

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 1—January, 1905.

I.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION FROM THE STANDPOINT OF AN ENGLISH SCHOLAR.

THE second and third volumes of Sir George Otto Trevelyan's *American Revolution** are now old enough to have ceased to be classed among very recent publications; but they are still too new to have become very familiar to the general reading public. In the field of fiction the best-known book is too likely to be the latest book, and the cases are comparatively few in which a novel outlives the first season of its publication. In the more serious field of history, however, and especially in the field of very detailed history, the process is quite generally reversed, a book achieving its largest sale and its greatest reputation only after it has received the approbation of those popularly considered competent to pass judgment upon its merits.

There can be little doubt, however, that this work of Sir George Trevelyan has the qualities which will satisfy the critic, and which will also give it a permanent interest and value to the most casual reader. It is the work of a scholar and an artist, accurate and full in detail, clear and interesting in the manner of presentation. If carried out upon the present scale to cover the entire period of the Revolution, it will necessarily include at least four additional volumes, as the three volumes already published carry the story only through the battle of Princeton (January 3, 1777). If ever

* *The American Revolution*, Part II, by the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart. In two volumes. Longmans, Green & Co., 91 and 93 Fifth Avenue, New York, 1904. (\$5 net.)

iner in Historical Theology in the University of London; late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and H. R. MACKINTOSH, M.A., D.Phil. (Edin.), Minister of Beechgrove United Free Church, Aberdeen; Translator of Ritschl on *Justification and Reconciliation*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1904. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 8vo; pp. xiii, 472. \$2.50 net.

"This volume has been prepared with the aim of bringing together within a small compass some of the leading positions in the philosophy of religion." It is evidently intended to be, and it is well worthy to be, a companion volume to *The Philosophy of Religion in England and America*, which was published by Dr. Caldecott in 1901, and which was reviewed at length and favorably in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April, 1902. The authors cited in the present volume are truly representative: Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Spinoza, the Cambridge Platonists, Berkeley, Kant, Schleiermacher, Cousin, Comte, Mansel, Lotze, Martineau, Janet, Ritschl. The selections are well chosen, and are long enough to be really instructive. The notes are numerous and very illuminative. A copious index gives easy command of the contents. The press-work could scarcely be surpassed. For these and other reasons the book cannot fail to be most useful.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF FAITH. By EVERETT P. WHEELER. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Paper, pp. 21.

This brochure was originally published as an article in *The Outlook*, having for its fundamental thought the idea that "all knowledge is based upon belief in the affirmations of human consciousness"—if not of our own consciousness, then that of some one else. In this way we derive a knowledge of God which is both certain and authentic. Some obvious objections are stated and answered in a very clear and helpful way.

Trenton.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

III.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, Dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the Assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A., D.D. EXTRA VOLUME: CONTAINING ARTICLES, INDEXES AND MAPS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. 4to, pp. xiii, 956.

Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* was completed two or three years ago in four large quarto volumes, the first of which was published in 1898 and the last in 1902. After this interval the present "Extra Volume" follows. The most obvious function which this "Extra Volume" serves is to provide a series of Indices for the work: and it may possibly have been first projected for this purpose. There are six of these indices, and they occupy the closing two hundred pages of the volume. The first of them gives a list of the authors who were engaged in the preparation of the work with the "principal articles" contributed by each. It will be observed that we say "*principal* articles," and we think that the qualification indicates a deficiency in this index: we should have thought it worth while to include in it a complete conspectus of each author's part in the preparation of the work, whereas it signalizes, "as a rule, only those articles which occupy at least a column." Even so, however, it enables us to estimate with substantial

accuracy the force at work on the *Dictionary* and the relative part taken in it by each writer. We learn from it, for example, that some 194 authors in all were employed, of whom some fifteen are of Continental and twenty-seven of American nationality, leaving over 150 for the native scholarship of Great Britain. The last two indices catalogue the illustrations and maps which occur in the work. The intermediate three—the “Subject,” “Textual” and “Verbal” Indices—are the really valuable ones, which may be supposed to add worth to the *Dictionary* as an actual handbook for the student. The “Subject-index” includes not merely the titles of the articles—for which, of course, no index was needed, seeing that (except those in this Extra Volume) they stand on the pages of the *Dictionary* themselves in alphabetical order—but besides “a great many other topics which are dealt with in the course of the work.” It thus makes the numerous incidental discussions of subjects of importance accessible to the reader, and very largely increases the usefulness of the work. It also breaks up the long articles into their separate topics, and thus serves as an index to their several parts. The Indices of texts and of Hebrew and Greek words particularly discussed still further open the contents of the work to the student. Altogether these Indices were well worth preparing and printing, and are a substantial gain to the possessor of the work.

But the Indices make but a small part of the volume. Seven hundred of its nine hundred pages are given to “Articles.” These articles are of very miscellaneous character and defy characterization by a single term. We cannot even say they are all long articles—though length, sometimes excessive length, is perhaps their most outstanding characteristic—for, after all, there are a few short articles among them, some excessively short, as, for example, that on “Concordances,” which is a mere meagre bibliography of less than a column and a half. It looks very much as if the editor, wishing to make out of his Indices a volume to range in size with the former ones of the work, conceived it to be desirable to bind up with them a series of discussions which would, in one way or another, supplement those in the *Dictionary* proper, and add in this manner to the value of the work as a whole. Some of these articles belong, no doubt—as the Preface remarks—to a class particularly useful to students of the Bible, but yet standing a little outside the compass of the Bible itself, and consequently not falling naturally into the vocabulary of a distinctly Bible Dictionary. These are such articles—to name only the examples given in the Preface—as those on the “Agrapha,” “Apocryphal Gospels,” “Code of Hammurabi.” But a Dictionary of the Bible in whose vocabulary the Apocryphal Apocalypses and Acts find a place, one would think could be made to contain also the Apocryphal Gospels: one in which the several Books of Enoch are treated, could probably be stretched to contain also the Sibyllines. Nor does this class of articles really form the characteristic element—certainly not the largest constituent—of the present volume. The most extensive article in it, forming a third of the whole indeed—Kautzsch’s article on the “Religion of Israel”—falls distinctly within the scope of a *Dictionary of the Bible*, and deals in fact with a subject which has not been left without treatment in the course of the *Dictionary* itself. No other article nearly attains its immensity of size—nearly 250 columns, or 175,000 words, which would make, if printed separately, a considerable octavo volume. But those articles which come nearest to it belong to the same class—articles like Prof. Votaw’s “Sermon on the Mount,” which extends to eighty-eight columns, or Prof. Ramsay’s “Religion of Greece,” which extends to no less than ninety-four columns. The plain truth seems to be that this whole series of articles have no excuse for being—and especially for being in an Appendix to a *Dictionary of the Bible*—except that they are useful articles on subjects insufficiently treated in the body of the *Dictionary* which the editor thinks will prove interesting and valuable to its readers. There are only thirty-seven of them in all, and they average as much as forty columns

or nearly 30,000 words apiece. No principle seems to have governed their selection, or the apportionment of space among them, or even their arrangement in the volume. They seem to have been printed in the order the MSS. came to the hand of the editor, either from their authors or from his drawer, and they can be turned up only by the aid of an index. The "Sermon on the Mount" comes first; the "Religion of Israel" comes last. Even such related subjects as the "English Versions of the Bible" and the "Continental Versions" are separated by any interval which the fortuitous concurrence of articles has happened to dictate. The "Textual Criticism of the New Testament" comes in at p. 208; the "English Versions" (which have nothing to do with "Textual Criticism") follows it at p. 296; while the "Continental Versions," which is a closely related subject to the latter, have to wait until p. 402,—and all kinds of things come between.

It is clear, then, that "form" is not the strong point of this Extra Volume. In some other minor matters also it does not come quite up to the highest standard. For example, one can hardly believe his eyes when he reads in the "Literature" at the close of Kautzsch's immense article on the "Religion of Israel," among the treatises "on Biblical Theology or on the History of the Religion of the Old Testament": "W. L. Alexander, *System of Biblical Theology*, Edinburgh, 1888, 2 vols." One would suppose that Dr. Kautzsch would include in the list of books he recommends to his readers on the subject he treats with so much learning and confidence only books known to him—which he had, at least, had in his hands: especially after the condescending way (with a condescension even more than that we are accustomed to see in foreigners) in which he had set aside as unworthy of notice the "older works on Biblical Theology," and the implied promise that he would name to us only such works as are free from the "blemish" of believing the Bible's own account of its origin and of the origin and growth of the religion of which it professes to be the record if not the codification. But in any event, one would have supposed that the Scottish editors would not have passed such an error as the adduction of a treatise on Systematic Theology (Dogmatics) by a distinguished Scotchman of the immediately past generation in a list of books on the Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. "Dogmatics," we are prepared to learn, are very little cultivated in the circles from which this *Dictionary* emanates; but we had been led to believe that "Biblical Theology" was so much their special *metier* that they could scarcely meet in their own immediate environment with a title so striking and promising so much as this, and yet so absolutely new to them, without at least pausing to investigate. It must be confessed, meanwhile, that the English part of this special "Literature" shows little sign of special "investigation" on the part of its supposable author or its supposable editors. It certainly looks very odd, for example, to see notes attached to Piepenbring's *Théologie de l'ancien Testament*, Budde's *Religion of Israel to the Exile* and Giesebrecht's *Grundzüge der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, to warn the *blasé* reader off from them as popular ground, and yet such a book as Prof. W. H. Bennett's *The Theology of the Old Testament*—a veritable primer—left standing out (on the principle that the exception proves the rule) among the works of strictly scientific value. Obviously, one would say, Dr. Kautzsch does not read English—at least not English books on "Biblical Theology." But then that might compel us to say, equally obviously neither does Dr. Hastings, nor Dr. Selbie.

Another rather amusing instance of Homeric nodding may be found in the closing paragraphs of Dr. Lupton's very interesting and very valuable and very judicious and fair article on the "English Versions" of the Bible. He is closing a really first-rate article with a really first-rate estimate of the American Revised Version, and remarks: "The inference to be drawn from this brief comparison of renderings, as well as from a more general survey of the work, is that it is premature as yet to call it, as is done on the title-page, a 'Standard Edition.'" . . .

"It is vain to hope that a standard edition of the English Bible will be soon forthcoming; and still more to dream that the desired object has been attained already"—and so on. But is it vain to hope that most readers will be able to distinguish between the announcement that a given edition of a version is put forth by the publishers as the "Standard Edition" of that version—to which they would wish all other editions to conform, and for which alone in its details they hold themselves responsible—and a claim for the version itself that it is to be taken and treated for all time as "the Standard Version" of the English Bible? Had Dr. Lupton not made so much of it we should have been disposed to believe we had here only a slip of the pen. But it is only too clear that he has taken the publishers' announcement of the place they wish a special edition of the American Revision to occupy among its other editions, for a claim of the revisers to finality for their work!

We cannot go, however, into details with reference to the treatment of the topics embraced in this volume. The spirit in which the study of the Bible is approached in it is, in many cases, much too free for our taste. As Mr. Garvie explains in his article on "Revelation," the men of the modern world no longer believe the Bible implicitly, and in very wide circles it has lost its authority altogether. This over-free attitude to the Bible dominates the thought of many of the writers in the volume, as in those that preceded it; and the consequence is that we must adjudge the total impact of the volume to be, to speak frankly, destructive. At the same time we thankfully acknowledge that a more reverent attitude toward the Scriptural revelation is sustained by some of the writers, and that much instructive material is presented by them all. If we find little to attract us in such an article as Mr. Garvie's on "Revelation," for instance, we find much in Dr. Scott's on "The Trinity," which immediately precedes it. And so, as we read, we go backward and forward, librating between what delights and instructs us and what deeply pains us. The book is thus, it will be seen, very much a mirror of the times, with its shifting varieties of opinion taking the place of established doctrines. The pity is that as a *Dictionary of the Bible* it is not rather a mirror of the Word. For after all is said, as *Alles rollt vorbei* and these *Zeiten*, like the others that have preceded them, pass away, along with the very *Welt* itself, phases of which all *Zeiten* are, the one thing that will abide is the Everlasting Word of God.

One of the things that we note, and note with much satisfaction, is the sturdy defense that is made in the article on the "Textual Criticism of the New Testament" of the textual work—and conclusions—of Dr. Hort. The whole article is, to our taste, too personal in tone (in the good sense) and leaves its subject far too frequently, to dwell on the personality of the workers with whose labors it deals. And we must confess that the polemic against Mr. Miller seems to us pushed too far into detail: twice to slay the dead may be well enough, but it can scarcely be necessary to slay over again, a third time, each of his fragments. Much more interesting is what is said of the newer but scarcely more likely contentions of our modern devotees of the "Western" text. We quite accord with the summary of the matter given in § 83 (p. 235): "On the whole, then, there seems no reason to anticipate that the present revival of interest in the early history of the 'Western' text will in the end be found to upset the estimates formed by WH of the relative importance of the different groups of textual authorities, or to modify in more than a mere handful of passages the judgments which they formed on individual readings." Dr. Murray has the inestimable advantage over many of those who have written of Dr. Hort and the modifications his conclusions are destined to undergo from the "newer investigations," that he really understands Dr. Hort's principles, and has taken the trouble to consider with some care their working. It is perhaps a little of a pity that his article bears so much the appearance of a direct defense of Dr. Hort and his views: many may be prejudiced by

this appearance and misled into treating it as if it were a piece of special pleading. It is in reality a wide-minded and solid and independent estimate, and will powerfully commend Dr. Hort's views to all who read it with care and critical discrimination. It is mere fact that the bases of Dr. Hort's theories were so solidly laid and the details worked out with such prudence, that subsequent acquisitions of facts and probabilities have only more strongly than ever commended them to careful thinkers. It is as true to-day as it was a quarter of a century ago, that all fruitful and promising textual criticism of the New Testament must take its point of departure from Dr. Hort's work.

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS: Their Nature and Meaning Explained. By JAMES WILLIAM THIRTLE. Crown 8vo, pp. viii, 386. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow and New York: Henry Frowde, 1904.

Mr. Thirtle's treatise includes a discussion of the whole body of notes that accompany the Psalms in the MSS. and have been transferred from them to the editions. This discussion is throughout careful and will bring needed light to the interpretation of these enigmatic adjuncts to the Psalter. But the specialty of the book concerns "the musical titles," for the interpretation of which Mr. Thirtle has found a new key. This key consists, in brief, in the conjecture that the "musical titles" are to be separated sharply from the literary titles which accompany them, and to be assigned not to the Psalms at the head of which they stand, but to those that immediately precede them. When so separated and assigned, Mr. Thirtle finds their interpretation greatly facilitated.

The starting-point of the theory is taken from the Psalm which constitutes the third chapter of Habakkuk. This Psalm, standing by itself, has claims, Mr. Thirtle thinks, to be studied "as a model in all its various features, literary and musical." This Psalm, now, is preceded by a literary note, which Mr. Thirtle would read: "A Prayer of Habakkuk, the Prophet: loud-cries [or exhortations]"; and is followed by a musical note: "To the Chief Singer on thy stringed instruments." It is not impossible, reasons Mr. Thirtle, that this arrangement was followed in the Psalter also, if we may be permitted to suppose that the Psalms were written in the MSS. of the Psalter continuously with no divisions marked between them, and that on the subsequent separation of the Psalms from one another the whole body of notes that came between them was taken over to the subsequent Psalms, instead of equitably divided between the two in contiguity with which they stand. If this supposition be allowed, we have only to restore to the preceding Psalms the musical notes, which really belong to them, and we have recovered for these notes the normal arrangement as exhibited by the Psalm in Habakkuk. When this is done, he argues, new light is thrown upon these musical notes. For the first time they become comprehensible; and not only so, but a fine appropriateness emerges in the case of many of them to the Psalm to which they are attached. The best example of this appropriateness which he adduces is supplied by the note which in our ordinary editions is prefixed to Ps. lvi: "For the Chief Musician: set to Jonath elem rehokim," that is to say (as the margin informs us), "The silent dove of them are that afar off," or, as otherwise read, "The dove of the distant Terebinths." This, however, has no imaginable appropriateness to Psalm lvi, while at verses 6-8 of Psalm 55 we read: "And I said, Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away and be at rest. Lo, then would I wander far off, I would lodge in the wilderness. I would haste me to a shelter from the stormy wind and tempest." This curious relation between the title of the one and the text of the other Psalm has not been unnoted. Thus, for example, Dr. William H. Green remarks of it: "It is a significant circumstance that the link that binds Psalm lvi to lv is the correspondence