

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.)

no intervention of episcopal authority is implied. The section on the epigraphic evidence for the doctrine of the intercession of the saints is well handled. The antiquity of the doctrine is treated vaguely, however, and some of Leclercq's intimations are not justified. There may be evidence for some idea of the communion of saints before Constantine, but all the epitaphs which are real proof of a belief in the *intercession* of the saints are post-Constantinian, although Leclercq says, "Nous avons vu ainsi l'Église triomphante, l'Église souffrante, et l'Église militante s'accorder sur un point de foi," etc. Again, Leclercq seems to intimate that the invocation of the prayers of dead relatives is an offshoot of, or at least coördinate with, the invocation of the saints, whereas it is probable that the epitaphs showing the former are anterior in date to those showing the latter, and the possibility of the prayers to the saints having developed out of the invocations addressed to departed friends is worth consideration.

In the article on Adam and Eve, Leclercq mentions the fact that "le plupart des artistes (in portraying Adam and Eve) ont choisi le moment où Adam et Ève sont tentés"; without saying why they did so. The reason for their choice was certainly that the moment makes an admirably symmetrical scene, with the tree and the serpent coiled around it in the middle, flanked by the figures of our first parents. *À propos* of this, it is unfortunate that the article by Mr. Meader on "Symmetry in Early Christian Relief-sculpture," which appeared a few years ago in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, has been so completely ignored by writers who have occasion to interpret works of Christian art. He has shown conclusively that the ruling motive in the Christian sculptor's choice, arrangement and treatment of scenes was the desire for symmetry. Yet we continue to see extravagant interpretations of sarcophagus-reliefs, which ascribe to the artisan profound conceptions worthy of a theologian, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Meader's conclusions should have made all this sort of criticism impossible. A tendency toward a saner method is discovered in Leclercq's words in the article *Adelphia*, p. 524, where he says, citing Le Blant, *Journal Officiel*, 1877, p. 5283: "Les sculpteurs des tombes chrétiennes se préoccupaient beaucoup moins du symbolisme, auquel ils étaient plus ou moins initiés, que de l'ordonnance symétrique de leurs compositions."

This article *Adelphia* is a discussion of a peculiar scene represented on the cover of a sarcophagus found in the catacomb of S. Giovanni at Syracuse in 1872, and inscribed IC ADELPHIA C F | POSITA COMPAR | BALERI COMITIS. The scene is explained by Leclercq, following Le Blant, as the introduction of the departed soul into the presence of the Virgin by her companion-saints.

Leclercq is also the author of the articles *Acolouthia*, *Acolyte*, *Ad Bestias*, *Ad Metalla*, *Adoration*, *Adultère* (in part) and *Affranchissement*. The fascicle ends with the beginning of the article *Afrique*.

C. R. MOREY.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY. By THOMAS CARY JOHNSON. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, [1903]. Svo, pp. xvi, 585.

Robert Lewis Dabney was born of pious parents, on his father's farm on the South Anna river, in Louisa county, Virginia, on the 5th day of March, 1820. He lost his father at the age of thirteen. After a preparation in the country schools of his district, he entered Hampden-Sidney College in the summer of 1836, at the age of sixteen: and spent three sessions there. The next two years were employed in aiding his mother and teaching a country school. Late in 1839 he repaired to the University of Virginia, whence he was graduated with the degree of Master of Arts in the summer of 1842. Two years were devoted, after this, to occupations similar to those which had engaged his energies prior to his entering the University. His mind was already made up, however, to give himself to the work of the ministry, and accordingly he entered Union Seminary, Va., in the

autumn of 1844, and was graduated thence in 1846. The first year of his ministerial life was spent as a missionary in Louisa county, in the service of "Providence Church." In July, 1847, he entered on his first real and sole separate pastorate at Tinkling Spring, Augusta county. There he remained until midsummer, 1853, when, at the age of thirty-three, he began his lifework as a teacher of theology at his theological *alma mater*, Union Theological Seminary, Va. For six years he filled the chair of Ecclesiastical History and Polity. In addition to the work of this Chair and the manifold labors that naturally fell into his hands as—after 1854 at least—the leading Professor in the institution, he taught also for one session Mental and Moral Philosophy in the neighboring college, and for another session Dogmatic Theology to one class in the Seminary. In 1858 he became one of the pastors of the College Church, a relation which was continued until 1875. In 1859 he was formally transferred to the Chair of Systematic and Polemic Theology in the Seminary, at first under the title of Adjunct Professor, which title he retained until 1869, though from the first he did the entire teaching of the department. Early in this period he received overtures both from the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, and from Princeton Theological Seminary, but elected to remain at his post in the South. His work in the Seminary was naturally much interrupted during the war between the States, in which he saw active service, first as a chaplain and then as chief of staff to General "Stonewall" Jackson. After the war, in much depression of spirit, and with increasing bodily weakness, he continued his labors as Professor of Theology at Union Seminary until 1883, when he became Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas. The work of this chair he continued to perform until 1894, when his connection with the University was severed. Meanwhile his physical ailments had continued to increase and he was called upon to endure the severest sufferings, culminating in total blindness. Despite these disabilities, however, he entered in 1884 into an arrangement which added to his University duties the burden of a class in theology in a school established by him and Dr. Smoot, which lasted until 1895. After 1895 his life was that of a private scholar and gentleman, full of interest and zeal in the causes which had interested him throughout life and continuing to lend the aid of his pen and voice to them as occasion offered. He died on the 3d of January, 1898.

Such are the formal annals of Dr. Dabney's life. Within this framework he lived as strenuous a life as it is possible to conceive. Of an ardent temperament naturally and accustomed to hold his opinions firmly and to urge them forcibly, he easily became a leader in every sphere of activity to which he was called. Not content with the duties of the several positions which he successively filled, he gave himself with tongue and pen to the wider propagation of the views which he had formed, and became thereby a power in both Church and State. The periodical press was used by him freely for the publication of his minor literary work: the larger productions of his pen naturally took the form of separate volumes. The range of topics dealt with by him was very wide. His earliest volume was a *Memoir* of his colleague at Union Seminary, Dr. Francis S. Sampson, which was published in 1854, and was followed a couple of years later by Dr. Sampson's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, very carefully edited by Dr. Dabney. His most important literary labors fall, however, in the sixth decade of his life. His *Sacred Rhetoric* was published in 1870; and the first edition of his *Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic Theology* in 1871. The latter book was really printed by his pupils from his unrevised notes. Seven years later he rewrote it, and it reappeared in this bettered form in 1878. His *Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century* was published in 1875; this, with his *Practical Philosophy*, written in the '80s, but not published until 1896, remains his most serious contribution to philosophical thought. Four volumes of his essays were collected and published between 1890 and 1897. Dr. Dabney himself, we are

told, regarded his *Practical Philosophy* as the best of his books: on the other hand, he "never seemed to value his *Syllabus of Theology* at its real worth," apparently (it is suggested) "because it was prepared by degrees and grew from year to year." From our own point of view we should reverse this judgment and, without derogating at all from the clearness of the expositions and the value of the trenchant criticisms in his philosophical treatises, yet rank his *Syllabus of Theology* as his *opus magnum*. This is a solidly thought and lucidly expressed compend of the Reformed theology, and is quite worthy of a place in the series of compendiums which have conserved the best traditions of Reformed theology from the beginning.

We shall not enter here upon an attempt to estimate Dr. Dabney's contributions to thought or his place in history. We have briefly expressed the high value we place upon his services to theological science and to the life of the Presbyterian Churches in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for August, 1901 (xii, 321), and must content ourselves with referring the interested reader to that estimate. He did not so much advance knowledge by his writings as conserve the truth. It must be confessed that the robustness of his views and the vigor with which he expressed them have, especially outside of the spheres of philosophical and theological matters where his thought was most at home, betrayed him occasionally into extremities of opinion. This will not, however, be permanently remembered against him. When all is said, he was a man of light and leading, who served his own generation well, and if unable to rise wholly above the provincialism powerfully fostered by the circumstances in which his life was passed, yet always worth listening to and always to be learned from. He is set before us in Dr. Johnson's biography from the point of view of an intense admirer. He was worthy of his biographer's admiration, but it may be doubted whether the expression of this admiration does not now and again pass the bounds within which it is effective. When speaking of a man like Dr. Dabney extravagance of praise is not necessary: the plainest picture of him, if true to life, will speak for itself. The good plan has been adopted by Dr. Johnson of confining himself mainly to drawing such a plain portrait and of letting Dr. Dabney himself occupy many of the pages with his letters. We would not have missed these letters for a great deal. They give us Dr. Dabney as he really was, unveiled for the intimate inspection of those who stood closest to him; and it speaks volumes as to his essential qualities when they compel us to say they give us Dr. Dabney at his best. They enable us to trace the growth of his mind and heart during his youth—to note the precocity of his judgment and the richness of his intellectual and emotional life. And they enable us to observe his sturdy honesty and his profound piety, as well as the working of his acute and powerful mind in his maturity. As we lay down the book, they enable us to say to ourselves with conviction that Dr. Dabney was not only an influential statesman and a powerful ecclesiastical force, not only an acute philosopher and a profound theologian, but also a devoted Christian—which is best of all. We may regret the element of unmeasured encomium which has been permitted to intrude into the biographer's pages, especially into his concluding "summary view of the man and his services": but we cannot fail to perceive a fair starting-point for the admiration it expresses in the genuinely noble qualities of the man that it depicts. Probably Dr. Dabney is at once the most voluminous theological writer and the most influential character which the Presbyterian Church of the United States (commonly called the Presbyterian Church, South) has yet produced. Not only that Church, but all Presbyterians owe him a debt of gratitude for his distinguished services to the truth we hold in common; and we shall all do well to honor his memory, and to extend the influence of his powerful advocacy of the truth that was to him his very life.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.