

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL 1927

ON THE HEBREW OF DANIEL

In his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,¹ Dr. Driver gives a list of twenty-five words and usages to show that the Hebrew of Daniel is "of the age subsequent to Nehemiah." As No. 16 in this list he cites the use of the verb *'āmadh* "to stand up" and its derivatives and forms. The statement reads as follows:

עמד *to stand up* [is used by Daniel], where the earlier languages would use קום, viii. 22, 23, xi. 2-4, 20f., 31, xii. 1a, (probably also xii. 13), as Ezra ii. 63, Eccl. iv. 15 (contrast Ex. i. 8), 1 Chron. xx. 4 (contrast Ps. xxvii. 3): with על *against* viii. 25, xi. 14, as 1 Chron. xxi. 1, 2 Chron. xx. 23, xxvi. 18 (contrast Dt. xxii. 26): in the sense of *to be established* xi. 17b (contrast Is. vii. 7). Cf. Sir. xlvii. 1, 12.

No. 14 refers to the use of *'ōmedh*, "place" or "standing." It reads thus:

על עמרי (עמור) lit. *on my (thy) standing* viii. 18 (cf. vs. 17) x. 11, Neh. viii. 7, ix. 3, xiii. 11, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxiv. 31, xxxv. 10.

No. 21 deals with the use of this verb in the Hiphil stem:

העמיר xi. 11, 13, 14, not literally *to station*, as in the earlier books, but in the weakened sense, *appoint, establish*: see p. 535, No. 4.

Turning to the treatment of Chronicles, referred to at the end of No. 21, we find this additional statement:

העמיר metaph. *to establish, appoint* (a weakened sense: in earlier books lit. *to station*): 1 [Chron.] vi. 16 [A.V. 31], xv. 16, 17, xvi. 17 (= Ps. cv. 10), xvii. 14, xxii. 2, 2 [Chron.] viii. 14, ix. 8, xi. 15, 22, xix. 5, 8, xx. 21, xxiv. 13 (cf. Ezr. ii. 68), xxv. 5, 14, xxx. 5, xxxi. 2, xxxiii. 8, [2 Ki. נתתי], xxxv. 2, Ezr. iii. 8, Neh. iv. 3, vi. 7, vii. 3, x. 33, xii. 31, xiii. 11, 30, Dan. xi. 11, 13, 14. Cf. Ps. cvii. 25 (Also 2 [Chron.] xxxiv. 32 used specially. In 2 [Chron.] xxiii. 10, 19, xxix. 25, xxxiii. 19, Ezr. iii. 10, Neh. iv. 7, xiii. 19 the lit. sense is more prominent: in Neh. iii. iff., vi. 1, vii. 1,

¹ Pp. 506f. This volume will be referred to by the familiar abbreviation LOT.

says Brunner, and seek justification by faith in the living God. The analysis is then pushed a step further. If Faith is definable in terms of the Divine contact with the spirit of man, and if God is transcendent to space and time, then Faith is the point where the spiritual life is outside the fields of space and above the river of time. This indeed puts it beyond both history and psychology, but it at once raises the question that plagues all such thinking, what to do with the "this side." Is there no meaning, we ask, to space and time as creatures of God, nor to the beings that live in them? What of our revelation that terminated in Jesus Christ, born in the fulness of time in Bethlehem, the one mediator between God and men, Himself man? What of His death and resurrection? We do not believe that the relation between the infinite and the finite, the eternal and the temporal, the divine and the human, can be satisfactorily expressed by annulling one of the terms. Nor can a God who is the everlasting dissatisfier of our longings be of genuine religious value. The book is a brave attempt to rise above the all engulfing waves of present subjectivism, and to gain new insight by a realization of the Divine presence, but the destructive part is more than the constructive. We wait for a more satisfying statement of the problem proposed.

Lincoln University, Pa.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

Religion in the Making. Lowell Lectures, 1926. By ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, F.R.S., Sc.D. (Cambridge), HON. D.Sc. (Manchester), HON. LL.D. (St. Andrews), HON. D.Sc. (Univ. of Wisconsin), HON. Sc.D. (Harvard), Fellow of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge and Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926. Pp. 160.

In this little book we have the reflections on religion of a man of deserved reputation in science and philosophy. Naturally, he seeks to apply the scientific method to religion. Experience and the history of experience is his starting point. In this case it is our religious experience that is important. Tracing the religious experience from its origination in ritual through its development in emotion and belief, Dr. Whitehead finds that rationalized religion consists in an intuitive insight into fundamental rightness as an aspect of the universe. We see a unified purpose or harmony in the whole of reality that at once demands our ethical approval. Religion itself is not necessarily good; morality is the test of religion, and aesthetics the test of morality.

The universe itself is a moving whole. "In analogy with Spinoza, his one substance is for me the one underlying activity of realisation individuating itself in an interlocked plurality of modes. This concrete fact is process" (Lowell Lectures for 1925, p. 102). This "actual world passing in time," needs for its explanation "those elements which go to its formation." It is these formative elements that are important for it is from them that we can learn about our author's conception of God. The first of these elements is a "creativity whereby the actual world has its character of temporal passage to novelty" (p. 90). Professor Whitehead here shows his close affinity to such thinkers as L. Alexander, and even Lloyd

Morgan and Bergson. Time is taken as a necessary aspect of reality as a whole. This at one stroke dethrones the theistic conception of a God in no way subject to the time process. Nor is there room for a temporal creation; the great line of distinction between God and man is effaced.

Secondly, there is "the realm of ideal entities, or forms, which are in themselves not actual, but are such that they are exemplified in everything that is actual according to some proportion of relevance" (p. 90). In this formative element we have a further delimitation of Dr. Whitehead's idea of God. There is a world of ideal possibilities or patterns which God must take into account in fashioning the world. This conception is essentially Platonic. Not as though our author would attribute to these "ideal entities" an ontological status. None the less, God is dependent upon them in the sense that He can create according to their pattern, but in no other way. The Good is higher than God; principle more important than personality. This accords strictly with his starting point which regards the moral consciousness as the judge of religion. The moral consciousness ejects its conception of the Good, and then inquires what remains for God to do in order that the universe may present an aesthetic whole.

We find that God has to transmute the "indetermination of mere creativity" into a "determinate freedom." The protean character of abstract possibility forbids us to regard creativity as such as being actuality. God is one of the three elements that must be brought into unity in order that there may be a real temporal world as we know it. The other two are "creativity" and "the other creatures." These three elements are mutually indispensable. God can even be said to be the ground of the world since He accounts for the order in it. The world could not be without order. Plato appealed to his God when he wanted to bring his world of Ideas closer to the moving and seething reality of time; this appeal to God was a "second best," a confession of failure to rationalize. Essentially the same thing happens in Dr. Whitehead's thinking. In his case it is not movement that must be accounted for, since that has been assumed to be ultimate, but it is "determination," and "purpose" that need explanation. Pythagoras himself would feel justified in raising his philosophy of the "tuned string" to the dignity of a religious cult if he could see this modern philosopher thus making aesthetics the basis of morality and religion. Philosophy such as this forms an admirable "scientific" and even "mathematical" basis for the type of preaching that makes its appeal to young men to live a beautiful life rather than a good life. God is the source of harmony and symmetry in the world. Do not seek beauty in holiness but rather holiness in beauty!

But there is another point that is noteworthy here. The picture our author begins with is a moving whole. This moving whole implies the possibility of new beginnings and unlimited developments in every direction. To get order and system out of this moving whole is no easy task; it is above human power. Hence it is given to God to perform. But God, if He is to accomplish the task assigned to Him must Himself be above time; He is called a "non-temporal actual entity" (p. 90). The

transcendence of God is felt to be a necessity and is sincerely sought. But we have before noted that in his first formative element Dr. Whitehead made time an aspect of all reality. This implies that God is subject to the conditions of the world, and a genuine transcendence is then impossible.

We have then in Whitehead's thinking what we find in much of modern philosophy, namely, an ambiguity in the conception of God. In so far as He is conceived to be transcendent He may be personal but is finite; in so far as He is immanent He becomes the depersonalized universal realised in the historic particulars. Among idealistic thinkers this ambiguity is so persistent and so carefully concealed that at one time the Absolute or God is portrayed as a Moloch who devours both space and time, reducing all our experience to "appearances"; while at another time He is represented as needing the space-time world, and being subject to its conditions. More realistic thinkers such as Dr. Whitehead, who hate all acosmism cannot consistently hold that God is a "non-temporal actual entity." The logic of their position must bring down the transcendent God till He becomes a "function" in the world, an "element" in life. "He is the binding element in the world" (p. 158).

For Theism it is important that God be not thus conceived as a universal realising Himself in historic particulars; Theism's God is the self-sufficient creator of the "epochal occasions," or historic particulars. Our conclusion is that Dr. Whitehead's thought underneath its scintillating and even cryptical expression, conceals a strongly antitheistic tendency. When he made time and change a necessary aspect of all reality he gave possibility an independent metaphysical status; God could be no more than an aspect, an "element" or a "function" in reality as a whole. Theism makes God the source of possibility; only thus can the transcendence as well as the immanence of God be maintained; only thus is God qualitatively distinct from man; only thus is He personal; only thus is He God.

Princeton.

C. VAN TIL.

Progressive Christianity. By WILLIAM A. VROOMAN. New York: The Macmillan Co.

The author begins by separating the religion of Christ from doctrine about Christ. But he too has his doctrine about Christ, namely that Christ is only a man, human, errant, faulty, and that all the record is to be understood from this approach. The first chapter castigates the Catholic for making his doctrines essential to salvation; also P. T. Forsythe for making orthodox belief, e.g. in Christ's Deity, essential to Christianity, asserting that Peter's confession meant no such thing to the Galileans as theologians assume. Semitic faith began in polytheism, evolved into monotheism, and in the Christian church came to trinitarianism in or after the second century A.D. Orthodox doctrine has been interpolated into the New Testament by speculative and designing theologians who scrupled at no falsification to attain their ends. Thus, the Trinity and the Deity of Christ were unknown doctrines in the simple beliefs of the primitive church. Christ's words "the glory I had

cant Factors in American Church History; WALLACE K. FERGUSON, Place of Jansenism in French History; ANGUS S. WOODBURN, The Indian Appreciation of Jesus; WALTER E. BUNDY, Meaning of Jesus' Baptism; JOHN R. SCOTFORD, A New Approach to the Teaching of Homiletics; A. T. BOISEN, Evangelism in the Light of Psychiatry. *The Same*, March: The Definition of Religion; D. E. THOMAS, The Experience Underlying the Social Philosophy of Amos; DONALD W. RIDDLE, Environment as a Factor in the Achievement of Self-Consciousness in Early Christianity; L. A. BOETTIGER, Missions and Mores.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, January: A. WILMART, Easter Sermons of St. Augustine; C. H. TURNER, A Textual Commentary on Mark 1: W. TELFER, "Bees" in Clement of Alexandria; E. BURROWS, Cuneiform and Old Testament; E. BURROWS, Oxyrhynchus Logion (1907)v.

London Quarterly Review, London, January: LYNN H. HOUGH, Dr. Babbitt and Vital Control; G. G. COULTON, "John Wyclif: A Story of the English Medieval Church"; JOHN BERESFORD, Wesley and Judith Beresford, 1734-1756; E. S. WATERHOUSE, Rudolph Eucken, the Man and the Thinker; W. F. HOWARD, The Fourth Gospel and Mandaean Gnosticism; CLEMENT A. WEST, Early Church Government in Britain.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, January: LUTHER D. REED, The Liturgical Principle; PAUL H. HEISEY, Story of Lutheran Theological Education in America; L. H. LARIMER, Students for the Ministry; JOHN C. MATTES, English Translation of Luther's Small Catechism.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, January: S. G. YOUNGERT, Philosophy of Rudolph Eucken and Its Relation to Christianity; W. ERNST ROHNERT, Of Faith and Good Works; C. F. SANDERS, The Psychological Nature of Faith; EARL S. RUDISILL, What is Christian Education?; JOEL LAKRA, Devolution of Missions in India; ABDEL R. WENTZ, Work of Samuel Simon Schmucker.

Missionary Review of the World, New York, January: J. CAMPBELL WHITE, Challenge of the Non-Christian World; SADHU SUNDAR SINGH, The East and the West; ROBERT A. HUME, Appeal of Jesus Christ to India; SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, Persia Faces the Future; MURRAY T. TITUS, Christian Literature for Moslems. *The Same*, February: LOUIS P. DAME, Results of Medical Missions in Arabia; COE HAYNE, Studying Mexican Relations at El Paso; ALBERT D. HELSER, Why I like My Missionary Job; HABIB YUSIFJI, From Mohammed to Christ; Effect of China's Turmoil on Missions. *The Same*, March: ROBERT E. SPEER, Fresh Impressions of Japan; NORMAN W. TAYLOR, Mexico from Within; RUSSELL W. ABEL, A Story of Changes in New Guinea; HARLAN P. BEACH, "The Quest for God in China."

Monist, Chicago, January: S. FRANK, Contemporary Russian Philosophy; EMMANUEL LEROUX, Philosophy of Religion in French-Speaking Countries from 1914-1925; W. P. BLEVIN, Theory of Sensa; D. LUTHER EVANS, Religious Relevancy of Recent Realism; JAMES B. SHAW, Mathematical Reality.

Moslem World, New York, January: E. E. ELDER, Universality of