

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

JANUARY 1908

NUMBER I

JOHN KNOX AS STATESMAN.

It was unfortunate that the recent celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Knox should have taken place in the midst of a discussion as to the accuracy of the hitherto accepted date of that event. There is no longer much room for doubt that the challenge of Dr. Hay Fleming was well founded, and that the Reformer was born, not in 1505, but in 1515, and died at the age of fifty-seven. The commemoration, nevertheless, was highly successful, and revived the impression of Knox's great personality and his unique services. It called forth also some excellent additions to the literature of the subject, among which Professor Cowan's contribution to an American series of admirable monographs on the *Heroes of the Reformation* is one of the best. Mr. Andrew Lang's extraordinary outburst has affected no reputation but his own.

We propose in the present paper to consider Knox in one aspect only—that of statesman. That a man, who was simply parish minister of Edinburgh, and who never but for a few months in an emergency undertook any political function, should nevertheless be classed as a statesman, and one of the most capable and successful statesmen of his time, will seem strange to no one who really knows the history of Scotland during Queen Mary's reign.

DES PAULUS BRIEF AN DIE RÖMER für höhere Schulen ausgelegt von RUDOLF NIEMANN, Gymnasialprofessor in Waren i. M. Gütersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1905. pp. iv., 127.

DES PAULUS EPISTEL AN DIE RÖMER. Abdruck der revidierten Übersetzung Luthers und Auslegung für Gymnasialprima von RUDOLF NIEMANN, Gymnasialprofessor in Waren. (Schülerheft.) Gütersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1905. pp. 51.

These two little books are addressed to the special needs of the higher classes in the German schools, but they might well attain a wider sphere of influence. Unfortunately, the Epistle to the Romans finds no regular place in the curriculum of our colleges; but careful teachers of Bible classes, either in college or elsewhere, might well receive useful suggestions, both for their own exegesis and for their pedagogical method, from the former of Niemann's commentaries. The "Schülerheft" seems too condensed; it is not quite clear why the fuller commentary could not be placed in the hands of students as well as of teachers.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

DER VORCHRISTLICHE JESUS, nebst weiteren Vorstudien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums. Mit einem Vorworte von P. W. Schmiedel. WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann (vormals J. Rickers Verlag). 1906. Pp. xix, 243.

This book is certainly unique in the circumstances of its origin. A professor of mathematics in Louisiana, who tells us that he was brought up as an orthodox Christian of the strictest sort, having entered the field of New Testament criticism, has published, in Germany and in the German language, with an introduction by a well-known German scholar, a book entitled *The Pre-Christian Jesus*.

The Introduction itself is somewhat remarkable. Professor Schmiedel intimates that he rejects the views of Smith *in toto*, and that, sooner or later, he shall seek to refute all his main positions (p. xi), and yet he regards it as the duty of every scientific theologian to read the book and to balance accounts with it (p. viii). For two reasons: first, because its theory is put forward again and again in varying forms (*e. g.*, Loman, Kalthoff, Robertson), and second, because of its "scientific method" (p. ix). The latter point he emphasises. But it is just here that the Introduction strikes one as remarkable—the conclusions of the book are not to be trusted, and yet its method is scientific! If a method is truly scientific throughout, scientific in its treatment of the sources whence data are derived as well as in the treatment of the data themselves, ought not the result to be worthy of confidence? If it is scientific merely in its handling of data, but unscientific in its gathering of the same, then surely it is unscientific in that which is most important. Assuming that Professor Schmiedel's view is correct, and that the results of our author's study are not to be trusted, then it strikes one that as a model of scientific discipline it is not to be recom-