**Book Reviews**


The preface to this work should not try to evade acknowledging its scholarly character by saying that its articles are mostly written by men who are, or have been, preachers. They are written, rather, by men who are, or are going to be, professors. Essential direction and final arrival, being positive, are more truly descriptive than early accidental position and subsequent departure, which are negative. Pastors who have become professors by that very transition betray their essential quality. It is not to their discredit. Both forms of service are needed and those who love God with the mind love him as really as those who love him with the heart. Perhaps Jesus added "mind" to the Deuteronomic precept just to make it clear that he commends and commands an integral rather than a fragmentary service and that there may be in service a transfer of emphasis from one function to another without sin. Well, this is, on the whole, a very scholarly dictionary. If only scholars and writers who know their Bibles so well that if a reference is anywhere near right they can easily make the necessary mental correction, would but remember how annoyingly the average and unerudite pastor is baffled and thrown out in his use of an article by coming upon a succession of inaccurate citations such as occur at the bottom of p. 71a and top of 71b, where John 2:29 must be meant for John 2:19; Matt. 12:29 for Matt. 12:40, and Mark 8:24 for Mark 8:34. There are some articles in this dictionary that should have been read more times than they have been in either copy or proof or both. Such inaccuracies, however, are minor as well as provoking, and, on the whole, the present work is not only scholarly in its treatments but accurate in its details.

The fact that the editor of the *Dictionary of the Bible* edits the present work also, at once raises the question why the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* should be issued at all. Christ and the gospels are integral parts of the Bible and should already have obtained in the earlier work their full
quota of appropriate articles. Nevertheless the new work is new and is wisely and helpfully made. Articles which duplicate the headings of the earlier dictionary do not by any means duplicate the earlier subject-matter. "Atonement" illustrates the difference. The former work uses three columns under this heading, the present uses over twelve. The former keeps pretty strictly inside the fences of biblical theology, the latter goes out into the systematic and dogmatic pastures. The former article starts with etymology, the latter with a theological thesis. Yet the history of the doctrine which it adds is very helpful to the average pastor and its clear statement of the issue between the thinkers who linger at the cradle and those who linger at the cross is illuminating. In a word, the important headings of the earlier work as repeated in the newer one do cover matter which is not to be found in the previous volumes. Every one knows how even in strong hands and in spite of fate biblical and dogmatic theology will overlap each other. Good material written up from both view-points should be within the pastor’s reach as he sits at his desk.

This same article, "Atonement," also illustrates what seems to the present reviewer to be the greater general conservatism or "orthodoxy" of the newer dictionary as compared with the earlier. There is an authentic story of a shrewd agent for theological books who said he was not so stupid as either to canvass for the Dictionary of the Bible in a certain New Jersey seminary or to canvass for the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels in a certain New York seminary. The story seems to be, to some extent, true to the character of the respective works; nor is a somewhat conservative view-point to be deprecated in a work specially intended for preachers. Something is due to one’s position, and to his audience. Truth is truth, even in the field of biblical criticism, and ultimately will prevail, but truth may be preached in such a way or to such a class of people as practically to teach moral error. There are "advanced" views after which a pastor may follow with discriminating footsteps in his study and yet keep well to the rear of in his public presentations. For the preacher is in the practical position so well indicated, though indirectly indicated, by the dead Laureate (In Memoriam, xxxiii and liii)—a position in which his wider faith may well be careful how it proclaims itself to men of a less sophisticated piety, a position in which he may hold his new doctrine to be sound and yet hesitate in an age of transition to preach it as a truth to "those that eddy round and round." Wise indeed in these days is the man who, Jacob fashion (Gen. 33:14), can lead on gently according to the pace of his spiritual children and yet lead the heart as well as the head.

Moreover, there are here provided certain entirely new articles written
with valuable sanity and healthfulness. The treatment of “Authority of Christ” is an instance. Pastors are continually hearing of and preaching upon the attractiveness and perfection of Christ’s utterances. They have been much lectured upon his “method and secret.” They get to thinking that if they could livingly reproduce the spirit of his life and words their own sermons would be irresistible. They suffer intensely and often morbidly over their spiritual failures. They will be glad to have it made clear, clear though it has always been, that Jesus himself was often a popular failure, and that while he spoke with authority, the sweet compulsion of his voice respected the sanctity of man’s will.

The wide range of the work before us and its completeness of treatment is sometimes startlingly in evidence. One comes upon titles that he would never think of looking for in such massive quartos. Who would expect a heading that repeats a popular religious watchword such as “Back to Christ,” or one that deals with such a plain old sermonic topic as “Coming to Christ,” or one like “Above and Below” that considers the religious incidence of the Copernican astronomy? Yet all these articles are decidedly helpful to preachers, giving, as they often do, a scholarly and systematic treatment of questions that modern science and the historic method are constantly slipping under the study door. The fact is that these diverse headings make it practically necessary that this dictionary be consulted fully as much as consulted. It is a work for reading as well as reference. One must know its titles and matter beforehand in order readily to find on any occasional consultation what he then requires.

A word should also be said in praise of the references at the ends of the articles. They often add to the volumes of biblical scholars titles from general literature which are of especial value to pastors. “Gentleness” is in point. The Dictionary of the Bible has no reference there to Matthew Arnold. The present work does refer to Literature and Dogma. To be sure the reference is not quite correct. It should read VII:5 instead of VII:3. There should also have been references to at least III:2, VIII:2, and VIII:5, and also to St. Paul and Protestantism, p. xix, where Arnold first suggested his rendering of ἐπικεκλημένος. But it is something to have Arnold referred to at all. And to the credit of the new dictionary it should be said that it does seem to be aware of the existence of much that in general literature has been clearly and helpfully said about special words and topics connected with Christ and the gospels.

And yet the present reviewer cannot for the life of him see why these references to general literature are not made far more numerous and more precisely appropriate than they are. Why is no reference given in the
Dictionary of the Bible, under either "David" or "Saul," to Browning's Saul or to Tennyson's Merlin and Vivien, 760-64? Why is there no reference under "Stephen" to Tennyson's Two Voices, 219-25? Why neither under "Elijah" in the Dictionary of the Bible nor under "Ascension" in the present work is there a reference to Tennyson's Lover's Tale, I, 299-303? And why under none of the articles on John or John's Gospel is there any reference to Browning's Death in the Desert? And if the writer of "Above and Below" already referred to could quote from The Higher Pantheism, why could he not refer, for instance, to the Holy Grail, 526-28, where, when the poet speaks of the Holy City as being no larger than a single pearl although the goal of all the saints, he gives a fine illustration in biblical imagery of the unrelatedness of space and spirit?

Nevertheless, this Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels is, so far as this first volume shows, a very good work indeed, and every pastor should have it at hand until the one that is perfect shall be published.

WILLARD H. ROBINSON


In these volumes Professor Ladd brings to a close an extended scheme of philosophical publication and at the same time embodies in a systematic treatise his ripe views on the subject of religion and on the relation of this fundamental interest to present-day scientific and philosophical methods. On both points he is to be congratulated, for in these days of complex investigations it has been permitted to but few thinkers to express themselves adequately on the varied field of philosophy and at the same time to orientate themselves definitely in relation to religion. We now have Professor Ladd's system completely and finally before us. It remains for the future to estimate its significance precisely. But while avoiding a pre-judgment of this estimate it may perhaps be said that Professor Ladd's name will remain as representing, typically, one distinctive line of American philosophical inquiry, viz., that of mediating between philosophy and religion.

The two volumes now under consideration are, as our author informs us, the outcome of some forty years' work upon the problems of religion. They express a mind sincerely religious yet earnestly desirous of under-