

REV 31 0

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITORS

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
JAMES OSCAR BOYD
KERR D. MACMILLAN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD
JOHN DE WITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
JOSEPH H. DULLES
HENRY W. SMITH

VOLUME XI

1913

Published Quarterly for
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION
by
THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, N. J.

marriage union. This is his one great mistake. If marriage, as our Lord teaches, results in one common life both spiritual and physical, then, only death or its equivalent can dissolve it and death or its equivalent must dissolve it. Hence, infidelity and final desertion must terminate marriage or evince that it has been terminated: as even physical death need not do, they mark the destruction of the exclusiveness of the more important element in marriage, the spiritual affection. Hence, also, only infidelity and final desertion can be just grounds of divorce: they are the only two reasons for it which in their effect on the common life of marriage are real equivalents of death.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The Place of the Church in the Work of Social Betterment. By EDGAR P. HILL, D.D., Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Applied Christianity in McCormick Theological Seminary; Superintendent of the Church Extension Board, Presbytery of Chicago. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. Pamph., 8vo; pp. 29. 1913.

A brief but admirable discussion of a question of great and of pressing interest. It believes that the mission of the church is primarily spiritual; but because this is so, it holds that the church has been and should continue to be of all forces the most effective for true social betterment. Dr. Hill writes soundly, sanely, winningly. His paper should do much good. We wish that it might be read by all who are interested, as all ought to be, in "social betterment".

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

GENERAL LITERATURE

Critical Reviews relating chiefly to Scotland. By DAVID HAY FLEMING, LL.D. London, New York and Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton. 1912. 8vo; pp. xvi, 600.

It seems a bold thing to gather together a mass of occasional notices of books, published during a period of twenty-five years, and give them the permanency of re-publication in book-form. Possibly the quarter-of-a-century product of few reviewers would endure such a test. Dr. Hay Fleming's endure it. Unity is already given to the whole by the circumstance that practically all the reviews collected deal with works on Scottish history. When Dr. Hay Fleming qualifies this in his title by inserting the word "chiefly", this is only a characteristic instance of his scrupulous exactness of speech. Out of the some five scores of book-notices here republished, possibly some half-score might be said to concern books on English rather than Scottish history: and almost all of these are on subjects so

closely connected with Scottish history—Elizabeth, the Stuarts, Laud, the Percys—that they scarcely form an exception. Only the review entitled “Wesley and Methodism” (pp. 404 ff.) is wholly without direct reference to Scotland. A deeper unity is given to them by their harmony in style, manner, tone, and, we must add, purpose. For twenty-five years Dr. Hay Fleming has been printing notices of all the significant books on Scottish history, especially its ecclesiastical history, and more especially still the history of its great Reformation struggle and its *sequelae*, with a view apparently to doing what a reviewer may do to help on in the great work of getting the history of Scotland, particularly its religious history, truly understood and accurately recorded. With his unsurpassed stores of exact knowledge, and his wide-minded outlook on the progress of historical development, he has been able to set each new book, as it appeared, in its right light before the public, and to assign to it its proper sphere of influence. When these critical reviews are brought together they constitute what we can scarcely characterize as anything else than a valuable critical commentary on the historiography of Scotland for the past twenty-five years. Every one who reads the histories of Scotland and the historical studies on phases of Scottish affairs published during this period should have Dr. Hay Fleming’s book at his elbow to instruct him as to the credit to be given to each, and to save him from misadventure in his “facts”.

One of the notable features of Dr. Hay Fleming’s reviews is the multitude of errors of fact in the books he reviews which he corrects. One might almost gain the impression, in desultorily turning over his pages, that they give chiefly a catalogue of the errors of the historians. This impression would be erroneous. Dr. Hay Fleming does far more than correct the errors of detail of the works with which he deals. He gives a balanced estimate of the value of each for the purpose for which it is written; an estimate, which, if it errs at all, errs on the side of generosity of judgment. But with his immense knowledge of the facts, he could not but correct a good many errors of detail as he went along. And these corrections of errors of detail form in the mass an exceedingly valuable contribution to our knowledge of Scottish history. He is able, of course, to point out only a few in each book,—just enough to illustrate the degree of trust which may be accorded to its representations. What a pity he could not point out them all! Some government ought to endow a man like Dr. Hay Fleming for the purpose of reading every book in his specialty and making a detailed list of all its errors. Then, indeed, we might hope, after a while, to get a history which could be trusted. And let it not be imagined that this detailed accuracy with respect to matters of fact is a small matter. We do not refer now to the difficulty of attaining it,—according to Dr. Routh’s saying that such accuracy may be judged a trivial matter, but it is no trivial matter to attain it. We refer to its value. It is an illusion to think a just general view can be attained apart from strict exactness of detail. It

is the details in their sum which make up the general view: and if any considerable number of the details are wrong or any of them are considerably wrong, the general view is wrong too. No worker in any historical sphere—however narrow—but has had the experience that the exact ascertainment of a seemingly minute detail has been the hinge on which the correct estimate of all the great movements turn. We wish to express the deliberate opinion that it is only through the zeal for the fact which is so happily shown by Dr. Hay Fleming in all his historical work, and not least in this volume of wonderful *Critical Reviews*, that our knowledge of history is substantially advanced.

It is, of course, impossible to discuss the substance of a book like this. The reviewer's only, and happily very pleasant task, is merely to make its general character plain. We cannot content ourselves, however, without expressing the satisfaction we feel in Dr. Hay Fleming's convincing vindication of the personal character of a great hero like Knox, who has been the target of so many poisoned shafts; and in his sturdy defence of the Covenanters from much carping criticism. At one point he makes a valuable contribution to the history of the Westminster Confession in the Church of Scotland (pp. 309 ff.). It is too much to hope that his repeated, patient explanations will save future writers from the confusion into which few fail to fall with reference to the several Covenants. But it is sincerely to be hoped that his corrections of the slanders which have been given wide currency of the Scottish martyrs, notably George Wishart, may bear fruit. Over and over again fresh items of information as to historical events or persons of importance are incidentally communicated. Now and then an incompetent writer is fairly scourged. A good example is afforded by the characterization—let us rather say, the exposure—of Dr. James Rankin's History of the Church of Scotland up to 1688 published in that remarkable work *The Church of Scotland, Past and Present*, edited by the late Dr. Story, whose editorial duties Dr. Hay Fleming seems to suggest began by "inserting his own portrait as a frontispiece to the whole History of the Church of Scotland" and ended "with a general preface of twenty-four pages". Dr. Rankin's contribution he describes "as a superlative specimen of the slipshod, superficial and pretentious work of this so-called critical nineteenth century" (p. 25).

He who writes critical reviews of the literature of Scottish history of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries must of course often fall foul of Andrew Lang. Dr. Hay Fleming has not been able to avoid pointing out his numerous shortcomings, in lack of sympathy with the true makers of Scotland, deep-rooted prejudice against its religious leaders, and inveterate inaccuracy of statement. One might imagine that the relations between the criticised and the critic were necessarily somewhat strained. All the more welcome is the beautiful allusion to Mr. Lang in the Preface, with its record of more than twenty years of friendship, and its revelation of the mutual

appreciation of each other's qualities which governed the intercourse of these two lovers of St. Andrews and workers in Scottish history. "You have been rather the Freeman to my Froude (not that Freeman really knew where to have Froude)" wrote Mr. Lang to his friend only a little over a year ago, "but I hope there has never been an unkind thought on my side, or an unsportsmanlike criticism on yours, which is rather rare among men of letters".

We must not give the impression that Dr. Hay Fleming's criticism is always caustic or even always negative. Correction is correction; and the two meanings of the word are expressive of much. But correction is not invidious when it is done as transparently as it always is done by Dr. Hay Fleming only in the interests of truth. And all his criticism is not corrective, even in its milder sense. No appreciation could be more whole-hearted and generous than his, where appreciation is deserved. And no desert of appreciation is missed by him. Every good quality is perceived and noted, and every book is judged with careful regard to its purpose and its adaptability to fulfil that purpose. His praise is the more powerful that it is the praise of a critic who is not blind to faults. And his praise is lavishly given.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, April: AMBROSE WHITE VERNON, Can an Efficient Theology be Dependent upon Historical Facts; HUGO GRESSMANN, The Sources of Israel's Messianic Hope; A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, The Ancient Persian Conception of Salvation according to the Avesta, or Bible of Zoroaster; JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, Luther and the Bigamous Marriage of Philip of Hesse; C. E. FRYER, The Numerical Decline of Dissent in England previous to the Industrial Revolution; EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, The Washington Manuscript of the Gospels; JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON, The alleged Persecution of the Christians at Lyons in 177.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Oberlin, April: HENRY A. STIMSON, The Development of the Doctrine of God and Man; HERBERT W. MAGOUN, A Layman's View of the Critical Theory; ALFRED H. C. MORSE, The System of Indulgences; WILLIAM H. BATES, Judgment or Judgments; A. A. BERLE, Christianity and Therapeutics; HAROLD M. WIENER, The Recensional Criticism of the Pentateuch; GABRIEL CAMPBELL, Philosophical Aspects of Religious Experience; JAMES LINDSAY, The Rule of Faith; JACOB the SON of AARON, The Book of Enlightenment.

Church Quarterly Review, London, April: ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, Foundations; E. WORDSWORTH, St. Francis of Assisi; A. CALDECOTT, The Religious Philosophy of Rudolf Eucken; Religious Training in Secondary Schools; W. C. BISHOP, The Proposals for a New Lection-