und Wissenschaftliche Belege*, mostly by the same scholar, which fill considerably more than half of the large volume and form an invaluable mine of information in regard to every conceivable sort of question that the most learned or the most curious reader might like to connect with the details of the original text. Particularly valuable are the notes, amounting at times to sizable articles, on some of the emperors, sultans, and pashas, and on some of the salient military and political events which the *Schärer* had occasion to refer to. It is only here and there, indeed, that the exhaustive researches of Waldburger and the editor have disclosed any mistakes in the Reiss, and so far as we have taken the pains to sample the notes—we must confess that their many philological references to Turkish, Persian and Arabic terms, and their often highly technical character made us eager to get back to the text as soon as possible—the proved errors seem to be surprisingly small in number, and of the minor sort that one might expect to find in a book of travel published five years after the writer made his observations.

The deepened interest which students of history as well as general readers have been taking, since the World War, in matters pertaining to the Near East makes this edition *de luxe* of Amman's *Reiss ins Globte Land* a timely publication.

Princeton.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

Christianity in its Most Modern Expression. By GEORGE BURMAN FOSTER, late Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Chicago, etc. Edited by Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1921.

The author was for some years, before he took the chair of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Chicago, Professor of System-

atic Theology in the Divinity School of that University; and "The present volume embodies his lectures on the dogmatics and ethics of the Christian religion in the form in which these were last delivered to his theological classes. The main body of the book is made up of the dictated portion of the lectures. The footnotes contain a report, also practically verbatim, of elaborations and extemporaneous remarks introduced by the lecturer at the indicated points of the main discussion."

Perhaps the following summary statement indicates as well as any short extract can the heart of his teaching as the author would like to have it presented: "As to *objective* content, Christianity may be defined as the gospel of the love of God the heavenly Father, who redeems us and educates us for his kingdom, this love being revealed in Jesus Christ. *Subjectively* considered, the Christian life consists in our trustful surrender to Jesus Christ, by means of which we win (a) filial communion with God, and (b) sanctification in discipline and love. By means of these (communion and sanctification) we gain (c) eternal life, beginning here already and awaiting consummation hereafter."

This beautiful statement is open to serious criticism for what it omits. Let us read it, omitting "this love being revealed in Jesus Christ" and "to Jesus Christ," and we shall see that the statement would fit Judaism and Mohammedanism, not to say religions generally, as well as it fits Christianity. In these two phrases, then, Dr. Foster expresses what he considers the distinctive element in the Christian religion.

The objective element is that the love of God is revealed in Jesus Christ; thus he makes the whole work of Jesus Christ to be revelation, and only revelation. This raises the question whether, the revelation having been once made, the continuance of Jesus Christ is at all necessary; and that question we must look elsewhere in Foster to find answered.

The subjective element, that the Christian life consists in trustful surrender to Jesus Christ, must be understood as meaning surrender to Jesus Christ as making the revelation, or as having made the revelation. Accordingly Foster in an explanatory note says, "The essential thing in the Christian faith in Jesus is that God is as good as Jesus is, even though appearances may sometimes be to the contrary. If we can stick to this in all the grind and torture and darkness of this world, we can live in hope and die without despair." Hence the essential thing in the surrender to Jesus Christ is sticking to the conviction that God is as good as Jesus is.

Besides this look-in upon the author's fundamental teaching, we may take a view also of his method. And first, as to his use of Scripture. Rejecting, of course, any view of Scripture that could accept its statements as altogether trustworthy, he yet makes hardly any other use of Scripture than to quote from it sentences and phrases here and there, in the proof-text manner. For instance, in discussing the doctrine of the Trinity he quotes four phrases from Scripture as giving its views, but nowhere does he attempt to set out the teaching of a Biblical book or author as a whole. In fact, he does not attempt to build directly on

Scripture. On the contrary, he says explicitly, "No religious teaching of the Bible can be immediately transferred into dogmatics."

Foster's use of the creeds of the past is generally to criticize them adversely and point out their errors. He does not come to them sympathetically or with the presumption that they are helpful statements of truth so much as with the presumption that they are full of limitations and mistakes which Foster must transcend and escape. The like remark may be made concerning his use of the great Christian thinkers. But modern thinkers, especially Germans, and more especially those who hold views unfavorable to Christianity, are approached by him sympathetically and with the presumption that they can give help. He is saturated with German criticism and philosophy of the skeptical type. Lecturing as professor of dogmatic theology, he is disposed to deny the possibility of arriving at dogmatic certainty except the certainty that nothing can be certainly known. Calvin and Calvinism appear in two passages of this book; Luther and Lutheranism, in seven; Kant, in eighteen; and Nietzsche, in four.

It was impossible for this mind to construct a dogmatic theology, or to construct any science or philosophy, a mind of questions and objections, but prejudiced in favor of questioners and objectors. A heart that we may believe never wholly lost the attitude of faith that he must have drunk in from a mother of simple and deep experience of Christ, his mission as a mind was to dig about the bases of his own faith and the faith of others, looking for weaknesses.

We are here reviewing the book as it lies before us and reporting his position as it was some years before he had gone so far in negation as he finally went. But already he had his course fixed downward from Christ as adored by Paul to Christ as despised by Nietzsche, and this intellectual toboggan must complete itself. Even if the horror of the heart resist the downward speeding which the gravity of logic compels, there is no logical escape from the bottomless pit of complete negation for those who once cut loose from the Propitiatory Cross on the Hill.

Staten Island, N. Y.

F. P. RAMSAY.

Divus Thomas et Bulla Dogmatica "Ineffabilis Deus." By FR. NORBERTUS DEL PRADO O. P. Friburgi Helvetiorum. Ex Typis Consociationis Sancti Pauli. Pp. lxiv, 402.

The Bull "Ineffabilis Deus" is that issued December 8, 1854, affirming as an article to be believed by all the faithful that the "Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instance of her conception, by the singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin." The volume before us is a long and painstaking argument supported by many quotations to prove that the papal decree formulates what the great teachers of the church had always taught.

It would be little gain to follow the argument through in detail. For Protestants it is enough that it is not only not taught in Scripture, but is expressly opposed to the plain meaning of such passages as Romans