

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VII

OCTOBER 1909

NUMBER 4

MUSIC IN THE WORK OF CALVIN.*

I have been brought before you this evening, ladies and gentlemen, by circumstances at once encouraging and intimidating,—odd and yet logical,—such as would suggest a long introduction. The response which I bring you to lectures delivered, respectively, four months ago and one month ago, was in point of fact worked out and prepared at least eighteen months ago. I can do little more, at best, than adjust it to the situation.

Yet, in view of the length of our road and the shortness of the time at our disposal, I feel bound to sacrifice all retrospective or personal explanations. I shall not even try to take advantage of that fellow-citizenship with you in heart, if not in blood, to which more and more frequent and pleasant visits to you, and friendships among you every year growing older and more numerous, seem to give me a

* [An Address delivered by Professor Émile Doumergue, now Dean of the Protestant Theological Faculty of Montauban, in the "Salle de la Réformation", at Geneva, in April, 1902. The allusions at the opening of the Address are explained by the circumstance that there had shortly before been delivered at Geneva, by MM. Brunetière and Münz, similar but sharply critical Addresses on phases of Calvin's work. It is pleasant to be able to record that the harsh judgments of these lecturers were rapidly modified, and in the opening words of a second Address delivered shortly afterwards, Professor Doumergue was able to advert gracefully to their change of heart.—*Translator.*]

evasion" (*eine Ausflucht*, p. 126; *cf.* the similar argument p. 186 Zusatz, "Es liegt eine ungenaue Ausdrucksweise vor", and p. 191 "oder Polycarp hat irrthümlicherweise gemeint"; *cf.* also p. 218). Moreover, parts of Dr. Leipoldt's argument are constructed on the basis of the results of the work of other scholars which will hardly commend themselves equally to all,—as for example the conclusions of Rohrbach in regard to the ending of Mark (p. 116 n. 2) or of Schwartz in regard to the early date of the Fourth Gospel implied in the Canon Muratori (pp. 146, 152). On page 131 it is argued that Justin's infrequent use of the Fourth Gospel is not an indication that he esteemed it less highly than the Synoptic Gospels (*cf.* also p. 153), and yet on page 148 n. 3 it is said that "the Apologete Justin probably had a dislike (*Abneigung*) for the Fourth Gospel." The connection also between conclusion and premise in Dr. Leipoldt's argument is at times a little loose, as when, for example, from the premise (p. 164) "When men like Clement of Alexandria and Sarapion of Antioch, who certainly or probably knew and acknowledged the fourfold-Gospel Canon, yet cite with regard other Gospels beside the four Gospels" it is concluded "therefore the fourfold Gospel Canon was not in their eyes a thing definitely circumscribed for all time". The facts of the premise only show that the recognition of the fourfold-Gospel Canon on the part of these men did not exclude or prevent a high regard for and citation of other Gospels. (Other instances of faulty interpretation are pointed out by A. E. Brooke, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1907-8, p. 607f.). Dr. Leipoldt manifests a tendency also to argue that a certain hypothesis "is not excluded" or to emphasize the fact that when something is said, it is "only" that and not something else that might have been said and from such considerations to draw important historical conclusions (*cf.* p. 238 where what is "*nicht ausgeschlossen*" appears in the next paragraph as an accepted fact; *cf.* also the qualification of the statement in the text on p. 248 by foot-note 3; for an undue emphasis upon "*nur*" *cf.* p. 164). Although generally careful to distinguish fact from opinion (p. 5), Dr. Leipoldt occasionally confuses them (Vol. ii, p. 73).

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

Cambridge Patristic Texts. General Editor: A. J. Mason, D.D., Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge.—THE CONFESSIONS OF AUGUSTINE. Edited by JOHN GIBB, D.D., Professor of Church History at Westminster College, Cambridge, and WILLIAM MONTGOMERY, B.D. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1908. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.) 8vo.; pp. lxxiv, 480.

Dr. Gibb and Mr. Montgomery have given us an excellent edition

of Augustine's *Confessions* in this beautifully printed and appointed volume.

The text they print is, of course, Pius Knöll's; and, of course, Pius Knöll's in its revised form (Teubner, 1898). They tell us they have departed from Knöll's text in a few readings; but they give us no list of these new readings. We have noted the following instances (which are probably nearly all of them):

I. viii. 13 (p. 13, 13) *omnibus, pensabam memoria*: for *omnibus. pensabam memoria*: (punctuation).

I. xviii. 29 (p. 31, 3) *omines* for *hominibus* (but *omines* in Addenda et Corrigenda).

VI. iii. 4 (p. 142, 12) *te terminatum* for *determinatum*.

VIII. ii. 3 (p. 205, 5) *spirabat prodigia* for *inspirabat populo* (but *spirabat prodigia* in Addenda and Corrigenda).

IX. viii. 18 (p. 254, 11) *reprobos*, for † *praepositos* (but *reprobos* in Addenda et Corrigenda).

X. ix. 16 (p. 285, 13) *earum* for *eorum*.

X. xx. 29 (p. 296, 4) "*sat, est illic*", *ubi* for "*sat, est illic*". *ubi* (punctuation).

X. xxiv. 35 (p. 300, 23) *inveni* for *invenio*.

X. xxviii. 39 (p. 303, 13) *prosperis* for *prospera*.

X. xxxi. 44 (p. 307, 2) *quid* for *quod*.

X. xxxi. 45 (p. 308, 4), *miles* for *milex*.

X. xxxv. 55 (p. 316, 8), *luceat* for *lucet*.

X. xxxv. 55 (p. 317, 1), *est* for *non est*.

X. xxxv. 55. (p. 317, 1), *operta* for *operata*.

X. xxxvii. 60 (p. 321, 13) *supervacanea* for *supervacuanea*.

X. xxxviii. 63 (p. 324, 3), *homo* after *saepe* for *omit*.

X. xl. 65 (p. 325, 11), *nuntiantibus* for *nutantibus*.

XI. xix. 25 (p. 350, 20), *non* for *nec*.

XII. xxii. 31 (p. 387, 29), *praescriptum* for *perscriptum*.

XIII. iii. 4 (p. 405, 15), *tu* before *es* for *omit*.

XIII. xix. 24 (p. 425, 23), *offocaverunt* for *suffocaverunt*.

XIII. xxi. 29 (p. 429, 1), *regnum* for *regno*.

XIII. xxi. 29 (p. 429, 9), *ut* for *et*.

The question naturally arises how far this best text of the *Confessions* rests on good MS. authority. It will be remembered that Knöll considers that the MS. transmission goes back to a single archetype of, say, the fifth or sixth century, and derives his text mainly from a single codex of the seventh or eighth century,—which he cites as S (*Codex Sessoriana*, now in the Library Vittorio Emmanuele, at Rome), the nearest congener to which is a Viennese MS. which he cites as W. The text of Knöll may be said, then, to be based on the readings of SW to which the remaining MSS. bring very little real help. In these circumstances it is not surprising that a number of passages have been transmitted to us corruptly and the precarious aid of conjecture requires to be called in for their correction. It is reassuring, however, to observe how few such passages there are. We

have observed the following conjectural readings in Dr. Gibb's and Mr. Montgomery's text:

- I. xi. 18 (p. 19, 14), *potius* (Knöll) for MSS. *per eos*.
- I. xiv. 23 (p. 23, 11), *texuerat* (Knöll) for SW *texerat*.
- I. xiv. 23 (p. 23, 23) *id quod* (Knöll) for MSS. *et qua*.
- I. xviii. 29 (p. 31, 3), *omines* (Knöll) for MSS. *homines*.
- III. viii. 16 (p. 71, 3), *cui* (Knöll) for SW *sive*.
- IV. iii. 6 (p. 84, 3), *sortem* (Knöll) for SW *sortes*.
- V. xiii. 23 (p. 133, 5), *sermonis suavitate* (Knöll) for SW *sermone suavitatis*.
- VI. iii. 4 (p. 142, 12), *te terminatum* (Benedictines) for MSS. Knöll, *determinatum*.
- VIII. ii. 3 (p. 205, 5), *prodigia* (Knöll) for MSS. *popilios*.
- VIII. iii. 9 (p. 210, 16), *fragra* (Knöll) for MSS. *fragla*.
- IX. viii. 18 (p. 254, 11), *reprobos* (Knöll) for MSS. *praepositos*.
- X. xviii. 27 (p. 294, 3), *non nidos suos* (Knöll) for S *non nidosue*.
- X. xx. 29 (p. 296, 25), *solo sono* (Knöll) conflating S *solo* and MSS. *sono*.
- X. xxi. 3 (p. 297, 7), *vidi* (Knöll) for MSS. *vidit*.
- XI. ix. 11 (p. 341, 11), *fecisti, deus* (Knöll) for reverse order of words in most MSS.
- XI. xv. 18 (p. 346, 10), *an ante* (Knöll) conflating S and other MSS.
- XII. xii. 15 (p. 376, 1), *possent* (Knöll) for MSS. *possunt*.
- XII. xxviii. 38 (p. 395, 13), *variationes* (Louvain.) for MSS. *narrationes*.

All of these conjectures except two, it will be noted, are Knöll's own, and all of them with the exception of the *te terminatum* of VI. iii. 4, have been simply taken over with Knöll's text. In this single instance Dr. Gibb and Mr. Montgomery desert Knöll's guidance, reverting to an old emendation of the Benedictines, which was approved also by Dr. Pusey. Clearly the text of the *Confessions* has been transmitted to us very soundly and we may look upon it as presented by Knöll as in a very satisfactory state.

Our new editors, though following Knöll closely, have not followed him blindly, and have discussed in their notes, as they say, "the comparatively few cases in which the text is uncertain, or the variants of special interest". As these discussions are not listed in the index, we note the following instances for the benefit of the interested reader:

- [I. ii. 2 (p. 3, 6), *invocabo*.]
- I. viii. 13 (p. 13, 13), *pensabam*.
- I. xviii. 29 (p. 31, 3), *omines*.
- I. xx. 31 (p. 33, 9), *ceteris*.
- II. iii. 6 (p. 39, 20), *ima*.
- II. iii. 9 (p. 42, 4), *prodiebat*.
- II. iii. 9 (p. 42, 10), *nec penuria et fastidio*.
- III. vi. 10 (p. 64, 2), *phantismatis*.
- III. vii. 13 (p. 69, 9), *hic serviunt*.
- IV. iii. 6 (p. 85, 1), *castus*.

- IV. viii. 13 (p. 92, 14), *flagrare*.
 IV. xv. 24 (p. 101, 11), *sexu*.
 V. i. 1 (p. 108, 1), *adtransiens*.
 V. iii. 4 (p. 111, 15), *se*.
 VI. i. 1 (p. 137, 4), *offerebat*.
 VI. iii. 4 (p. 142, 12) *te terminatum*.
 VII. xx. 26 (p. 197, 7), *quisque*.
 VIII. ii. 3 (p. 205, 5), *prodigia*.
 VIII. xi. 26 (p. 227, 22), *vanitantium*.
 IX. iii. 5 (p. 236, 12), *anxitudine*.
 IX. iii. 5 (p. 237, 11), *virtutis*.
 IX. iv. 20 (p. 243, 11), *lambiunt*.
 IX. viii. 18 (p. 254, 11), *reprobos*.
 IX. viii. 18 (p. 255, 9), *ordinate*.
 IX. ix. 19 (p. 256, 12), *condicionis*.
 IX. ix. 27 (p. 262, 17), *ponitis*.
 IX. xiii. 34 (p. 268, 10), *discutias*.
 IX. xiii. 37 (p. 271, 2), *hanc vitam*.
 X. xxxiv. 53 (p. 314, 20), *sacrificatori*.
 X. xxxvii. 62 (p. 323, 8), *tu*.
 XII. xi. 14 (p. 374, 21), *infirmarum*.

It should be remarked, however, that most of these notes, though attached to readings, are not strictly speaking textual notes, but concern questions of form, grammar and interpretation.

The editors have very properly inserted between the Introduction and the Text a brief "summary of the history of the text". Though the details are filled in from other sources, the outline of this summary has unfortunately been taken from Knöll. We say "unfortunately", for the section in Knöll which has been drawn upon is not a summary of the history of the text but only an account of the editions which he selected for use in the preparation of his own text. Accordingly he cites the readings of these (four) editions in the digests of readings which he prints beneath his text. Strange to say, in the digest of selected readings which Dr. Gibb and Mr. Montgomery print beneath their text citations of these editions are taken over from Knöll without any indication to the reader of what the symbols stand for. The reader accordingly meets repeatedly with "*edd.*" with no intimation that just these four editions are intended, and with such symbols as *m*, *o*, *mo*. without any clue to their significance. There may be good and sufficient reasons for selecting just these four editions,—Amerbach 1506, Louvain (Paris) 1651, Benedictine, 1689, Pusey 1838—for collation in presenting the text. But what reason is there for considering their enumeration to constitute a "summary of the history of the text"? In point of fact, the *Confessions* had been printed at least four times (first, apparently at Milan, 1475) before the *editio princeps* of Augustine's works was printed by Amerbach at Basle in 1506. And how can a summary of the history of the text of the *Confessions* pass over in silence the long series of editions which bear the name of Sommalius

(beginning apparently 1607)? Or the series which Wagnareck inaugurated in 1630? Or that begun by Du Bois in 1687—which lies at the base of Pusey's and von Raumer's texts?

Perhaps this is the place to express doubt also whether the statement with which the preface opens may not be misleading. There we are told that, "with the exception of Dr. Pusey's edition of the year 1838, which contains a number of parallel passages and a few notes in Latin, no annotated text of Augustine's *Confessions* has hitherto been published in this country, and only one in Germany, which appeared as far back as the year 1856 under the editorship of Karl von Raumer". The phrase, "in Latin", seems to contrast Dr. Pusey's notes with those of the present edition in the matter of the language in which they are presented. But Dr. Gibb and Mr. Montgomery have not avoided Latin in their notes, but freely cite illustrative passages from other authors in that language, as they are clearly entitled to do when annotating a Latin author. They also cite passages in Greek, which also seems entirely proper. We have more doubt of the desirability of citing German, French and Italian authors in their own languages, as they also do,—if, that is, their book is designed as a handbook for students, as it seems to be. But this aside, though the main assertion of the statement in question may be formally true, it would be misleading if it were understood to affirm that annotated editions of the *Confessions* are confined to those enumerated. We may not hold Wagnareck's extended commentary on the *Confessions* in very high esteem, but it is part of the history of the annotation of the *Confessions*, and is still, after two centuries and a half being reprinted (Turin, 1891) and (very much indeed) "modified" (by M. Pihan, Paris, c. 1902) for modern consumption. And certainly the "notes" with which Du Bois (1687) "illustrated" his text—which formed the mine from which Dr. Pusey drew—are by no means negligible. And other elaborately annotated editions have been published.

We have thought it right to call attention to these petty inexactnesses of statement or treatment. They are, however, of no great importance. What is of importance is that our editors, having adopted the best extant text of the *Confessions* and, beautifully reprinting it, have accompanied that text with the best extant series of notes upon it. Former annotations on the *Confessions* have dealt almost exclusively with its matter, and have had as their object to explain, illustrate or even to apply Augustine's teaching. Wagnareck's elaborate commentary is very properly described by Portalé as a body of "excellent ascetic notes". Dr. Pusey's notes, representing another line of descent, are mainly concerned to elucidate Augustine's meaning either by the adduction of parallel passages from his other writings or by didactic explanation. Much of this annotation is valuable; but we have lacked hitherto a good hand-edition of the *Confessions* provided with notes which should be broadly explicative in the pedagogical sense,—should supply, in other words, just the aid the inexperienced student needs to help him over the hard places of the text and to enable him to read it intelli-

gently. It is this that Dr. Gibb and Mr. Montgomery have undertaken to supply: and they have done it admirably. Their notes are strictly confined to aids to the understanding of the text and supply information and guidance in textual, lexical, grammatical, rhetorical, logical, archæological, historical and philosophical difficulties. Every chapter is begun with a brief statement of its contents, and then the editors accompany the readers through it, clause by clause, helping him over the difficulties and seeing that he understands each clause exactly and appreciates it fully. It is no light praise to say that the editors have done this work well, with adequate knowledge, good judgment, restraint and sound pedagogical instinct. We should like it better, if, as we have said, passages quoted from German, French and Italian writers had been rendered into English: for the book is distinctly for, not the learned, but learners. But this is a small matter and is worth mention only because the passages quoted are always so appositely quoted that we feel regret that many of those who will use the book will miss their aid. It is astonishing with what full and sound knowledge of Augustine and his teaching, the customs and thought of the times, and the course of Christian history these notes are informed.

There is prefixed to the volume an adequate Introduction, which supplies the reader with what he needs to know of the origin, literary form and character of the *Confessions* and their place in Augustine's development, that he may proceed profitably to their study. The same competent knowledge and sane judgment exhibited in the notes are manifested in this Introduction also. We should have liked a fuller discussion of the literary form which the *Confessions* exemplify—with perhaps a sketch of the development of autobiography in the ancient world and its culmination in the *Confessions*, and an indication of the essential differences which separate them from all simple autobiographies strictly so called. The editors, however, simply decline the task of determining the precise literary *genre* of the *Confessions*: "It seems best to leave the *Confessions* in a separate category of their own, and not to attempt to bring them into relation to works of a different age and of a different spirit." No doubt. Yet we cannot help thinking it would be useful in introducing students to them to set them into relation to works of a similar general character in their own age and of the same spirit in different ages, that the category to which they belong may be intelligently apprehended. It is in connection with this somewhat perfunctory discussion of the literary congeners of the *Confessions* that there occurs the only serious slip in a matter of fact which we have observed in the volume. How the editors came to write "Paulinus of Nola" for Paulinus of Pella when speaking of the latter's *Eucharisticos Deo* as a possible parallel (in one aspect) to the *Confessions*, it is difficult to imagine.

A "table of dates" in the life of Augustine down to the writing of the *Confessions*, and three excellent Indices—of Subjects, Scriptural Texts, and Latin words—add to the usefulness of the volume. Every teacher who has ever read the *Confessions* with a class and hopes to read it

again—and who that has once done it will not hope to do it again?—will be grateful for this admirable class-edition of the book.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

MEN OF THE KINGDOM. ERASMUS: THE SCHOLAR. By JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, Professor of Historical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1907. Pp. 249. Price, \$1.00 net.

To publish volumes on such men as Cyprian and Erasmus in successive years is no light task, but Professor Faulkner has accomplished it. What was said in this REVIEW, (Vol. VI, p. 677) of the former volume is applicable also *mutatis mutandis* to the one on Erasmus. The volume before us is intended for laymen and those beginning their historical studies,—for those who have to be informed what rhetoric was, or that the popes of the fifteenth century were temporal rulers. Professor Faulkner is nothing if not modern. As he could not write of Cyprian without reflections on Philadelphia under the Quay ring, much less could Erasmus fail to condemn our modern faults. We are told opportunely that we fall short of Erasmus' ideal "with our robber tariffs and our huge monopolies building up our multi-millionaires, and creating conditions which have in them the seed-plots of revolutions" (p. 140); that the degree of Doctor of Theology was conferred on Erasmus "for the same reason that our honorary degrees are *sometimes* granted, viz., as a recognition of special attainments in theological science" (p. 80); and that the Sorbonne condemned the "colloquies" like the "contemptible censorship of Russia's despot" (p. 166). Indeed, the whole volume is pervaded with a breezy modernity of style that is but ill adapted to portray the graceful repose sought after by the leaders of Humanism. It may not be inexact to say that the Inquisition "nabbed" Laurentius Valla (p. 23), but somehow the word does not seem in keeping with the dignity of the Holy Office; and when we read that the author does not take "much stock in" a certain statement of Erasmus (p. 85), or that the great scholar exhorts the church "to sidetrack her abuses" (p. 228) our feelings are somewhat exacerbated at being thus incontinently jerked out of the dim quiet of a sixteenth century study and hurtled on to the floor of a wheat exchange, or into the shunting yard of a railroad terminal. By "bursarship" (p. 36) is meant "bursary".

Professor Faulkner has read widely both in the writings of Erasmus and in the literature concerning him, and the little volume contains a great deal that is interesting and informing. We look in vain, indeed, for a unified, clearly thought out portrait of the greatest scholar of his age, with his foibles, idiosyncrasies, learning and popularity. They are mentioned, indeed, but they are not woven into the texture of the book in such a way as to bring the reader into touch with the living personality. What the author gives us is rather a more or less chronological, running account of Erasmus' life and labors, with frequent