

# The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER 1926

---

JOHN D. DAVIS\*

The Reverend John D. Davis, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Laws, Helena Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary, died on June 21, 1926, in the seventy-third year of his age.

At the beginning of the last academic session he seemed to be in the full enjoyment of his usual vigor of body and mind, and, so far as his colleagues could observe, he performed his duties throughout the year with his customary fidelity, efficiency, and success. Few, even among those intimately associated with him, had any inkling that his health was being impaired. His familiar form was conspicuous for its absence from the Commencement Exercises in May, and as the word spread among the members of the Faculty, the graduating class, and the large gathering of alumni and friends of the Seminary, that our beloved senior professor had left town in order to undergo a surgical operation, expressions of sincere regret and deep solicitude were heard on every hand; nor were our apprehensions altogether allayed by the assurance, emanating from a seemingly trustworthy source, that under normal circumstances his early restoration might be confidently expected. All that human skill and af-

\* A memorial discourse, delivered by appointment of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, in Miller Chapel, on Tuesday, October 12, 1926.

to come; because He remains the same yesterday, today and forever. In our judgment, however, the real Jesus—the historical as well as living Jesus as contrasted with the mythical Jesus—and so the only Jesus in whom with adequate intelligence we can put our trust for time and eternity is a very different Jesus than the one set forth in the lectures. In these lectures Jesus nowhere appears as the living object of our faith who because of His life on earth and His sacrificial death is qualified to be our saviour from the guilt and power of sin. In these lectures, as Dr. Gilkey puts it, “we have steadily understood and interpreted essential Christianity as a way of life, incarnated in Jesus himself”—a mode of presentation that is good as far as it goes but which omits what is most vital to Christian faith and hope. Because, in our judgment, the liberalism of which Dr. Gilkey is so able and eloquent a spokesman is something other than real Christianity we are unable to believe that the students of India have a better knowledge of the Christian religion by reason of having heard them. There is a need of lectures on the “Relations of Christianity and the Other Religions”—and so of the Barrows Lectureship—but it seems to us that it is useless to expect a helpful discussion of this important theme by one who in many respects has a false and in all respects an adequate conception of what Christianity is.

Princeton.

S. G. CRAIG.

*The Virgin's Son.* By JOHN B. CHAMPION, M.A., B.D. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 1924. Pp. 160.

This work is a vigorous discussion of the Virgin Birth and related topics, especially suited to the intelligent layman. It is sound and discriminating. To the reviewer its chief value is in showing how a vigorous mind connects the Virgin Birth with truth about the Scriptures and the deity of Christ. Practically this one little fact, as it seems to be regarded by some who admit it, is so tied up with Inspiration, the Atonement, and the Person of our Lord, that those who reject or doubt the Virgin Birth are, as a rule, to be found denying or doubting also the authority of Scripture, the Atonement, and the Deity of Christ. This little book is commended as maintaining a truth in its relations to the system of truth.

West New Brighton, N.Y.

F. P. RAMSAY.

*Do Fundamentalists Play Fair?* By PROFESSOR WILLIAM MENTZEL FORREST of the University of Virginia. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1926.

The author who speaks of himself as “having been free born, untrammelled by any ordination vow not to outgrow a creed or somebody’s interpretation of Scripture,” etc., cannot be expected to shine like a fixed star, but rather to glow for a moment like a meteor, and then vanish.

The point of the work is that Fundamentalists play “No Fair” with their opponents all along the line. Banning Evolution from the public schools without banning the whole of Biology is “No Fair.” By the same process it is “No Fair” to permit Geology and Astronomy to remain