

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN  
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D.

VOL. V.

1891.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

**Richmond, Va. :**

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & Co.

# CONTENTS.

X  
P. 2  
P 925A  
v. 5

## VOLUME V.

	PAGE.
American Bible Society in Foreign Work,.....	<i>T. H. Law</i> , ..... 266
Apocalypse of the Gospels, The .....	<i>H. Wilson</i> , ..... 408
Authority in Revelation and Morals,.....	<i>T. P. Epes</i> , ..... 317
Baldwin's Psychology,.....	<i>J. B. Shearer</i> , ..... 299
Besant and Palmer's Jerusalem, .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> , ..... 131
Black's Fatherhood of God, .....	<i>Robert A. Webb</i> , ..... 127
Bledsoe's Theory of Moral Freedom,.....	<i>W. P. McCorkle</i> , ..... 229
Bocock's Writings, .....	<i>D. E. Jordan</i> , ..... 636
Brace's Unknown God, .....	<i>H. C. Alexander</i> , ..... 118
Briggs, The Inauguration of Doctor .....	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , ..... 270
Burge's Origin and Formation of Hebrew Scriptures, .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> , ..... 130
Burney's Soteriology, and the Cumberland Theology, .....	<i>T. C. Johnston</i> , ..... 157
Burney's Psychology, .....	<i>J. A. Quarles</i> , ..... 295
Calvinism and Confessional Revision, .....	<i>A. Kuyper</i> , ..... 479
Calvinism; and Calvinism and Infant Salvation,.....	<i>W. L. Nourse</i> , ..... 567
Canonicity, a Recently Proposed Test, .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> , ..... 33
Carson's Introduction to Shakespeare,.....	<i>W. S. Currell</i> , ..... 469
Chadwick and McGregor's Exodus, .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> , ..... 289
Christian Endeavor Movement, The .....	<i>William McKibbin</i> , ..... 243
Christian Endeavor Movement, The .....	<i>James Lewis Howe</i> , ..... 615
Chronicles and Kings, Alleged Discrepancies Between .....	<i>Lewis B. Paton</i> , ..... 587
Church, The Scriptural Idea of the.....	<i>Robert Watts</i> , ..... 177
Closed Questions, .....	<i>Robert A. Webb</i> , ..... 610
Criticisms and Reviews,.....	118, 284, 452, 625
Current Discussions in Apologetics,.....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> , ..... 125
Dabney's Discussions.....	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> , ..... 452
Deluge, The .....	<i>George D. Armstrong</i> , ..... 209
DeWitt's The Psalms, .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> , ..... 467
Dod's Genesis, .....	<i>W. W. Moore</i> , ..... 128
Edersheim's Prophecy and History, .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> , ..... 628
English, Relation of to Anglo-Saxon .....	<i>William H. Whiting, Jr.</i> , 107
Evangelistic Revival in the Synods,.....	<i>T. D. Witherspoon</i> , ..... 262

	PAGE.
Fatherhood of God, The.....	<i>Robert A. Webb,</i> ..... 56
Fatherhood of God, The.....	<i>Samuel J. Baird,</i> ..... 350
Gladstone's Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, ..	<i>George D. Armstrong,</i> ..... 284
Hunt's Studies in Literature, .....	<i>W. S. Currell,</i> ..... 132
Inspiration, .....	<i>J. A. Quarles,</i> ..... 332
Inspiration, The Doctrine of .....	<i>H. C. Alexander,</i> ..... 190
Inspiration of the Scriptures, .....	<i>John Pym Carter,</i> ..... 525
John's Argument from Miracles, .....	<i>L. G. Barbour,</i> ..... 1
Kerr's Voice of God in History, .....	<i>W. S. P. Bryan,</i> ..... 633
Licensure, .....	<i>Thos. R. English,</i> ..... 100
Morris' Calm Review of Brigg's Inaugural, .....	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i> ..... 630
Musick's Genesis of Nature, .....	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i> ..... 468
Northern General Assembly of 1891, .....	..... 430
Notes, .....	..... 91, 262, 408, 587
Original Languages, The Study of .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters,</i> ..... 542
Recent Publications, .....	..... 140, 308, 473, 638
Regeneration, N. T. Terms Descriptive of, .....	<i>B. B. Warfield,</i> ..... 91
Reith's John's Gospel, .....	<i>W. M. McPheeters,</i> ..... 287
Representative Government in the Church, .....	<i>D. C. Irwin,</i> ..... 363
Row's Christian Theism, .....	<i>H. C. Alexander,</i> ..... 627
Royal Teaching Preacher, The .....	<i>J. B. Shearer,</i> ..... 372
Schurman's Belief in God, .....	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i> ..... 291
Scotch-Irish, Influence of the .....	<i>J. H. Bryson,</i> ..... 380
South, God's Problem for the.....	<i>A. L. Phillips,</i> ..... 536
Southern General Assembly of 1891, .....	<i>P. H. Hoge,</i> ..... 416
Spoiling of Doctor Dryasdust, .....	<i>R. A. Lapsley,</i> ..... 71
Stearns' Evidence of Christian Experience, .....	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i> ..... 461
Swete's The Septuagint, .....	<i>R. B. Woodworth,</i> ..... 303
Unifying Doctrine in Theology, The .....	<i>K. M. McIntyre,</i> ..... 413
Union for which Jesus Prays, The.....	<i>A. W. Milster,</i> ..... 84
Universal Book, The.....	<i>J. B. Shearer,</i> ..... 517
Van Dyke's The Church, Her Ministry, etc., .....	<i>J. L. Girardeau,</i> ..... 133
Watt's New Apologetic, .....	<i>Samuel M. Smith,</i> ..... 123

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 15.—JANUARY, 1891.

---

I. ST. JOHN'S ARGUMENT FROM MIRACLES.

1. WE are so accustomed to regard John's Gospel as a sweet, tender evangel, that we are apt to leave out of view its argumentative character. John himself, however, in his twentieth chapter, teaches us to avoid this mistake: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

If we understand this passage, John does not mean that the preceding part of his book is wholly occupied with an account of various miracles. They have their place along with other things—other things, and, it may be, better things; for our Lord is represented as saying (xiv. 11), "Believe ME, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake." What emphasis is to be placed on that pronoun ME, what unfathomable depths of meaning are involved in it, no finite intellect can know. They who are most spiritually minded see in Christ, more than others do, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, and beholding it as in a glass, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord. Perhaps no one ever apprehended this divine glory more fully than did the beloved disciple; but he was preserved from the narrowness of depreciating, much more of despising the argument from miracles; in which, indeed, he would have been untrue to the ancient and sacred beliefs of his race. Hence, in addition to other things, we find in the first twenty chapters of his Gospel

a number of what are called miracles; and he tells us that they have been written with an argumentative purpose.

2. For our ends it is hardly necessary to define the term miracle anew. It is enough to say that any satisfactory attestation of a message from heaven must include the exhibition of a wisdom, a power, or some other attribute, above what belongs to man; something that surpasses the skill, the might—may we not add, the love, the pity, the self-sacrifice—to which we can attain. It must be a *τέρας*, a miraculum, a wonder. Then, too, it should be a *σημείον*, a signum, a sign. Thus will it agree with our Saviour's own words in John iv. 48, "Except ye see *σημεῖα καὶ τεράτα*, signs and wonders, ye will not believe"; wonders that not only attract attention to accompanying instruction, but that prove its heavenly origin.

It is not, then, a matter absolutely indispensable that the sign and wonder should be wrought in the domain of matter, and be discernible by the physical senses. Yet this is usually the case in the miracles of the Bible, and is uniformly so in the miracles appealed to by John in this Gospel. The two apparent exceptions will be noticed in due place.

The reason why the realm of matter is thus honored we take to be this: our bodily senses are less injured by the fall, and less incapacitated for receiving and reporting the truth, than almost any other part of our complex being. A diseased nervous system, or an attack of *mania a potu*, or a debauch on opium or hasheesh, may make us see visions of all kinds. Dr. Guthrie states in his autobiography that one day in his convalescence he saw a beautiful flower growing out of a marble mantel in his chamber, but knew that it was a hallucination. A man once told us that in a spell of delirium tremens he saw it rain fire, and that the most eloquent preacher could not paint the horrors that he endured. So that sin and disease have not left the sensory part of our nature untouched; and yet, taking mankind in general, we find our five senses reliable in their normal condition. Whatever might be true of disembodied spirits, we know that man can be very effectually reached through his senses. There is a commendable sobriety in this method; as John himself intimates in

the opening sentences of his First Epistle: "That . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life; . . . that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you." Honest Simon Peter, too, says: "This voice, which came from heaven, we *heard*, when we were with him on the holy mount." Hence he knew that he was not following cunningly devised fables.

Doubtless there was a divine wisdom in thus exalting the matter which God the Son had made in the beginning, so that during the long centuries of inspiration earth herself should lift up her voice in witness to the truth of his religion. "Marvellous are thy works, O Lord, and that my soul knoweth right well."

3. The most effective argument is not produced by a bewildering mass of proofs, but by a judicious selection. John had a large store to draw from. He chose nine or ten out of a great number of signs and wonders, and rested his case on these. Let us devoutly seek for the principles on which the selection was made.

4. The gospel is intended for all classes and conditions of men, for the learned and the unlearned, for the gentle and the simple. Hence its evidences must, at least some of them, come down to the level of the lowliest understandings, just as the air which all men must breathe descends from the upper heights, not merely to embrace the mountain peaks, but also to flood the vales; and the blessed sunlight rests upon the summit of Mont Blanc and upon the Swiss *chalét* far beneath.

Although, after the teaching of the Master and under the influence of the Holy Spirit, John was a profound thinker, he was not a scientific man in the modern sense of the term. It was needful therefore that the evidences exhibited to him in the natural world should be adapted to his degree of acquaintance with the laws of nature, in order that he might be a reliable witness; that is, a witness who really understood the matter concerning which he was to give testimony. At the same time, and this is one of the most curious and interesting features of the whole subject, the facts adduced must be such as would stand the test of scientific examination at any period of the world's history. It was eminently proper that the natural laws involved should be im-

portant laws, of wide application and susceptible of unquestionable verification. It was absolutely necessary that the facts alleged could not be accounted for by the operation of the forces of nature without special divine intervention. And this must be true although new and unsuspected forces should be discovered in the lapse of ages.

#### WALKING ON THE SEA.

5. In his sixth chapter John tells us that on one occasion, not long before a passover, our Lord left his disciples and departed alone into a mountain. The disciples entered into a ship and went over the Sea of Galilee toward Capernaum. The sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew. Modern science shows that this sea occupies a very deep depression in the earth. The rapid radiation of the heat from the elevated lands on both sides of the water chills the air, makes it heavier than that lying above the sea, which radiates much more slowly than the land, and thus cold currents rush down the slopes and through the gorges, and lash the lake into fury. On this particular occasion, either from the violence of the gale or from its blowing from the west—John does not state which, but both Matthew and the detail-loving Mark say the wind was contrary—the disciples were toiling at the oars. They had gone three or four miles, when they saw something preternatural walking toward them, and then (Mark) apparently about to pass by the ship. The passover was always at the full moon, sometimes in March and sometimes in April, when the sun sets and rises at or near six o'clock. The incident took place "in" or "about" the fourth watch of the night, *i. e.*, between three and six o'clock A. M. As the moon was near the full, there may have been some light from it hanging low in the west, and it would be advantageously reflected from an object approaching from the east. This probable, though not necessary, feature would add to the phantom-like appearance of one walking upon the sea. The disciples were frightened, as modern men would be; but Jesus said unto them, "It is I; be not afraid." Then they willingly received him into the ship.

We have no doubt of the truth of this narrative. But its truthfulness is not precisely the point we are aiming at. If so, it might

behoove us to notice that on the one hand the enemies of Christ were not present to scrutinize the miracle, and the account is given by his friends alone; and on the other, that both Matthew and Mark had written their accounts many years before, and that John long after re-affirms the story and avows himself an eye witness; that John declares circumstantially that the people on the eastern shore observed that there was only one boat at the landing and the disciples had taken it, Jesus not being in their company; but some other boats from the west side had come near the landing, so that these people took shipping and crossed over to Capernaum in search of Jesus, and were mystified as to how he had gotten over to the western shore. All of this has the appearance of being written by a man who was trying to tell the exact truth. Other considerations might be adduced; but our points are that this miracle was level to the observing capacity of plain men; again, that if it occurred at all, it was something beyond human skill and power; and, once more, that we are not informed precisely how it was effected.

What more, now, can we say by the aid of modern science? Can the men of to-day walk thus upon the surface of a lake, any more than the men of eighteen centuries ago? Assuredly not. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the men of any coming century will be able to accomplish the feat.

We have learned that gravitation, whatever the nature of that force may be, not only affects both organic and inorganic matter, as the ancients must have known, so far as they thought of any force bringing down bodies to the earth; but also that it extends to the binary stars away out in space; for they revolve about a common center of gravity in elliptical orbits. By analogy we conclude with very great probability, if not positive certainty, that the same pervasive force grasps the remotest nebula in space. It is potentially omnipresent in the universe, and indeed throughout immensity; for if God should create a new particle of matter anywhere in the measureless void of space, every previously existing particle would at once lay hold upon it and attract it with a force directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance. We say *at once*, for we believe that hitherto no one has succeeded in proving that



the transmission of this force requires time. If that new particle were luminous and as brilliant as Sirius, the light might be millions, billions, quintillions of years in reaching us. Not so with gravitation.

We have learned that electricity is arrested to a large degree by a pane of glass; that galvanism passes through the pane; but gravitation, through a world. As for instance, in a total lunar eclipse, when the earth is for as much as two hours between the sun and the moon, the sun's attraction of the moon is not a whit diminished. Great, occult, everywhere-present Force, conserving the material universe, which otherwise would rush madly to ruin; image and vicegerent of the Deity, interpenetrating, enveloping, upholding all things that are; possibly,—we know not,—yet possibly the Former of the worlds out of primeval star-dust, thou art the servant, not the master, of mind.

It was well that one of John's miracles should be drawn from the realm of gravitation. Modern science has only enlarged our knowledge and enhanced our appreciation of this force. It has not explained away the miracle, but has given it increased dignity in our eyes. As we are not informed by the sacred writer how this miracle was wrought, we can only speculate about it. Two methods may be suggested:

*1st.* Gravity is not one of those primary qualities of matter, as for instance, mobility or absolute incompressibility, without which matter itself could not exist. A well-known trick of sleight-of-hand is to roll a large ball between the hands, seemingly reducing its size all the while, until it finally disappears entirely. The puzzle lies in this: everybody knows that matter cannot be pressed into nothingness. If this were possible, the mystery would be gone. Some writers appear to think the secondary laws of matter as imperishable and indestructible as the primary. Not so at all. In this miracle of our Lord the attractive force of the earth may have been suspended for the time so far as relates to Christ's body. He who impressed this force upon matter in the beginning, could surely annihilate or suspend it. Man can not do this, because he is not God.

*2nd.* Another method of explanation depends upon the familiar

fact that in some inscrutable way our own spirits counteract the force of gravitation. We do this every time we lift a weight. Bone, tendon, muscle, nerve, and then, reaching across the dark chasm between two worlds, mental conation, constitute the series by which we raise our hand. Our power in this line is confined to our own organism; but we know of no reason for restricting the power of the Almighty, who can surely move all matter hither and thither as he wills. It may have been by the exercise of this divine force, so much resembling what we possess in a more limited way, that Christ supported his body on the surface of the lake. If so, there was no suspension of gravitation; just as there is none when we hold up a weight in our hand. Gravitation perpetually solicits the weight, but is overcome by a superior force.

Of these two conjectures the latter seems to our own mind the more probable; the counteracting force may have been just great enough to keep the feet of the Master on the surface of the rising and falling waves. But we are not tied to either explanation.

#### THE WINE AT CANA.

6. Gravitation appertains properly to the inorganic world. It bore sway before the existence of organic life; and it would still rule if every trace of that life should disappear from the universe. Meanwhile it affects organized, living substances, just as it would if they were dead; but one of the functions of life is the counteraction of the force of gravity. These principles have a wide application and could be illustrated with much variety and interest. It is enough for the present to point out that in the making of wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, our Saviour passes into the region dominated usually by vegetable life.

In oriental countries it was, and is still, customary to keep a supply of water in earthen or stoneware vessels, each holding quite a number of gallons. At the feast the wine gave out, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, informed him of the fact. Half a dozen water-pots were within view, presumably empty at the moment. Jesus said to the servants, Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. He said to them, Draw out now and

bear to the governor of the feast. This official did not know whence it had come, but pronounced it wine of superior quality.

This miracle could be tested by ordinary men. It was subjected to five senses by its color, taste, smell, its liquid splash on being poured from flagon to goblet, and its cool passage through the mouth. To this we may add the sense of muscular resistance in carrying it about in vessels. It was impossible to practice any deception in the case. The company knew as well that it was wine, as they would have recognized water if water had been given them. The cheap, weak wine of the country was an every day drink with the people. An impostor would have chosen some rare substance, which few or none of them had ever seen, and something that could not be tasted or smelt. Here, too, it must be noticed that the disciples of Jesus were not the only witnesses; the wine was dealt out to a promiscuous throng.

As before, no hint is given of the mode of the miracle's performance, and modern science can only conjecture.

(a.) Wine and water have many properties in common. It is conceivable that the qualities possessed by wine and not by water were superadded to those of the water. Or some of the qualities of water may have been taken away, and certain vinous ones substituted in their stead. For so far as we can judge, the Creator of all things assigns the secondary properties to elementary substances, and directly or indirectly to compound bodies.

This, of course, demands a divine power, and a divine wisdom, too. At least no living chemist can tell what molecular or other condition makes wine red. We can say that if the hulls of the grapes are not removed from the expressed juice, the fermented wine will be red, and there is little, if anything, more that we can say. Who can tell us the ultimate reason why wine is sweet, and also acid, and also bitter, and also fragrant, and yet again intoxicating?

The difficulty of thus converting water into wine is immeasurably greater than the unthinking imagine. Suppose we stood by a water-pot containing fifteen or twenty gallons of water and had superhuman power granted us. What should we do? How should we use our power? What precise effect should we im-

press upon the particles of the water, so that it should absorb the other rays of light in their passage through it, and transmit only the glowing crimson? or that some of those particles should smite upon the exceedingly delicate nerves of taste in their minute papillae with a thrill which the soul interprets as the cause of the sensation of sweetness, while others as inscrutably gave rise to the sensation of acidity, and still others to that of bitterness?

This wisdom is not yet possessed by the race of man, and we have no reason to believe that it ever will be. The work is beyond us, even if we had all the retorts, the alembics, the stills, the re-agents in the world at our command, with heat up to ten thousand degrees centigrade, and with absolute cold to assist us; much more if the work were to be done without the use of any means, by a word, or, as in the actual case before us, by an unuttered volition.

(b.) The same reasoning applies to the changes produced in matter without interfering with its primitive qualities. Thus, as an instance of what chemists call allotropism, phosphorus must be kept ordinarily under water to prevent the combustion which takes place on its exposure to the atmosphere, and which any one who has ever experimented with it will remember as indicated by a fine white smoke arising from it. But if in the proper atmosphere it be subjected to a very high heat for say fifty hours, it loses that extreme combustibility and can be used in the arts. This, however, requires time, a special environment, and a heat of two hundred and forty to two hundred and fifty degrees centigrade, or four hundred and sixty-four to four hundred and eighty-two degrees of Fahrenheit. Just what a chemist can do in his laboratory may be impossible to state, but is not the question here.

We come now to what is known as isomerism.

The same number of atoms of the same kinds of substances may yield very different compounds. "The oils of orange, lemon, turpentine, pepper, juniper, parsley, citron, bergamot, caraway, and others, however widely they differ in properties, have the same elementary composition and are isomeric." This is believed to be due to differences in the arrangement of the molecules, and has been illustrated by the white and the black squares of a check-

erboard, which may be disposed in various patterns. "The sugar which sweet milk furnishes, and the acid which exists in the sour, contain identically the same proportions of the same constituents." (But a molecule of sugar of milk furnishes the material for four molecules of lactic acid.) Then whether the conversion of water into wine is a possible case of isomerism depends on whether water contains the necessary elements of wine.

To illustrate from words: it was more the humor once than it now is to make anagrams. Thus John Bunyan surpassed the wits of his day by saying,—

" Witness his name. If anagrammed to thee,  
The letters make Nu hony in a B;"

—a clever re-arrangement of the letters of his name. But if we should attempt to make out of those ten letters the sentence, "England expects every man to do his duty," the impossibility would appear at once. So the question arises whether the elementary constituents of wine are found in water.

Professor George Schaeffer, formerly of Brooklyn, N. Y., and afterwards connected with the Patent Office in Washington city, once said to the writer, "Have you ever thought particularly of that miracle of the making of wine?" We acknowledged that we had not. In fact we had never been quite able to see why our Lord and Master had used his divine power to supply the guests at a marriage feast with an additional allowance of wine; though of this we said nothing to the professor. He proceeded to say, "To me it is one of the most wonderful miracles in the Bible; for I know as a chemist that water does not contain the ingredients of wine, and hence there must have been an act of creation." What, then, are the elements of wine? They are four, chiefly, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen. These four are the great staples of the world of life, and the first is so important that organic chemistry has been called "The chemistry of carbon compounds." The elements of water are oxygen and hydrogen. Hence it is substantially true that it does not contain all the elements of wine. Absolute rigor of speech requires us to add, that ordinary water has, interpenetrating it, a little air, otherwise the fish could not live, and a trace of carbonic acid, or dioxide of carbon, as we now

say, and of ammonia, which is a compound of hydrogen and nitrogen.

But while very small amounts of these substances are found in ordinary water, there is not enough of them to make wine. And this is still true if we suppose that the water was drawn from a limestone well or a rock-hewn cistern, and held in solution a trifle of carbonate of lime, which might well happen, since the prevailing formation in Palestine is a subcarboniferous limestone, resembling that in which Mammoth Cave occurs.

To resume our illustration: in John Bunyan's name there is only one letter O; in Lord Nelson's famous saying there are two, making the anagram impossible. The parallel will be nearer the truth if we employ Paul's saying, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." Here we have all the letters of *John Bunyan*, using his freedom of writing I for J, according to the ancient method; but while there is one I, there are six O's, and we cannot duplicate, triplicate or multiply the choice dreamer's name.

Hence new materials had to be introduced into the water, and this could be done either according to Prof. Schaeffer's idea, by an act of creation, or else by summoning the needed elements from air and earth. The former seems to us the more probable of the two methods, but the latter may have been the one actually employed. In either case no human power or skill would have sufficed. To the chemist a new difficulty emerges here. It would not be enough to introduce the new matter into the water. Any chemist could do that at the present day, though by a long, tedious course of processes. But to induce the new elements to combine with the old, so as to produce wine, is a task beyond our chemistry to this day. This kind of production is called synthesis. It is effected very variously in nature's laboratory by the aid of the archmagician, life. In early spring, on the heights along the Rhine and the Ohio, the unsightly stakes of the vineyards uphold the gnarled and leafless vines. A little later and the tender shoots and leaves timidly appear. In due course of time life interweaves sunbeams and soil, rain from heaven and kindly dews, with carbon and nitrogen stolen from the air, into clusters of the most exquisitely colored and most delicious of fruits. This is synthesis.

But when the juice is expressed and set aside in casks, analysis begins; for such in truth is fermentation; certain elements form a new, gaseous combination, and escape, leaving alcohol as a residuum. But the wine is not very good yet, for bitartrate of potash must be eliminated and settle upon the bottom and sides of the casks, and this slow ripening and mellowing takes place in cool cellars through months and years.

It was formerly believed that chemical skill could not build up by synthesis the products of life. It has been found, however, that a few of the simpler organic compounds, such as urea, can be made in this way; and this has been extended to alcohol. The processes are sufficiently detailed in the works of Fownes (Wallace's edition) and other writers. But to effect this in a moment, and by a volition, is clearly beyond human skill and power. Even now with all our progress this is true; and surely it was true then, when neither chemistry nor its visionary predecessor, alchemy, had appeared on earth.

There are several varieties of alcohols known to chemists. Of the single variety designated as monatomic, Fownes gives twelve kinds, and only one of these is found in wine. It is the second in a curious arithmetical series, and hence not the very simplest sort. The human tongue and palate would have very promptly detected the mistake, if the third, or the first, a more or a less composite number of the series, had been stumbled on. The august Maker of the wine at Cana of Galilee anticipated our modern science by many centuries.

Every word of Scripture is valuable. The governor of the feast, after he had tasted this wine, said to the bridegroom, "Thou hast kept the good wine until now;" *i. e.*, instead of bringing on an inferior article late in the evening, you have reversed the ordinary custom. The wine made by Jesus is pronounced better than the best furnished by the bridegroom. How is wine made good? Of course the quality of the grapes is important. But after the juice is fermented and the wine is really made, the two chief modes of improvement are the elimination of the bitartrate of potash already mentioned, and the gradual formation of certain ethers in the wine.

As to the former, it may be supposed that the objectionable bitartrate was not produced at all in this instance. As to the second, besides the various others which distinguish different wines, there is in all wine an œnanthic (*ὄνος*, wine; *ἀνθος*, a flower), or vinous ether, whose presence in abundance gives a superior excellence of both taste and odor. Recent chemistry has isolated this remarkable substance by analysis. No living chemist, we believe, has ever made it by synthesis. No chemist whatever eighteen hundred years ago knew what it was; but any peasant familiar with wine could have at once detected its absence by two of his senses. It was so abundant in this wine at the marriage feast as to attract the attention and elicit the commendation of the architriklinos, or official director of the supper.

So much for the goodness of the wine. But it should not pass unnoticed that no chemist has ever been able, without the aid of vegetable life, to make one drop of wine, whether good or bad.

As to any imaginable counterfeiting of wine, that is hardly worth considering. It is wholly improbable that our modern villainous compounds were known at all in that age, and especially in a wine-producing country like Palestine. The people to whom the wine at Cana was submitted had all their lives been accustomed to a pure article, and were well qualified to detect a counterfeit. Furthermore, to imitate a spurious wine, colored with logwood and adulterated with foreign ingredients, would be as difficult a task as to make the pure article; particularly to give the logwood coloring without any logwood, and the imitation flavoring without any flavoring extracts.

Any smuggling in of wine is thrown out of consideration by the largeness of the quantity. The firkin, or metretes, held about seven gallons and a half. Two or three firkins, then, would be fifteen to twenty-two-and-a-half gallons; and the six stone jars would hold from ninety to one hundred and thirty-five gallons. At a moderate estimate there were one hundred gallons of wine. So that there could have been no surreptitious bringing it in. Besides, this abundance is illustrative of the bounty of the most munificent of all beings, as it furnished a supply to the newly-



formed family. Wine is in itself a good gift of God, though so horribly abused by man.

This first of miracles showed, moreover, that our Lord could easily supply all his physical wants, instead of entrusting that work to the loving hearts and hands of his redeemed ones. This principle is of exceedingly wide application.

#### FEEDING THE FIVE THOUSAND.

7. The miracle at Cana is related by John only; but the feeding of the five thousand is found in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, also. So that John repeats the account after the death of the other evangelists. Matthew and Mark give another very similar miracle, in which seven loaves and a few small fishes were the starting point of the supply for four thousand men, besides women and children. Why John preferred the former is a matter of conjecture; perhaps because it led to the memorable discourse of our Lord in the sixth chapter. But at least one of the two miracles was needed in order to the completion of the argument. Wine was an ordinary article of table consumption; now bread and fish are introduced. Water or milk would not have served in place of wine. It must be something manufactured by man; something in whose production human skill and labor were exercised; something which every observer knew of a surety that no man could produce in a moment and without the use of means. And to this purpose the liquid, wine, was admirably suited. But two common articles of food remain to be considered—such as a lad would carry with him to a great public gathering for a lunch—five loaves, or thin cakes (*ἄρτοις*), and two small fishes (*ὀψάριον*, a diminutive of a word which originally means some kind of food accompanying bread; then fish, as this was the usual solid addition to bread in that country and among the common people).

Many of the same principles enounced in the previous division concerning wine are applicable to the bread, and need not be repeated here.

But the miracle of the bread is in some respects more wonderful than that of the wine.

Surely no man can be deceived into supposing that he is eating

bread when he is not; or that he is eating a piece of ordinary, well-known fish, when such is not the case. No impostor would have dared to select these two kinds of food for his jugglery.

Human agency is more largely employed in bread-making than in wine-making. The latter requires much care in the selection of the grapes, the rejection of the under ripe, the avoidance of crushing the seed, the due exposure of the must to the action of the atmosphere, the proper construction and preparation of the casks, and perhaps a few other points. But to procure bread they must thresh by oxen or with the flail, winnow, grind in the little mill at home, knead, and bake. Few, if any, in that day knew why the cereals support human life so well; or what the rising of the sponge in bread is occasioned by; or why barley bread rises so much less than the wheaten loaf; or just what baking accomplishes in the process of bread-making. But any of the simple folk could distinguish between bread and a stone, between a barley and a wheaten cake, and between a mouthful of uncooked dough, or flour and water, and a mouthful of genuine bread.

In all generations the simple folk outnumber the scientists, and the gospel is mostly for the unlearned. The few noble are not so few now as in Paul's day, but they are few yet. The multitudes of unscientific ones needed then, and need now, something sure and something impressive; something that comes home to the men who handle the sickle or the reaper, the flail or the thresher; to the women who then ground the grain in little household mills, or who now but hear the rumble and roar of the rollers, yet everywhere more or less knead and bake as of old; to the children who carry their lunches to school or picnics; in a word, to the hungry, toiling millions who know nothing of science, but can infallibly distinguish bread from a stone.

Well may the toilers wonder and believe, when Jesus does in one moment what they attain only by weary hours, days and months of labor; above all, when he accomplishes the work without plowing or sowing, without sickle or flail, without mill-stones or bakers' ovens; and yet, most wonderful, when he does all without flour or water.

This brings us to a new aspect of the miracle. The materials

must have been furnished; whether by immediate creation, or by miraculous gathering from overhead and underfoot, they *must* have been supplied, and there was no opportunity of transmutation. For the double purpose, as we suppose, of teaching a lesson of economy, and of verifying the actuality of the miracle, twelve baskets full of fragments are taken up. Our senses are appealed to as trustworthy. No illusion is practiced, and no properties are given to various kinds of matter which they did not possess before.

8. What light does our modern science throw on the subject?

(1.) It analyzes the bread and finds in it two kinds of food, the respiratory and the plastic. The former is composed principally of starch and sugar, which contain carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, but no nitrogen; the latter contains nitrogen, and is specially needed in the formation of muscle. Respiratory food supplies warmth, but does not replace the waste of organized tissues; plastic food may poorly furnish warmth, but this is not its proper province. Another interesting discovery is that much of the building material of our bodies is furnished by the vegetable world in such condition that no great change is necessary to fit it for its place. Another is that mankind have, so to speak, stumbled on a very suitable combination of dietetic articles. The boy's bread and fish went well together, bread being rich in starch, and animal food in fibrin.

(2.) Science shows what effects are due to cooking. Baking bursts open the little starch-cells, destroys the germs of the yeast after they have done their work, hardens the gluten in wheaten bread, and expels a portion of the water used in kneading. We do not speak of boiling, as it does not appear to have been used on this occasion; nor of cooking the fish, as it is probable that it was dried, like our herring. Baking also converts a small portion of the starch into gum. If yeast is used, it converts part of the starch into sugar and then into carbonic acid (carbon dioxide), and into alcohol, which usually escapes, but has been occasionally collected. It forms no part of the bread.

John informs us twice that it was barley bread. Chemists say that barley has almost the identical constitution of wheat, but the

former has albumen where the latter has gluten. As a consequence the barley does not make a light spongy loaf like wheaten bread, which is owing to albumen's inferiority to gluten in elasticity and tenacity; the rising bubbles of gas escape too soon in barley or rye bread. But rye bread, and we presume barley bread, which closely resembles it, does not become stale so soon as that made from wheat, in which the water left in the fresh bread does not indeed escape, but enters into some kind of molecular union with the other elements of the loaf.

But with these interesting discoveries in chemistry, it is unquestionably true that no scientist has ever been able to make by synthesis from the primary elements one crumb of bread or one particle of fish.

Christ either created bread and fish, or he made them from elements already existing. Before the mystery of creation *ex nihilo* the peasant and the philosopher alike are dumb. But as to making by synthesis, the philosopher does know how very hard a thing it is, and he may form some idea of the reason why it is so hard.

Oxygen and nitrogen mixed, but not chemically combined, are at hand abundantly in the air, and there is always present a little aqueous vapor to furnish the hydrogen, and a little carbon dioxide to supply the carbon; very often, too, a little sulphuretted hydrogen, which blackens silverware exposed to the atmosphere. This would give the sulphur, and the soil beneath us contains phosphorus. Other elements in very minute quantities might be found by an all-seeing One. It may be conceded that science proves that a creation is not absolutely required, a conclusion which might have been reached without science's aid.

How could any human being summon to his assistance a dozen or more elementary substances by a mere volition? The chemist might have either the simple elements that enter into bread or the compounds which nature uses, as carbonic acid, ammonia, water, and the rest, and he could not make a crumb for one of God's sparrows.

Science indicates the reason of this inability. We do not yet know the molecular structure of the protein bodies, such as gluten, and vegetable albumen and casein. (The name protein is retained

as descriptive.) Their general composition is given by Prof. Porter, of Yale College, as 55.16 per cent. of carbon, 7.05 of hydrogen, 21.81 of oxygen, 16.96 of nitrogen, with  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 per cent. of sulphur and phosphorus in an unknown form. The combination is a very complex one. Fownes and Prof. Bloxam, of London, give as an empirical formula of the proteids, C 72, H 112, N 18, O 22, S, with a little phosphorus probably mechanically intermixed. In starch, "the lowest form of organized vegetable material," each molecule is composed probably of sixty-three atoms, viz.: carbon, eighteen; hydrogen, thirty; oxygen, fifteen. (Fownes.)

Herein we see the wisdom of our Lord in selecting these *very complex* bodies, which never have been imitated in all these eighteen centuries; yet our gustatory nerves distinguish very promptly and surely even between barley bread and wheaten.

In making bread from its elements by chemical synthesis, regard must be paid to the fact that the most admirable dough is not bread. The changes produced by baking must be known and in some way effected. Who can do this without baking?

9. The question recurs in a somewhat new form, Was any law of nature suspended in this miracle? We have seen that an advance has been made over the previous miracle by the introduction of animal food. The two small fishes are important.

It seems to the writer hardly proper to say that the force of vegetable life, or that of animal life, was suspended in this miracle. These mysterious powers still held sway all over earth and sea. In the five loaves and the two fishes they had accomplished their ends. Here, if anywhere, there *was* a suspension; for the grinding of the wheat had crushed the tiny germs of the grains, and the life of the fishes had ceased to be. Death is a cessation. But in the abundance supplied by our Saviour, neither vegetable nor animal life had ever entered the lists. No surcease was possible. The Maker of all things simply produced, without the aid of vegetable or animal life, what we can produce only by their assistance. It was a case of intervention, not of suspension—just as without leaving my seat I may stretch forth a walking cane for something beyond the reach of my hand; or, if preferable, I may arise and

get it without using a cane. My using means may be owing to my limitations of power and presence, which of course are not to be attributed to God. The thing to be explained in reference to him is not why he ever works without means, but why he ever uses them at all. Into this most inviting field of speculation our limits forbid us to enter to any length; but we may be allowed to suggest that the Almighty delights in the exercise of his attributes, and among them not the least is wisdom. If he should work everything by power alone, there would be no room for divine skill. Besides, he could not, as he now does, develop created wisdom by countless object lessons. But there are reasons for his working by means; reasons for his indirectly producing the five loaves and the two fishes by the ministry of nature's forces and of man. It seems quite inexact to say that the forces of nature were suspended in the production of the rest of the food. We might as well say that man's powers were suspended. Neither nature nor man was called into requisition, but God wrought without them. This is the simplest and truest way of putting it; while we have no objection to any revealed suspension of the laws or forces of nature. If by a suspension of the laws of nature it be meant that God directly, by an immediate exercise of his power and wisdom, did that which he ordinarily accomplishes by second causes, the intent of the phrase is good though the phrase itself is hardly felicitous.

The progress of science, therefore, has shown us what bread is, and why we need it; what animal food is, and why that is helpful; but it does not show how wine, bread or fish can be manufactured synthetically. The most recent and expert chemists do not know the molecular structure of bread or fish; much less can they make in their laboratories the least particle of either. No torture of nature in furnace or crucible has wrung the secret from her mute lips. It is an ignorant sort of argument to say that electricity and magnetism have effected great wonders in our day, and that Christ may have wrought his so-called miracles by natural agencies. On the contrary, science testifies that he could not. How could an unlearned Jew in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar accomplish, without apparatus or re-agents and in prodigal abun-

dance, what the finest chemists with the best equipped laboratories of the last quarter of the nineteenth century do not know how to set about doing on the smallest scale?

It is important now to cast an eye over the argument up to this place, and to observe that John has touched nature at several points: 1st, The inorganic world; 2nd, The world of vegetable life; 3rd, The world of animal life. In each case there was present an exhibition of what nature and man can do, and, close beside it, one of what nature and man cannot do. This was important for contrast and verification. The disciples were kept from sinking in the waves by the boat they were in; Jesus, by divine power. The wine, the bread, the fish that preceded the miracle, had been produced by vegetable and animal life, chemical forces and human agency; that which Christ gave was made without these means. The force of the vegetable and the animal life had been expended in the production of the wine, the bread, the cooked or dried fish; the products were tested by the human life acting through nerves and muscles. We are thus led up to three new miracles in which the life is not yet spent, and that life is, as it should be, the life of man—the most important form of animal life, and that of which perhaps we are the best qualified to judge.

#### THE NOBLEMAN'S SON, THE INFIRM MAN, THE MAN BORN BLIND.

10. In these cases life is still existent, but it is assailed, or its perfect development is thwarted.

The nobleman (*βασιλικός*, kingly) was probably one of Herod's courtiers, as Josephus uses the adjective to distinguish Herod's officers from those of the Roman Emperor (Jacobus, *Com. in loc.*). His son was sick of a fever at Capernaum. The father had most probably heard of the miracle at Cana, which was not very far from Capernaum.

The salient points here are that the healing was performed by an agent at a distance from the patient, at a time when the son could not have known that his father had just met with Jesus, and on a youth (*παῖδιον*, a little boy) about to die. It was, moreover, an acute disease, whereas the infirm man was suffering from a chronic malady.

How it is precisely that our modern medicines, as the salts of quinia, cure fever, no man can say. The intimate pathology of these and other diseases is, not yet fully understood, if, indeed, it ever shall be.

Endow a physician with ample power to heal; bring him to the bedside of his patient, and he would not know what to do. Any man has enough physical strength to repair a watch that is out of order; but where and how to apply his strength—that is the question. Especially if he is not permitted to open the watch and examine its works; still less if he has not even the opportunity of observing any outward manifestation of the internal disarrangement or breakage, but must accept an indefinite report from a non-expert.

Presence in the sick-chamber gives a physician access to the mind of the patient, and thus it is possible that cures have been effected on the body. An impostor would not have failed to avail himself of this subtle influence. The misguided faith-cure operators of our day visit their patients, or have their patients go great distances to them. Why should this be necessary, if God be everywhere, and the faith of miracles still dwell in the church? It should, in fairness, be conceded that fevers sometimes leave a patient suddenly. This can be accounted for frequently, though not always. Humanly speaking, it is just possible that the fever left this little boy both suddenly and inexplicably; but this is a wholly improbable solution. A deceiver would not have risked everything on so exceedingly slender a chance.

A chronic case is given us in the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. The nature of his malady is not stated. He was weak, ἀσθενῶν, ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ; but we are not informed as to the cause of his weakness, except that ἀσθενής by *usus loquendi* means weak from disease, or sick. The multitude of the sick is divided into three classes, the blind, the lame, and the withered or paralytic. We are sure that he was not blind, and are confident that he had not lost a limb. It may have been an inveterate case of rheumatism or paralysis, as it was of thirty-eight years' duration. Whatever it was, a man similarly afflicted at the present day would be sent to a home for incurables.

This man is not represented as having any faith in Jesus. On



being asked if he desired to be made whole, or following the Greek more closely, "Do you wish to become well?" he omits the natural answer, "Yes, of course, I do, or I should not be here," and explains why he has not already gone down into the water; as though he had said, "I am not here as an idle spectator; I need the healing, but have no assistant to put me into the pool at the proper time." His whole tone is explanatory and apologetic, and indicates no faith whatever in Jesus, who was evidently a stranger to him, for he wist not who it was. The healing was instantaneous. The man immediately became well, and took up his bed and walked about, (*περιπατει*, the same word as that used by Christ in his command.)

Compare with this the coaxings, the exhortations, the solicitations, renewed sometimes day after day, in the cures of hypochondriacs; where there was no genuine disease except perhaps a weakness of the nervous system, and no cure was effected save by the minds of the patients upon their bodies. It is not easy to believe in the absolute sincerity of faith-cure performers, when they leave so convenient a loop-hole for themselves: "If you are healed, it is by divine power conditioned upon your faith; if you are not healed, it is for lack of faith in you, or possibly in me."

Of this transparent fallacy Jesus never made use. He never failed to heal any applicant, and never hesitated to stake all his claims to be the Son of God and the Saviour of men upon each and every attempt to work a miracle.

There is another class of maladies about which the faith-curers walk very gingerly. They are such as require surgical aid. A broken limb, a cataract in the eye, anything which demands the ligature, the bandage, the surgeon's knife,—why are these beyond the reach of faith? In his ninth chapter John introduces a case of congenital blindness, in that day regarded as hopelessly incurable. Here we are almost certain that surgical treatment was needed.

We believe that the faith-curers do not exercise their art in blind asylums, though much needed there. A grown man, blind from his birth, would offer a signal opportunity. Our Saviour did not avoid so difficult an undertaking, but accomplished the cure in

a brief space of time without the use of means. He spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay. Of course there was no curative virtue in this, nor in the washing in the Pool of Siloam. Why the anointing and the subsequent washing were resorted to, it may be impossible to say. Might it have been to signify the washing away of the filth of sin, and the giving of sight to the spiritually blind by him that was *sent* to remove sin's guilt and sin's darkness?

If any one who reads this article shall examine general medical works, or still better, some special treatise like that of Nettleship, he will be surprised at the number of diseases to which the eye is subject. We may begin at the conjunctiva which covers the front of the eye, and go back not merely to the optic nerve, but to the farthest portions of the brain, and we shall find all along the route organs, or parts or accessories of organs, that may become diseased.

Our present instance restricts us to cases of congenital blindness. Some diseases do not cause blindness, so that an inquiry is limited to those which do produce blindness and produce it previous to birth. In addition to our own reading, we have availed ourselves of the technical knowledge of Dr. Reynolds, of Louisville, Ky., the well-known professor and specialist. He gave the following possible causes of congenital blindness:

1. Arrested development.
2. Persistent pupillary membrane.
3. Syphilis and tuberculosis, affecting the occipital lobes of the brain.

As to the third of these, we have at least the testimony of our Lord that the blindness in this case was not owing to any foul disease of his parents. "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents." The clay, the saliva, and the water would have reached none of the three.

Again we are confronted by the fact that the evangelist gives no precise description of the malady relieved. If he had been inspired to do so, his account would have been unintelligible for many centuries, and even now unintelligible to all but a few.

It is extremely probable that no physician of his day understood the nature of the young man's blindness. Evidently no one

had ever healed him, and he himself, if his testimony may be admitted, expressed the universal belief of his times when he said that since the world began it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If at the present day a cure of such a case should be performed, which is a possible thing, it would redound to the skill of the operator and the instrument maker. If the most expert operator in the world should be asked to accomplish such a cure without instruments, without medicines, without more or less prolonged treatment, without means of any kind, he would regard the applicant as an unseemly jester, a fanatic, or a madman.

There is an opening here for the apostles of infidelity to help on their cause by showing practically that our Saviour's miracle can be duplicated. Let them hunt up the most distinguished oculist in London, Paris, Vienna, or the whole world; let him go out from his office, leave behind him his operating chair, his ophthalmoscope, his belladonna, his knives and pincers, and take a congenitally blind beggar on the street and heal him. Let the man come back from some public fountain with his eyes wide-open, seeing as others do who have seen all their lives. Surely this proposition is as fair as Tyndall's about the Christian and the prayerless hospitals. It is more than fair, for it gives the infidels the benefit of all the study and research that eminently skilful men have devoted to the eye. Their champion may know all that is known of the coats, the humors, the muscles, the reticulated nerve, the crystalline lens, the pigmentum nigrum, the ciliary process, the white disk, the arteries, the veins of the eye. Let him heal!

#### LAZARUS.

11. Life may be not only hindered and thwarted; it may perish. Can it be created anew? This surely is a crucial test, for no man thoroughly knows what life is, much less can any man restore life to the dead. Three theories have been advanced as to the nature of this mysterious power. (1.) That it is a force correlated with other physical forces and producible by some combination of them. Thus Mr. Huxley, in his well-known jest—for jest it should be considered—about aqosity. Oxygen and hydrogen are mixed by some

chance; by some other chance a flash of electricity passes through the mixture, and the two elements unite to form water, whose differentiating quality or property may be styled aquosity. So the elements, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen, with mayhap a trifle of sulphur and phosphorus, singly or in binary or trinary compounds, are intermingled, when lo! a flash of something or other, and LIFE starts into being! This savors too much of the mountebank to require special refutation.

(2.) That it is a force *sui generis*, directly originated by the Almighty in the outset, but transmissible by his creatures; capable of inhering in matter, though not itself a substance, either material or immaterial, and known to us only by its effects. This is the view held by probably nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine-hundredths of thinkers.

(3.) That it is an immaterial substance, endowed with certain peculiar powers, inhabiting our bodies until death comes, and then perishing utterly. Such, if we have been able to understand it, is the theory of a few thoughtful men. As a theory, it is novel, curious, and worthy of respectful consideration, but labors under the grave objection of postulating a third substance, which is neither mind nor body, and which is not needed as an element of the cause of the phenomena. As far, however, as our present argument is concerned, it would derive even more strength from the third than from the second of these theories.

Now, three instances are given by the evangelists in which life was originated by our Lord. The little daughter of Jairus was dead for a very short while, some minutes, or a quarter or a half of an hour. The only son of the widow of Nain was in his bier on the way to the cemetery, and had reached the gate of the village. The most notable case is reserved for the pen of John, and time, place, name, and circumstances are given with unusual fulness of detail. Lazarus has been dead four days, and incipient decomposition must have set in. Life's sceptre is broken, and the inorganic powers are in revolt, and are forming new combinations, tetrarchies, dukedoms, or provinces, out of the former august empire. Let now the first, greatest, most thoroughly equipped association of scientists on earth stand at the grave of some modern Lazarus.

What could they do? Do they know what life is? Have they the power of originating life? If they had the power, would they know how to exercise it? Would they bring a thousand-cell galvanic battery into play upon the nerves of the already putrescent corpse? Alas! this might produce immediately after death a horrid distortion of the features, a spasmodic contraction of the limbs; but life, fair goddess, would keep aloof from the profanation of her deserted temple.

This is not all. The association must not be allowed to have a single cell of any kind of battery, or a single implement, or utensil, or instrument of any sort whatever. Naught but a prayer, a tear, a voice. Naught, finally, but a cry of two words, that shall ring down the centuries, and all through the regions of the dead, so that Death himself shall quake on his throne. If such an attempt should be made by the most learned of our scientists, it were hard to decide which element of the scene would predominate, the shocking or the grotesque.

Spinoza said that he would give up all opposition to Christianity if he could be convinced of the resurrection of Lazarus.

There is another even more interesting feature of this miracle. Not only was animal life created; the soul was recalled and reunited to the body. Whither goes the soul when it leaves the body? To heaven? But where is heaven? To hell? But where is hell?

“When coldness wraps this suffering clay,  
Ah! whither strays th’ immortal mind?”

So sang Byron; and the Roman Emperor Hadrian had sung long before him that pathetic address to his soul beginning with the tender words,

“Animula, vagula, blandula,”

and ending with the terror-stricken question,

“Quae nunc in loca abibis?”

Ah! yes, let our science summon back one soul, just one, from the unknown void. But if it were brought back, how could it be reunited to the body? What mysterious tie is this, far below the sounding line and plummet of consciousness? What manner of bridge sweeps over the dark chasm between the material and the

immaterial? How does it anchor itself to body at one extremity and to spirit at the other? Here we find one of the two apparent exceptions adverted to near the beginning of our article. The miracles recorded by John are wrought in the domain of matter. A part of this one appertains to the higher realm of mind. But the column, though reaching aloft into the upper air, has its solid base upon the earth. For the evidence that the soul of Lazarus was restored to its dwelling place in the body was addressed to the senses of all who beheld him once more alive. It was a thing about which the humblest, most unscientific observer could not be mistaken.

#### CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

12. Like Luke and Mark, John leads us in his twentieth chapter to an open sepulchre. The stone is already rolled away and the sepulchre is empty. He does not inform us, with Matthew, that there was a great earthquake, and that the stone was rolled away by an angel; but he brings out more clearly than any of the other evangelists the truth that this resurrection was effected by Christ's own power. Thus, as early as in the second chapter, we have Christ's saying, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." To which John adds, "He spake of the temple of his body." Very fully, too, in the tenth chapter, "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power (*ἐξουσίαν*, right, privilege) to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." In the original the word *power* is made emphatic in each clause by being placed first: Power have I to lay it down, and power have I to take it again.

The claims made by the sacred writers are (1), that Christ's body, unlike that of Lazarus, did not see corruption; (2), that it arose on the third day, by the power committed to him by the Father: "This commandment I received from the Father;" (3), that his body arose to an endless life, as a promise and pledge of our own resurrection from the grave; (4), that not only the reasonable human soul of Christ, but also his divinity, was reunited to his true body. Here the earth-based column rises up

into the heaven of heavens. But while our dazzled eyes gaze upward, as well as they may, into the exceeding glory, John does not hesitate to recall our look to that which we may clearly behold. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

This passage from the beginning of the First Epistle of the beloved disciple, the "heavenly mystic," is very instructive. The divinity of our Lord is substantiated, yea, is independently proved, by testimony addressed to our five senses; just as Paul, in Rom. i. 4, teaches us that Jesus Christ was powerfully declared to be the Son of God as to his highest and holiest nature by his resurrection from the dead. This resurrection was, of course, to be judged of, and accepted or rejected by those senses which God has given us. Christ's own prediction that he would rise from the dead was addressed originally to men's hearing; and he risked his claim to be a divine person on the fulfilment of this prophecy, so that John strictly agrees with Paul and with our Lord himself.

If now any one of all these miracles were actually performed,—none others being attempted—it would settle the whole question. The voice of universal humanity re-affirms the confession of Nicodemus, "No man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." But inasmuch as the supernatural is thus attested by the natural, it was wise that nature should be interrogated at every point, and everywhere give a consentaneous answer. Is there not a beauty of wisdom in the method of John?—or may we not say, in the method of the Holy Ghost speaking by John? From Christ standing on the deck of the fisherman's boat and overruling nature's first great force, all the way up to the same Christ seated at the right hand of the Father, Lord paramount of the universe, all forces, all worlds, all principalities, all powers, all men, and all devils are subject to him who filleth all in all.

As has often been said of the sacred writers in general, so we may say specially of John, that he could not have been deceived as to the facts which he relates. This feature of John's argument has scarcely attracted its just attention, being somewhat thrown into shadow by the effulgence of the person of Christ. Nevertheless, John himself emphasizes it, and we ought to be in full sympathy with him. His opportunities of close scrutiny were abundant, by day, by night, on land, on sea, in public, in private. If Christ had been an impostor, it must have been found out by John.

The question then arises, Why should John have falsified about the matter? If Jesus had not really arisen from the grave, he had been dead about sixty years. The witchery of his presence had mouldered in some unknown sepulchre. The spell of his enchantment had been broken, and two generations of men had passed away since a blaspheming pretender to equality with God had met a felon's doom. Would John, would we, would any sane man, persist in reasserting and defending the horrible imposture?

An adventurous traveler once planted a black cross high in the eternal snow of Mt. Ararat. Thrown into relief by the background of spotless white, it could be seen from far beneath; it remained so for years; it may peradventure be there to-day. The whiter the snow and the blacker the cross, the more certainly and the more distinctly could its blackness be seen.

The application is obvious. If John were a wilful impostor, he has taken the most remarkable means of exhibiting his baseness to all subsequent generations. He has selected the one spotless background of all history in front of which to place his baseness. What should be said of a man who, knowing his master to be a liar and a blasphemer, should portray him as the one exalted and infinitely pure God-man?—and persist in this shocking falsehood down to an age of ninety or a hundred years, when ambition's fires have died out on the hearthstone, and the dawn of eternity is peering in at the door-way?

If it were not aside from our present line of argument, we might add that the colors of the portraiture which he has given us of the Christ are not found on the earth; the brush must have been dipped into the tints of heaven.



Falsification in John would have held him up to certain contempt and universal reprobation.

Why should we not as readily believe John's statements as those of Julius Cæsar? This leads to the further question: Why do we accept as true in the main that ingenious campaign document and adroit piece of self-glorification, the Commentaries on the Gallic war? Because Cæsar would not have dared to forge accounts of what had never happened; because he is everywhere so precise, so graphic, so circumstantial; because the facts recounted by him are necessary to explain collateral and subsequent history; because even the pure Latinity of his style is befitting to a man of culture in the latest days of the Roman republic.

All these points are just as striking in the case of John. As to circumstantiality, see how he names persons, places, occasions, and even introduces the criticisms, favorable or unfavorable, of bystanders in the streets of Jerusalem.

It is more in the line of our present article to ask how John, unless divinely guided, could have made the selection of the facts which have been detailed? Were the sacred writers not naturalists? This has often been alleged by unbelievers, and we suppose it to be true. So much the better. We have had to slightly rearrange the facts so as to exhibit their wonderful relation to our modern science, just as in botany, geology, zoölogy, we take widely scattered facts and trace their beautiful scientific relations, and thus, with John Kepler, think God's thoughts after him.

As John touched nature at so many points, why did he make no mistakes? Plato had by general consent one of the finest intellects that has graced philosophy. Yet see the pitiable blunders in natural science in his *Timæus*! How was John preserved from all this except by the all-wise One himself? One of the most remarkable aspects of this whole affair is, that John has erected a citadel which has withstood all the attacks of infidelity, from even the most unexpected quarters. When we visited Fortress Monroe, a few years since, it appeared to our unprofessional eye to be a very strong place. What with the granite walls, the moat, the enormous ramparts, the siege-guns above and the bomb-proof casements beneath, it seemed a fortification of consummate

powers of resistance. But an officer on duty there told us, that the recently-invented projectiles thrown from on board ship of an armor-plated squadron would plow their way through and through all those earthworks faced with granite. Suppose two thousand years hence the art of gunnery shall have gone as far beyond that of our day as ours is in advance of the catapults and battering rams of ancient Rome, can any man of the present time invent a fortification that will resist all attacks in every century after this nineteenth, and some of whose provisions of strength shall not be understood or appreciated until the ordnance of the twentieth century below ours shall have been devised and tried on those inexpugnable works? Yet this is what John has done in his Gospel. And, so far as we can judge, he could not foresee the nature of the assaults to be made nineteen or twenty centuries later. Was he not building under the guidance of Him who foresees the end from the beginning?

Last of all, we note the repose of manner in this beloved saint. Whatsoever others may think, John always calmly asserts that he knows whereof he speaks. He had seen, heard, touched, handled. John Ruskin says, in his *Modern Painters*, that God has stamped his rest on the vales of this earth; and this is as true as it is beautiful. But there is another part of nature in which his rest is even more conspicuous—the rest which comes after labor. Ten or twelve miles from the writer's home, above the old Silurian strata, the Appalachian chain which divides the Atlantic slope from the valley of the Mississippi has thrown out an isolated peak. Only a few miles away, and in full view of this solitary height, is an elegant country home whose hospitalities we have enjoyed when invited to preach in a neat chapel hard by. We have sat and watched the sunlight as it fell on the forest that sweeps from the plain to the summit, and the deep masses of shadow that trailed over the northern slope. How strong, yet how quiet, was this lonely mountain! Like a Roman sentinel on the outposts of his legion! Like the first pyramid that looked out from the valley of the Nile upon the eternal desert beyond! Older than Rome and her legions; older than Egypt and her pyramids; outlasting the legions, and, it may be, yet to outlast the pyramids, for its builder

was God. Layer after layer it was built up, until the topmost stone was laid, and then God rested from his labor, and his rest and his strength are there in the work of his hands. His deeper rest and mightier strength abide in the Gospel which he constructed by the hands of John, and the storms rage about its lofty heights in vain. The mountain and the evangel shall remain until Christ himself shall return to earth. "Even so; come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

If any soul of man, troubled with doubts and misgivings, should let fall a kindly eye on these pages, may we not in the deepest humility adopt the words of the beloved disciple, "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

L. G. BARBOUR.

## II. A RECENTLY PROPOSED TEST OF CANONICITY.<sup>1</sup>

THE work of the occupant of the chair of Biblical Literature is in some respects an exceedingly humble one. It is that of "a hewer of wood and drawer of water" for the chair of theology. But its importance is none the less on that account, for even the "queen of the sciences" owes her crown, her sceptre, and her throne, to this "power behind the throne." For it deals with the questions that lie at the foundation, as it were, of our system of church government, at the foundation of our system of doctrine; yes, at the very foundation of the Christian religion. That this is not the language of exaggeration is clear from the fact that "the Bible," according to the famous saying of Chillingworth, "is the religion of Protestants," and Biblical Literature deals directly with the Bible. It examines its claims to be a revelation from God; fixes the elements of which it is composed; traces the history of its human origin, its preservation and its circulation; and, to pass by other points, undertakes to determine the meaning of its contents. The occupant of this chair thus, as it were, searches out, quarries and chisels into shape the stones out of which the temple of the Christian system is erected.

Hence the vast inherent responsibility attaching to the duties of this department. But if the inherent responsibilities are themselves great, they are greatly enhanced by the present trend of theological discussion. One needs scarcely to be reminded that the Bible itself, rather than this or that particular biblical doctrine, or system of doctrine, is the centre around which the theological thought of the day revolves. We have seen the claims of almost every book of Scripture challenged, and its historic origin questioned to a greater or less extent. Not only have we seen the canonical authority of individual books discussed, but we have

---

<sup>1</sup> Inaugural address by W. M. McPheeters, D. D., on the occasion of his installation as Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., May, 1890.

witnessed the reopening of such questions as these: What are the essential elements of canonicity? And again, What is the ultimate test of canonicity?

The last of these questions is so fundamental in its character, of so great intrinsic importance, and withal one rendered so prominent by recent discussion, that I hope it may furnish an appropriate and interesting theme for this occasion.

The theme, therefore, to which, without further delay, I invite attention is: A RECENTLY PROPOSED TEST OF CANONICITY.

Before proceeding to discuss it, I may be permitted to recall a few definitions which are familiar to many of you, but may be serviceable to some others. First, the term "canon" meant originally a "reed." By an easy transition it came to mean a "measuring-rod;" by another, equally easy, it came to mean a "rule." Finally, it was to be applied to those writings which God has given to be a rule of faith and life to his people. In this sense it will be used in the following discussion. Canon, then, as thus defined, is synonymous with the more familiar term, Scripture. To say, therefore, that a book is entitled to a place in the canon is equivalent to saying that it is entitled to a place in Scripture.

Closely connected with the term canon are two others, which, as they will occur frequently, may as well be defined here. They are *canonicity* and *canonical*. By the former, or canonicity, is meant that quality or characteristic of a writing which invests it with authority as a rule of faith and life. And by canonical, the adjective, is meant the possession of canonicity, or of a right to a place in the canon.

It will be well, further, at this point to fix attention upon the precise nature of the question to be considered. The question, then, is not, what are the *elements* of canonicity? but, what are the *evidences* that a writing claiming to be canonical does indeed possess that quality or those qualities which constitute it a rule of faith and life? We do not inquire at present what quality it is that invests a writing with this peculiar dignity and supreme authority, but how can the claims of a writing to the possession of this quality be tested? To discuss the question, what are the

essential elements of canonicity? would consume time needlessly, and would divert attention from the single issue now to be considered. It is admitted, then, at least so far as the present argument is concerned, that inspiration is the essential element of canonicity. It is admitted that it is the fact that a writing is inspired that constitutes it a rule of faith and life. And the simple issue before us is, How can we assure ourselves that a given writing claiming canonical authority is inspired? What are the evidences of the inspiration of a book? Or, to state the case in concrete form, upon what grounds do we admit the inspiration of *Ecclesiastes*, and deny the inspiration of *Ecclesiasticus*?

Numerous answers have been returned to this question. They may all, however, for present purposes, be reduced to three.

The first is that of the Romish church. It has been stated thus by Dr. Lynch, a former Roman Catholic bishop of Charleston: "God has ordained that each Christian shall learn what books are inspired from a body of individuals, to whom, in their collective capacity, he has given authority to make an unerring decision on that point." Stated in different terms his answer comes to this: The Christian is obliged to recognize the canonical authority of a certain writing because the (Romish) church says it is inspired. According to this view, then, the possession of *proper ecclesiastical sanction* is the ultimate test of canonicity. The books which have received such sanction are thereby invested with canonical authority. And to prove, in reference to any book, that it has received the official sanction of the (Romish) church is to establish its canonicity. This, however, only pushes our question one step further back. For we instinctively inquire: How does the church know that a given writing is inspired? The answer returned to this query is that, as God has given her "authority to make an unerring decision on the point," so he likewise gives her that illumination and special guidance of his Spirit that enables her to render such a decision. In a word, the answer virtually given is: "The church is inspired." Now, a pertinacious Protestant would be likely to press his inquiry by asking, "How may I know that the church is inspired? It cannot be because the Bible says so, for on this theory I have none until she gives it to me, and I cannot receive it from

her unless assured that she is herself inspired. How, then, may I know that such is the case?" But as it is not my purpose to discuss Rome's test of canonicity, I will dismiss it with the single remark, that she has always found it more convenient to gag than to answer those who have called in question her baseless and blasphemous pretensions.

The next answer that we may profitably notice is that of a long line of Protestant apologists and theologians. I cannot do better than to give it in the very words of one among the most illustrious of them all. I refer to the sainted and gifted Thornwell. He says:

"It is a favorite scheme of the papists to represent the settling of the canon as a work of gigantic toil and formidable mystery. It evidently, however, reduces itself to a simple question of fact: What books were written by men whose claims to inspiration were either directly or remotely established by miracles? It is a question, therefore, of no more difficulty than the authenticity of the sacred books. To illustrate the matter in the case of the New Testament: the churches that received the Epistles from Paul could have had no doubt of their canonical authority, because they knew that the apostle was supernaturally inspired as a teacher of the faith. He produced in abundance the signs of an apostle. So also the writings of the other apostles would be recognized by their contemporary brethren as the word of the Lord. The books actually written by the apostles, or approved by their sanction, would be known by living witnesses to the fact. The historical proofs of this fact—that is, the testimony of credible witnesses—would be sufficient in all future time to attest the inspiration of any given work. If a man, for example, in the third century is doubtful of the Epistle to the Romans, all that is necessary to settle his mind is to convince him that Paul actually wrote it. This being done, its inspiration follows as a matter of course."

Such is Dr. Thornwell's admirably clear and strong statement of the case from the ordinary standpoint of Protestants. Similar language might be cited, were it necessary, from the writings of Paley and Cosin, the Alexanders and the Hodges.

It is not my purpose now to show the correctness of this answer. Let it suffice to emphasize the following points: First, according to this view the questions of origin and canonicity are inseparable. To prove the canonical authority of a writing we must be able to trace it to men "whose claims to inspiration were either directly or remotely established by miracles." And conversely, to trace a writing to such a source is to prove its canonicity. So that the ultimate test of canonicity, according to this

view, is not ecclesiastical sanction, but *apostolic origin or sanction*. Secondly, it is important to note that it follows, from what has been said, that the question of the canonicity of a writing is purely a historical question, to be settled by historical evidence. Third, it is fair to say by way of caution, that those who hold this view do not ignore the evidences of inspiration furnished by the contents of a writing, nor do they ignore the testimony which the Holy Spirit bears in the hearts of believers to the infallible truth and divine authority of Scripture. On the contrary, they regard both of these as important independent lines of corroborative testimony, calculated greatly to confirm the conviction produced by the historical evidence, and in connection with it to beget a "full persuasion" of the canonical authority of a writing. But for valid reasons, as might be shown did time permit, they decline to find, either in the contents of a writing or in any subjective impressions in reference to it, the ultimate test of its canonicity. And, not to dwell too long upon this theory, it is proper to observe, in the fourth place, the contrast between this view and that of Rome. The two have recently been declared to be identical; but in reality they are wide apart as the poles. There is a sense in which both may be said to appeal to the testimony of the church, though this language, which is ambiguous and misleading, should be avoided. But how different is the nature of the appeal in the two cases. Romanists appeal to the church in her organized and official capacity. Protestants appeal to the individuals who compose the church, and appeal to them, not for their official *sanction*, but for *information* upon a simple question of fact. Romanists appeal to the church as a judge whose decision is final. Protestants appeal to her members as credible witnesses. Romanists appeal to her for an authoritative decision upon a question which they are unable or indisposed to examine for themselves. Protestants appeal to her members for evidence, which they weigh as they would any other evidence. According to the Romish view, the church collects the evidence and passes upon it, and declares her judgment in the premises, from which judgment there is no appeal. According to the Protestant view, the persons who compose the church may collect the testimony and perpetuate it from



generation to generation, but each individual may and should pass upon it for himself. To fail to see this distinction does not speak well for one's mental acumen. To deny its existence argues "invincible ignorance."

There is a third answer to the question, What is the ultimate test of canonicity? to the consideration of which the remainder of this paper will be devoted. The reasons for singling out this third answer for special examination are several. First, There is at present an effort being made in high quarters to give it wide-spread currency. Second, It is not only intrinsically false, but is based upon principles which, if admitted, must be fatal to the Christian system. It looks like an attempt to derationalize religion in order to make room for rationalism. It gilds the spire of the Christian temple with a false glory, to dazzle the eyes, and to distract the attention from the fact that it is busy sapping its foundations. Third, This theory, though false, is specious. It seeks to adorn itself with a show of humility, which is exceedingly fascinating. Then, too, it looks like reverence personified. Finally: It is, let us not say boastful and arrogant, but lofty in its claims. Probably it would be as well just here to state what these claims are.

It claims, then, to represent the doctrine of the Reformers and Puritans. It claims the sanction of the Westminster Confession. It claims to be the doctrine of many of the most gifted and godly modern scholars, such as Neander, Tholuck, Müller and Dorner. It claims to furnish the only sure basis for certitude in regard to the canon. It claims to put the humblest Christian above the need of a "mediating priesthood of theologians," above the need of any help from apologetics and polemics, above the reach of all cavils, and I suppose one might add, above the need of all church history. It claims as a peculiar merit that, while it enables the humblest Christian to rest in the sweet assurance that he possesses the truth of God, it also enables the higher critic to go on in his destructive and constructive work with the comfortable reflection that under its ægis there will be none to molest or make him afraid. It claims that it alone prevents the reason, the conscience and the religious feeling from being forced into conflict one with another, and one or all with the Spirit of God. It claims to render the

reason, conscience and religious feeling independent of "the external authority of scholars and schools, of church or state, of tradition or human testimony, however extensive,"<sup>1</sup> with which it asserts they can never be satisfied, and to furnish them a divine authority upon which to rest. It claims that it alone secures to the individual Christian the inalienable and inestimable right of private judgment, not only as regards the several doctrines of our faith, but also as regards the source of these doctrines. This it does by encouraging and enabling every Christian to make his own Bible.

These are unquestionably lofty claims, and may well arrest our attention upon the theory in behalf of which they are made. Let us then proceed to examine it. I will give it in the words of one of its latest and ablest advocates, Dr. C. A. Briggs:

"The principles on which the canon of Scripture is to be determined are, therefore, these: (1,) The testimony of the church, going back by tradition and written documents to primitive times, presents probable evidence to all men that the Scriptures, recognized as of divine authority and canonical by such consent, are indeed what they are claimed to be.

"(2,) The Scriptures themselves, in their pure and holy character satisfying the conscience; their beauty, majesty and harmony satisfying the æsthetic taste; their simplicity and fidelity to truth, together with their exalted conceptions of man, of God and of history, satisfying the reason and the intellect; their piety and devotion to the one God, and their revelation of redemption, satisfying the religious feelings and deepest needs of mankind—all conspire to convince more and more that they are indeed sacred and divine books.

"(3,) The Spirit of God bears witness by and with the particular writing, or part of writing, in the heart of the believer, removing every doubt, and assuring the soul of its possession of the truth of God, the rule and guide of life. . . .

"Thus the human testimony, the external evidence, attains its furthest possible limit as probable evidence, bringing the inquirer to the Scriptures with a high and reverent esteem of them, when the internal evidence exerts its powerful influence upon his soul, and at length the divine testimony lays hold of his entire nature, and convinces and assures him of the truth of God, and causes him to share in the consensus of the Christian church."<sup>2</sup>

Such is the theory we are now briefly to examine. One could wish that it furnished less to support the sneer of the distinguished French diplomatist who said that language is designed to conceal our thoughts. How much would it aid us in forming a judgment of this theory had the writer just quoted stated "in a few plain

<sup>1</sup> Briggs' *Biblical Study*, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136, 137.

words" what he has hidden under many cloudy sentences. As it is, we must carefully and patiently thread our way through a maze. Still we need not despair of finding the clue to this labyrinth. Fortunately, what is dark or obscure in the above statement may be so illuminated and explained by other statements from the same pen as to enable us to fix with certainty the essential features of the theory.

First, then, let it be observed that this theory reduces the evidence for the canonicity of any writing to three heads, namely, that furnished by "the testimony of the church;" that furnished by the contents of the writing itself; and that furnished by the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

It will simplify our investigation to dismiss at once from consideration all that is so truly and eloquently said about the evidence which the character of the contents may furnish for the canonicity of a writing. We may dismiss this because it presents a view not peculiar to this theory, but common to it and to that advocated by Drs. Thornwell and Alexander. In a word, it is admitted on all hands that this kind of evidence is at best only corroborative. It may deepen, but it cannot of itself ground a conviction of the canonicity of a book.

It only remains, then, to consider the "testimony of the church" and the testimony of the Spirit. Here we may very properly inquire into the meaning of the terms employed, and also into the relative weight ascribed to each kind of testimony.

Let us turn, therefore, and examine what is meant by "the testimony of the church," and what is said of it.

Now, as soon as we begin to try to fix the meaning of the expression "the testimony of the church," we find that the words are beset with an ambiguity which makes the use of them in the statement under consideration scarcely less than criminal. The gravity of the offence is not at all diminished by the fact that the expression seems to be borrowed from the Confession of Faith, and apparently professes in this connection to echo the sentiments of that venerable document. If we attend merely to the sound of the words and their meaning as used in the Confession, we would not unnaturally suppose that the phrase, "the testimony of the church," referred to the consensus of opinion existing among

ecclesiastical persons, or to the consensus of the official decisions of ecclesiastical courts and councils. But the sound here is evidently misleading. This phrase, as used in the passage cited above, was designed, as will appear when we examine it in the light of other statements from the same pen, to include all *historical evidence* coming to us through ecclesiastical channels. Things so different should not be confounded. An opinion is one thing, evidence is another and quite a different thing. The former is the answer to the question, What do you *think*? The latter to the question, What do you *know*? When we ask for the opinion of another with a view to making that a rule of conduct for ourselves, we virtually hold our own judgment in abeyance and act upon that of another. When we ask for evidence, it is with a view to forming an intelligent and independent opinion for ourselves. To turn to ecclesiastical persons or councils for their opinion might look like we stood at their bar and recognized in them some right to impose their opinions upon us. But to collect the evidence furnished by ecclesiastical persons or councils is to seat ourselves upon the judgment seat and call them before our bar to be examined and cross-examined as witnesses. To be controlled by the opinions of ecclesiastical persons or councils, no matter how perfect the unanimity or how great the antiquity of such opinions, might squint towards a surrender of the right of private judgment; but to demand evidence is usually and properly regarded as an assertion of this valued right. I say again, then, that things so different as a mere *consensus of opinion* and *historical evidence* ought not to have been confounded. If one did not feel that the distinction between them was too important to have been intentionally obscured, he would be apt to say that it is too palpable to have been unintentionally obscured. However this may be, the fact is that it has been obscured. Hence the importance of noticing the fact that the phrase, "the testimony of the church," as used by Dr. Briggs, covers and was designed to cover all *historical evidence coming to us through ecclesiastical channels*. It would have been clearer, then, had the paragraph quoted read: Historical evidence, "going back by tradition and written documents to primitive times, presents probable" proof "to all men that the

Scriptures" are "of divine authority and canonical." For, as we will see, this is the real position of this theory.

The next point in this connection is the weight allowed in this statement to historical testimony. It is said to furnish "*probable* evidence" of canonicity, nothing more. This is not only the furthest actual, but the "furthest possible limit" to which "human testimony" can attain. It may confirm us in convictions otherwise produced, but it is in itself powerless to produce conviction. If left to this we could not be sure of the canonicity of a single book in the Bible.

This is surely a startling position. It simply amounts to this, that no line of historical evidence, however complete, can establish the canonicity of a writing. It may extend back to the times of the apostles, it may connect a writing with one of these authorized and inspired founders and expounders of the Christian system, but it will be of no avail so far as establishing its claim to be a rule of faith and life. It follows from this that the questions of canonicity and authorship are not only distinct, but wholly severed from each other. To prove that a given writing is the official production of an inspired man does not prove that it is inspired and canonical.

If any one questions the correctness of this construction put upon the language we have been passing under review, it can be abundantly confirmed. Thus Dr. B. B. Warfield says: "It is also clear that prophetic and apostolic origin is the very essence of the authority of the Scriptures."<sup>1</sup> Upon which the writer before quoted comments as follows: "If this is the 'very essence of the authority of the Scripture,' that essence is not strong enough to sustain the strain of criticism, and to bear the weight of a world demanding infallible evidence for its faith."<sup>2</sup> Now this criticism is equivalent to a strong denial of the assertion that "prophetic and apostolic origin is the very essence of" canonicity.

Again, Dr. Alexander says:

"As to the proper method of settling the canon of the New Testament, the same course must be pursued as was done in respect to the Old. We must have

---

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, Vol. X., p. 506, quoted in *Whither*, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> *Whither*, p. 87.

recourse to authentic history, and endeavor to ascertain what books were received as genuine by the primitive church and early fathers. The contemporaries and immediate successors of the apostles are the most competent witnesses in this case. If among them there is found to have been a general agreement as to what books were canonical, it will go far to satisfy us respecting the true canon, for it cannot be supposed that they could easily be deceived in a matter of this sort. A general consent of the early fathers and of the primitive church, therefore, furnishes conclusive evidence upon this point, and is that species of evidence which is least liable to fallacy or abuse. The learned Huet has therefore assumed it as a maxim, '*That every book is genuine which was esteemed genuine by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written and by the ages following in a continued series.*'"

It is not for me to pause here to point out the correct interpretation of Dr. Alexander's language. Its general meaning is manifest and manifestly sound. But Dr. Briggs, commenting on this, says:

"Dr. A. Alexander thus gave himself unreservedly into the hands of the learned Jesuit without seeing the trap into which he had fallen. Those following him have all fallen into the same error. They have abandoned the principle of the Scriptures as maintained by Luther, Calvin, Knox, Cartwright, the Reformed Confessions, and the Westminster divines, and have tried to find the rock of our faith in the shifting sand of human tradition."

Without pausing to bemoan the blindness of Dr. Alexander or to admire the penetration and fairness of his critic, it is enough to say that this criticism is tantamount to the assertion that no line of historical evidence, even though it reach back to the very days of the apostles, can be conclusive as to the canonicity of a given writing. Such evidence, in the estimation of our critic, furnishes no more stable foundation for confidence in the canonicity of a book than shifting sand furnishes for the foundation of a house.

One more quotation from Dr. Briggs' own pen. He says:

"The question as to the authenticity of the Bible is whether God is its author; whether it is inspired. This cannot be determined by the higher criticism in any way, for the higher criticism has only to do with human authorship, and has nothing to do with the divine authorship, which is determined on different principles."<sup>1</sup>

Now it must follow from this that the answer to the question, Who was the human author of this writing? gives no light as to whether or not it is of canonical authority. To prove that the inspired Apostle Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Romans

---

<sup>1</sup> *Biblical Study*, p. 228.

does not upon this theory prove that Romans is of "divine authority and canonical."

Both of the points just made will stand out more clearly, if possible, when we examine the doctrine of this theory in regard to the testimony of the Holy Spirit and its relations to the evidences of canonicity. This we must now proceed to do as briefly as possible.

In laying down "the principles on which the canon of Scripture is to be determined," Dr. Briggs, having relegated the evidence for canonicity derived from the contents of the writing and from "human testimony" to the category of merely "probable evidence," adds: "The Spirit of God bears witness by and with the particular writing, or part of writing, in the heart of the believer, removing every doubt and assuring the soul of its possession of the truth of God, the rule and guide of life."<sup>1</sup>

One may, I hope, without impropriety express the wish that there was a less manifest ambiguity about these words. This would tend greatly to the comfort of the reader, to say nothing about the credit of the writer. I venture to offer the following as a just summary of the teachings of this paragraph, viz.: It teaches, (1,) That the *testimony of the Spirit* to the inspiration of a writing is the *ultimate test* of its canonicity; (2,) That this testimony is not outward, in the form of miracles, but wholly inward, purely and entirely subjective; (3,) That in the case of one and the same writing, this testimony may be given to parts of it and withheld from other parts of it; (4,) That this testimony is invariably limited in its power and influence to single individuals; (5,) That it is given only to believers, who alone, therefore, have sufficient reasons for accepting the statements of Scripture as true and of binding authority—from which the necessary inference is, that to expect others who have no satisfactory evidence of the divine authority and canonicity of Scripture to receive and obey them as a rule of faith and life would be not only most unreasonable, but unjust; (6,) That this testimony is delivered "*by and with the particular writing or part of writing*" that may be under consideration; (7,) That it is not only an ultimate, but also the sole, test of canonicity.

Such is the doctrine of this paragraph. Passing by, for the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Biblical Study*, p. 136.

present, some of its features, we may embody in the following proposition so much of it as it is necessary for us to consider at this stage of our discussion, viz., The ultimate, only and alone test of the canonicity of a writing as a whole, or any part thereof, is that testimony which the Holy Spirit may inwardly deliver to its inspiration. That this is the only correct interpretation of this paragraph is manifest, first, from the connection in which it occurs. The object of the statement as a whole is professedly to lay down principles for the determination of the canon of Scripture. This being true, we have but three alternatives among which to choose: either (*a*), the writer forgot the very thing he started out to do, and has laid down no test, which may be dismissed; or (*b*), the test laid down is complex and not simple, which, as we will see, is excluded by other statements; or (*c*), the test is simple, and consists in the single principle just announced. That the last is the true and only interpretation is manifest, in the second place, from what is said on this point in other connections. Let the following, from among other statements that might be quoted, serve as an illustration.

Dr. Archibald Alexander, with his usual sobriety and discrimination, says: "It is certain that the influence of the Holy Spirit is necessary to produce a true faith in the word of God; but to make this the only criterion by which to judge of the canonical authority of a book is certainly liable to strong objections."<sup>1</sup> Upon this the following comment is made by the writer whose test of canonicity we are examining: "In this passage Dr. Alexander throws himself against the Gallican Confession, as he acknowledges; but he probably did not realize that he was going against the unanimous testimony of the Reformed Confessions, the Westminster standards, and the entire body of Continental Protestants and British Puritans; and certainly he did not apprehend the peril of his departure from the fundamental principle of the Reformation."<sup>2</sup> Now, admitting the justice of the concessions so generously made here to Dr. Alexander's ignorance, and trying to preserve due composure under the alarming tone of bravado which

<sup>1</sup> *Canon of the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 114-116, cited in *Whither*, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Whither*, p. 78.



pervades this passage, you will observe that this language is equivalent to a strong affirmation that "the *only* criterion by which to judge of the canonical authority of a book" is the testimony of the Holy Spirit to its inspiration.

We have now passed under a careful review the several parts of this theory. If our examination has been prolonged, it has been due to the character of the witness with whom we have had to deal. He has shown himself to be an apparently reluctant witness. A close cross-examination has been necessary, therefore, to compel him to lay aside his reluctance and to testify to the real nature of his theory. If the attempt has been successful, two considerations will go far to compensate us for the time it has taken: First, We may feel sure that our view of the theory is correct, inasmuch as it has been derived from the statements of one of its advocates; and, second, We need not tarry long upon its refutation, for this is one of those cases where a clear statement of a theory is almost equivalent to a refutation of it.

Our examination, then, has shown that the leading features of this theory may be reduced to three. Of these two are negative in character, and one positive. The negative features may be thus stated:

1. No kind or amount of human testimony can establish the canonicity of a writing.

2. The inspiration of a writing would not be established even if it should be proven to be the official production of an inspired man.

The positive thus: The ultimate, only and alone test of the canonicity of a writing, or of any part of it, is the testimony of the Holy Spirit to its inspiration; which testimony is delivered in the heart of the believer.

The first stricture which I have to offer upon this theory is, that, let its advocates deny and attempt to disguise the fact as they may, it is nevertheless true that this doctrine of canonicity is liable to all the objections of mysticism, and, like mysticism, must sooner or later lead to fanaticism. It is simply another illustration of the saying that extremes meet. Here we have rationalism run to seed in irrationalism. Let us see. What is the evidence

of canonicity upon which we are invited to repose our faith? Is it not, after all that can be said, simply and solely a subjective impression produced upon the mind of the inquirer? This subjective impression, it is true, purports to be from the Holy Spirit. But what is there to certify the inquirer that he is not the dupe of a heated or disordered fancy, or, worse still, of a wicked spirit? It may be said that the Holy Spirit is just as able to assure individuals now that he is speaking to them as he was to do the same in the case of apostles and prophets. This is granted. But how did he assure apostles and prophets that he spoke to and by them? Was not the internal voice invariably confirmed and corroborated by some external sign? Moses first sees the bush burning without being consumed, hears an audible voice, witnesses a number of miracles, and then, and not until then, he goes to Israel and to Pharaoh, and says, "Thus saith the Lord." Paul speaks of the signs of an apostle. These were doubtless signs to the apostle himself as much as to others. It seems perfectly safe to say that in every case where the Holy Spirit spoke, in this special way, to one or by one, his voice was either preceded, accompanied or followed by miraculous evidence addressed to the senses. It seems safe to say, that wherever communication is opened *de novo* between God and a man there is a necessity for miracles. As soon as we come into possession of God's written word this necessity in a manner ceases; for in the word itself we have the safeguard we need. By it we can try the spirits whether they be of God. It may be granted, then, that the Spirit who gave the word is able to bear such testimony to it as his word as will leave no shadow of doubt upon the mind. The question is not what the Spirit can do, but what he does. It would be preposterous to assert that, in addition to witnessing to the word in the heart, he works miracles in order to assure men of the canonicity of this, that or the other book of Scripture. But without these miracles, how can men be assured that they are not following an *ignis fatuus*? Let us suppose that some one has deposited five thousand dollars in bank to the credit of Mr. A. B., an individual not personally known to any of the officials of the bank. Shortly after it has been deposited, in steps a man, who draws a check in these terms: "Pay to self or

order," and signs it "A. B." He steps up to the desk and passes his paper over to the cashier. The cashier, of course, will wish the signature identified. Suppose, now, the man who has just drawn the check says, "I will identify it." Would not the cashier very promptly respond, "But, my dear sir, who will identify you?" We are told by the advocates of this theory that the Spirit of God will identify his own writings. But, we make bold to ask, who will identify the one claiming to be the Spirit of God? Reason demands that when we have so much at stake we should only act under the protection of every possible safeguard. The Scriptures recognize and ratify this demand; but the theory we are considering utterly ignores it. To all intents and purposes it makes the whole Bible, and each part of it, a new revelation to each individual. The authority of this stupendous revelation rests solely upon a subjective impression, for the Holy Spirit no longer accompanies the word with "signs and wonders following." The fruit of such pernicious doctrine it is easy to see.

It may be proper to add at this point, that the writer is not alone in seeing the virus of mysticism in this theory. Long ago the venerable Dr. Archibald Alexander uttered his warning against even that modified form of the theory which appears in the Gallican Confession, and based that warning upon the inherent tendency of the theory to the errors of mysticism. Later, this is the view of the theory which has arrested the attention of the clear and vigorous mind of Francis L. Patton, president of Princeton College, who says of it: "It does not tend in the slightest degree to reconcile us to these opinions to say that the Reformers entertained them. It would not be strange if, in their opposition to the claims of the church of Rome, they went to the opposite extreme and were in danger of falling into the errors of the mystics."

It has been alleged, however, that the theory is clearly distinguished from mysticism and guarded against error from that quarter by the fact that the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit is delivered "by and with the particular writing or part of writing" which happens to be under investigation.

(a.) My first comment upon this position is, that its plausibility

lies wholly in the fact that the language used is similar in sound to language used in the Confession of Faith, in a materially different connection and with a totally different sense. The advocates of this theory will find that the mere form of sound words will fail to hide its nakedness and ugliness from thoughtful minds.

(b.) My next comment is, that the terms used, when viewed in the connection in which they are used, are confused and confusing. They convey no very distinct idea of any kind. Let it be remembered that the question to be decided is: Is this particular writing inspired? And we are told that the Spirit establishes its inspiration by testifying "by and with" the writing itself. But if the writing is the channel through which the testimony of the Spirit is delivered, then surely it would seem to be necessary in some way to connect the channel through which the testimony comes with the source from which the testimony is said to proceed. If A. B., being unable to attend court, sends a written deposition, before it can be received in evidence the court must be certified that it proceeds from A. B. If it be said that A. B. is surely competent to certify that a certain document proceeded from him as its author, this is granted. But observe, this implies that A. B. himself is present and has been duly identified. If so, then the question might arise, why testify by and with the writing when he is on hand to speak for himself to all points mentioned in the document? Moreover, let it be carefully observed that in this case we would not have two independent converging mutually corroborative lines of testimony resulting in cumulative evidence, but a mere repetition of testimony.

(c.) But we are told, by way of explaining the terms, that "It is one thing to say that the Spirit teacheth us by the Scripture, and another thing to pretend the Spirit's teaching besides, beyond, or contrary to the Scripture; the one is a divine truth, the other is vile *montanism*."

Upon this I remark first, that it is difficult to see how the Spirit can teach us by the Scripture before we are in possession of the Scripture. The very core of our inquiry is, Is this writing Scripture? Until this is settled the Holy Spirit has no Scripture with which to teach us anything. In a word, the naked testimony

of the voice claiming to be the voice of the Spirit must establish the fact that certain writings are Scripture before the Spirit is in a position to teach anything by the Scripture; otherwise he has no Scripture by which to teach.

But, in the second place, if those who offer this explanation mean that the Spirit does not deliver his testimony apart from, or independently of, the particular writing or part of writing which happens to be under examination, then I remark that they have deceived themselves with a bald and meaningless truism. For, as a matter of course, if the Spirit testifies to a writing, then the writing itself must be before the eye of the body or that of the mind. And if they mean that he testifies simply and solely by the written words themselves as opposed to a voice, or vision, or mere inward impression, however produced, then I reply that there is no evidence that the Spirit of God is testifying at all. They have in effect fallen back upon the internal evidence presented by the writing itself, which evidence they formerly rejected. The fact is that, let them twist and squirm as they may, let them use language as a means of concealing their meaning as much as they may, they will after all find themselves compelled to rest, even by their own showing, under the charge of "*vile montanism.*"

3. But, again, it will help us to form a just estimate of this theory if we consider briefly some of the consequences which naturally and necessarily flow from it. Let it be remembered, then, that according to the doctrine we are considering, the question of origin, or authorship, is wholly distinct from that of canonicity. The fact that the apostolic authorship of a writing is proved by a chain of unimpeachable historical witnesses settles nothing. It is, therefore, not only needless, but useless, to associate any book by a chain of historical evidences with Christ or the apostles. Their *imprimatur* is worthless. It may secure for a writing reverent esteem, but can invest it with no authority. A book having no connection whatever with the authorized and inspired founders and expounders of the Christian system may nevertheless become a rule of faith and life to those living under that system. And, on the other hand, a book proved by the most unquestionable evidence to have proceeded from John or Paul, and

claiming upon its face to be a rule of faith and life, has not necessarily any authority whatever. If this be denied, it can only be upon the ground that the Holy Spirit will in every such case as that first mentioned refuse to testify by and with the writing in the heart of the believer, and in every such case as last-mentioned, will invariably testify by and with the writing. But to say this is simply to surrender the theory. If, on the contrary, the consequence be admitted, then the theory may be subjected to a simple and decisive test. Doubtless it was just as true for the Galatians as it is for us that authorship could not determine canonicity. Let us ask, then, when Paul's letter came to them duly attested, did it, or did it not, demand and deserve their immediate acceptance and obedience? Did they have to wait for a special, direct, supernatural, miraculous confirmation of its authority by the Holy Spirit? If Paul's name as an inspired apostle was a sufficient guarantee of the canonicity of the epistle in the first instance, then how can the mere lapse of time have affected its sufficiency as a guarantee to us?

But further, in this same connection, let it be remembered, that according to the view we are examining there is no process by which the canonicity of a writing as a whole can be established. So jealous are its advocates for the right of private judgment, and withal so humble and devout is their temper of mind, that they must be certified by the Holy Spirit of the canonicity, not of the writing as a whole merely, but also of its several parts. They do not believe in the inerrancy of the very autograph which came from the hands of the apostles. Hence they need a special revelation in connection with each paragraph and every sentence. They do not believe in verbal inspiration. Hence the Holy Spirit must disentangle the thought from the words, and certify to them that such and such disembodied thoughts, so to speak, were designed when the writer used such and such words. Let us see, then, whereunto this doctrine if admitted must grow. Here we have the Epistle to the Romans. It is all from one hand. It claims to be sanctioned in every part by one authority. But, notwithstanding these facts, it would be entirely possible upon this theory that the Holy Spirit might certify chapters i.—viii., and

decline to certify chapter ix. If this is denied, it is hard to see upon what ground. It cannot be upon the ground that the Holy Spirit will always bear witness by and with what he himself has in the first instance inspired; because this assumes that this chapter was in the first instance inspired by the Holy Spirit. This, however, is the point in question. But if it be admitted that chapter ix. is not canonical, or might not receive the attestation of the Spirit, then observe what follows. Paul unquestionably regarded himself as speaking under the inspiration of the Spirit in the ninth chapter as truly as in chapters i.—viii. But he was mistaken, or may have been mistaken. And if he may have been mistaken in regard to the ninth chapter, why may he not have been mistaken in regard to chapters i.—viii.? And if he was, or may have been, mistaken, notwithstanding all the evidence that he had that he was truly under the guidance of the Spirit, what guarantee can we have that we are not mistaken when we fancy we hear the voice of the Spirit in our hearts bearing witness by and with a particular writing, or part of writing? This theory is a road losing itself in intellectual quagmires and swamps, where the traveller may temporarily rejoice in the light of a jack-a-lantern, but must eventually land in a bog.

4. But the radical and revolutionary character of the theory will probably appear most clearly when it is shown that it invalidates the miraculous and historical evidence upon which the Christian system has been supposed to rest. Let us examine this allegation.

It has been the boast of a long line of Christian apologists that it is a distinguishing feature and a distinguishing excellency of Christianity, as contrasted with all other religions, that every one of its leading doctrines is so rooted in a historical fact that to establish the fact is to establish the doctrine. Thus, given the facts of Christ's life, and we have of necessity the doctrine of the incarnation; given the facts of his death, and we have of necessity the doctrine of the atonement; given the fact of his resurrection, and we have the doctrines of his divinity and of the trinity. Now, it will be observed, that the inspiration of the writings of the apostles, for instance, is as much a doctrine of Scripture and of the Chris-

tian system as any of those just named. What, then, are the historical facts in which this doctrine roots itself? The answer ordinarily has been, the fact that those who wrote them and claimed for them inspiration did works "which no man could do except God were with him." The inspiration of the writings, therefore, follows as a necessary inference from the inspiration of the writers; and that, in turn, follows necessarily from the miracles they wrought. Paul's epistles rest their authority upon his authority as an apostle, and this, in turn, rests upon the signs of an apostle which he wrought wherever he went. If, then, neither canonicity nor inspiration can be established by external evidence, it must be either because we have no sufficient, satisfactory historical evidence connecting these writings with the authorized and inspired founders and expounders of the Christian system; or because there is no sufficient evidence that the writers did work miracles; or because miracles do not furnish satisfactory evidence of a divine commission. To accept either of the former alternatives is to make shipwreck of the Christian system, by asserting that the facts upon which it professes to rest are incapable of being verified. To accept the last alternative is to make shipwreck of it again, by asserting that, granting the facts, they furnish no ground for the doctrines of the system. In a word, if it be impossible to establish the inspiration of a writing by any kind or amount of external evidence, then it is impossible to establish the inspiration either of a writing or a writer by miracles, for they unquestionably fall in the category of external evidence.

There are other points in connection with the theory we have been considering which might be noted, but which must be passed by in order that we may glance at the attempt that has been made to foist it upon the Confession of Faith.

This attempt derives all of its plausibility from the mere sound of the language used by the Confession, in utter disregard of its connection and manifest sense. The language referred to is as follows: "Yet, notwithstanding our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof," *i. e.*, of the Scriptures, "is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts." Does the Confession



then commit itself to the doctrine that the canonicity of a writing cannot be established by any kind or amount of external evidence? Does it teach that the ultimate test of canonicity is the testimony of the Holy Spirit by and with the particular writing or part of writing which happens to be under consideration? Not at all. The question of canonicity, properly speaking, was not before the minds of the framers of the Confession when they wrote these words. Canonicity is an intrinsic quality of certain writings. It belongs to them, whether those to whom they come will hear or whether they will forbear. Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority of a writing, however much it may affect our conduct and concern our welfare or our woe, has nothing to do with its canonicity. This, as the Confession says in the paragraph just preceding that from which the words above quoted were taken, depends upon the authority with which God has invested it. The question as to whether God has or has not invested a writing with authority as a rule of faith and life is by no means identical with the question, How do men come to a full persuasion of the infallible truth and divine authority of this rule? It is a question which rests upon its own proper and independent evidence: evidence which would hold were all men to refuse to recognize the infallible truth and divine authority of the rule; evidence which would compel the assent of the understanding, and bring the conscience under obligations, even though it failed to secure the confidence of a corrupt heart and the obedience of a rebellious will. Now, any one who will read the Confession carefully will find that it is dealing, not with a question of Christian evidences, but with a question of Christian experience; not with the question, What is there to show that this writing has been invested by God with authority as a rule of faith and life? but, How is its acceptance at the hands of man secured? To this the answer is, its full and complete acceptance is only secured by an inward operation of the Spirit, persuading and enabling the heart and will to yield to the overwhelming external evidence furnished by the origin and contents of the books. The case may be illustrated by what we speak of as historical and saving faith. Surely no one will make Christ's claims as prophet, priest and king de-

pend upon "the inward work of the Holy Spirit." These claims rest upon their own proper evidence. This evidence may, and frequently does, compel the assent of the understanding, even when the person so convinced refuses to believe with the heart. How great a perversion would it be of the teachings of the Confession to say that, because it declares that "faith is a saving grace," therefore it teaches that the validity of Christ's claims rests upon an inward operation of the Holy Spirit. It is equally perverse to wrest the language we have been considering into meaning that the only evidence of the canonicity of a writing is the testimony of the Holy Spirit by and with it in the heart.

But it is time to leave this theory. Taking a parting glance at it as we turn away, we find that its claims are in curious contrast with its real character. For instance, it poses as the persecuted and disowned heir of our Puritan fathers and the Reformers. Doubtless, could they rise from their graves, they would be surprised at the company this descendant of theirs is keeping. It claims to do special honor to the Holy Spirit, and yet it opens the door of the heart for every lying spirit that may choose blasphemously to impersonate him. It pretends to stand alone in recognizing the claims of the reason and religious feelings. But it deprives the former of its primary, proper, and well-nigh sole function in matters of religion, by refusing to permit it to sift the historical evidences of Christianity, and making it the dupe of every inner voice or light which human fanaticism or Satanic cunning may ascribe to the Holy Spirit, and at the same time it deprives the religious feelings of their only norm and safeguard, by virtually making them sit in judgment upon the claims of the word. It professes to give the only ground for certitude in regard to the canon, but as a matter of fact invests every book and every paragraph of Scripture, from the first chapter of Genesis to the twenty-second chapter of Revelation, in uncertainty. It professes to be the great bulwark and protection of the Christian system, when, in fact, it saps the system at its foundations, by calling into question the validity of the historical and miraculous testimony upon which it rests, and substituting for these a line of evidence which at best must, in the end, rank it, among intelligent men, along with the systems of Swedenborg and Joe Smith.

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS.

### III. THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.<sup>1</sup>

IN the controversy between Principal Candlish and Professor Crawford, the main question of disagreement was as to man's original relation to God. Dr. Candlish affirmed that Adam, in Eden and unfallen, sustained to God the servile relation alone; while Dr. Crawford contended that he sustained both the servile and filial relations. The one denied and the other asserted God's common fatherhood of the race.

Our question goes back and inquires about *Adam as he was* and *man as he ought to be*.

But in the interests of clearness, it is incumbent upon the discussion to expound the two relations, noting the specific differences between a son and a servant.

1. They differ as to their *genesis*. A servant may become such in a great variety of ways: by birth, by divine creation, by free choice, by misfortune, by purchase, by theft, by war, and the like. A son, on the other hand, can become such by the following methods alone: by divine creation, by generation, by regeneration, by adoption. The possible ways of superinducing upon a human creature the servile relation are almost infinite, while those by which the filial relation is constituted are very few.

2. They differ as to the *character of the moral government* under which they live. Both are under moral government, but the servant is under that moral government where the rectoral feature is prominent, while the son is under that moral govern-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Fatherhood of God*. Being the first course of the Cunningham Lectures, delivered before the New College, Edinburgh, in March, 1864. By Rob. S. Candlish, D. D., Principal of the New College, Edinburgh, and Minister of Free St. George's Church, Edinburgh. With a supplementary volume containing reply to Dr. Crawford, with answers to other objections and explanatory notes.

*The Fatherhood of God*. Considered in its general and special aspects, and particularly in relation to the Atonement, with a review of recent speculations on the subject and a reply to the strictures of Dr. Candlish. By Thomas J. Crawford, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

ment where the disciplinary feature is outstanding. One is under rule in the state, the other under rule in the house. One is under God's magisterial government, the other under his fatherly government. To the servant, God is Lord and Master; to the son, he is Father and Friend. The subject of rectoral moral government may at the same time be the subject of disciplinary moral government. The two relations, the servile and the filial, may co-exist upon the same person at one and the same time. There is no inherent incompatibility. Christ was both the Servant and Son of his Father.

3. They differ as to the *regulative motive of obedience*. Both are under law, and the obligation of perfect obedience presses equally upon both. The servant is just as much bound to obey his master as the son is to obey his father. *Fear*—it need not be slavish, and in Adam unfallen and in Christ it certainly was not—is the inspiring motive with the servant. He dreads the consequences of disobedience. The penalty everywhere and always obtrudes itself upon him. The drawn sword is to him the final reason for obedience. However much pleasure he may find in service, he can never forget that it is duty. The requirements of his master may be anything else than irksome, but he can never forget his position; he can never forget that he has a master who holds a lash with the authority to use it. The supreme motive is a sense of duty. On the other hand, *love* is the ruling motive with the son. The injunctions of a parent rise into privileges rather than into cold duties. There is a sympathy between the father and the child. There is between them a community of blood and heart. Of course sin has made, among men, the normal abnormal, the natural unnatural; but in the glorified state, the saints, as servants, will obey out of a holy reverence for and pleasure in authority, and, as sons, from a motive of holy love to the divine Father.

4. They differ as to the *ground of their expectation of reward*. The servant pleads his work; the son his privileges. The servant is dealt with upon the naked principle of justice; the son according to the riches of paternal goodness. The servant fixes his eye upon his merits; the son upon his father's heart. The servant regards himself as a wage-hand; the son as an interested partner.

The servant presents his claim, and points to the contract; the son expresses his wishes, and appeals to his father's love. Both expect rewards for their work; but the servant stands upon right, and claims his in the name of the contract; the son stands upon paternal goodness, and asks in the name of fatherly affection. Both have rights to their respective rewards; but the right of a servant grounds itself in the justice of a law-court; that of a son in the justice of a father's house.

5. They differ as to the *design had in their punishment*. The offending servant is dealt with in the name of naked justice. The officer of law takes him in hand. Retributive justice pursues him with sword in hand. The design in inflicting punishment upon him is simply and solely to effect the righteous and necessary connection between guilt and punishment. All other consequences are incidental and secondary. The good of the offender is thrust into the background. He is punished because he *deserves* punishment. The offending son, on the contrary, is dealt with in the name of fatherly discipline. His sufferings, as caused by his father, are not punitive in their nature, but corrective. The object is the son's improvement. There is a heart of love behind the hand which deals the stroke. The child's sufferings, as inflicted by his father, are not penal and rectoral, but reformatory and beneficent.

6. They differ as to the *freedom and fulness of access into the presence of their superiors*. The servant may be intimate, but he is less so than the son. There is not the same wealth of communion, the same nearness of approach, the same confidence. The servant is farther from his master than the son is from his father. The one is received in some presence-chamber; the other at the familiar fireside. The one must stand with head uncovered, or kneel in humble reverence; the other may move in and out, through the rooms of the mansion, and frequent the hallowed places about the dwelling. The highest attainable position of the servant is that of the unfallen angels who minister as flames of fire about Jehovah's burning throne; while the redeemed son is admitted into the mansion on the light-covered hills beyond the stars, and permitted to pillow his head on his Father's bosom.

The position of the servant before the throne is sublime; but the position of the son in the Father's house is indescribable.

Now, the precise question is, What was man's original relation to his Creator? Was he a servant only? or was he both a servant and a son? Manifestly, if there were an inherent incongruity between the two relations, the question could not be asked; but the foregoing marks of contradistinction show that no such incongruity exists, and that the same person may, at the same time, be the son and subject of his father. The Prince of Wales is at once the son and subject of Queen Victoria.

Upon this question the Scriptures are the only competent and credible authority. Reason, as a source of information on the subject, is to be ruled out, because incompetent to speak to the question. The fact of creation proves man to be the responsible subject of the Creator; but it gives no intimations of the sonship of man, for all lower animals are the creatures of God, and it is incompetent to argue from their creaturehood to their sonship. Reason cannot disprove the fatherhood of God. On this question it is silent; it can speak neither to the one side nor to the other. It can accept whatever the Scriptures may teach.

Dr. Candlish undertakes to disprove the original paternity of God by an argument ingeniously constructed and very readable:

“Whatever God as Creator makes, he must rule. If it is not to rule him, he must rule it. And he must rule it in all its actings and workings; through all the stages of its development. . . . If it is inert matter that is to be ruled, the law will be of a material or physical kind, whether mechanical or chemical. . . . But now, let what is to be ruled be, not inert matter, but beings possessed of animal life, having the capacity of feeling and the power of voluntary motion; with the sensational propensities we call instincts, and the dawns of intelligence, which render them teachable, as they are unfolded in growing shrewdness from the lowest to the highest order of brutal tribes. The sort of law by which such beings are ruled—the law of instinct, and, it may be added, in a measure, of experience,—is adapted to their sentient and motive natures. . . . But if the creatures to be ruled be possessed of intelligence and conscience, his rule becomes government, properly so called; government worthy of himself; . . . a rational and moral government, by means of a law and judgment of which reason and the moral sense take cognizance. . . . Thus it would seem, from the nature of the case, creation implies rule and government. The Creator must, of very necessity, be a ruler and governor, unless his creation is to be independent of himself. And as regards his intelligent creatures, his rule or government must be, in the proper forensic sense, legal and judicial, if it is to be adapted to the constitution and relative

position of the persons to be governed. . . . Where is the idea of fatherhood? Is there, at this stage, and so far as the inquiry has hitherto been pushed, any room for it at all? Is it not rather excluded? . . . Let it be taken for granted that the Creator is a living, personal intelligence, distinct from his own creation, and in particular distinct from his own intelligent creatures, who are themselves, as he is, living, personal intelligences. It may be clearly shown, and certainly inferred, that he must, as Creator, govern them, and govern them in a manner suited to their organization or constitution, as being made capable of owning righteous authority and reasonable law, and, therefore, capable of receiving recompense and retribution. Standing to them in the relation of their Creator, he must of necessity stand to them in the relation, as thus explained, of their ruler, their sovereign lawgiver and just judge. These apprehensions of God, and of his relation to the rational and responsible inhabitants of his universe, are of the essence of all belief in him, and all worship of him. They originate, and what is more, they fully explain and vindicate, both belief and worship. But the paternal relation, the fatherhood of God, has no place among them." (Pp. 10-14).

But when the validity of this argument has been conceded, that which has been proved is the Creator's lordship, and that which has been disproved is man's independence. The question of divine fatherhood and human sonship has not been touched. If the two relations, the servile and the filial, were mutually exclusive of each other, then the argument establishing the one would bar the other; but the two relations are not thus contradictory, and so the argument in proving man's subjectship fails to disprove his sonship.

Prof. Crawford charged this inconclusiveness upon Dr. Candlish, and sought to match his argument from creatureship to subjectship by the following reasoning, which proceeds from divine love as a premise to God's fatherhood as the conclusion:

"Be it assumed, then, that 'God is love,' and that his being so 'springs out of the very necessity of his nature.' Be it further assumed that, in the exercise of that love, which is thus allowed to be 'essential to his manner of being,' he has brought into existence a race of intelligent and moral creatures, 'created in his own image and after his own likeness,' with reference to whom he must have been disposed equally to manifest his love and maintain his righteous authority. And yet farther, be it assumed that these rational and moral creatures, as bearing the image of him by whom they were made, *have something more* to distinguish them from other creatures '*beyond the bare fact of intelligent responsibility,*'—that they have the capacity of knowing, loving, desiring, trusting, serving, and enjoying him; and that the very sum of all the duties which they owe to him is nothing else than *love*, as the natural and fit response to that love wherewith their Creator hath first loved them.

"It may be that in this last supposition there are some things that will not be

readily, if at all, conceded. But why not? There is surely nothing unreasonable in it. The 'image or likeness of God' cannot surely be held to consist in anything *so barely intellectual or so coldly judicial* as a mere capacity of 'understanding the divine will, and feeling a sense of responsibility under it.' If this were all that is implied in bearing the divine image, what then are we to think of God himself, whose image it is? In that case, we must evidently divest the character of God of some of the most essential and most adorable of its attributes. One thing we certainly know, that the *restored image* of God in the souls of men, when regenerated by the Holy Spirit, includes in it, not only 'intelligent responsibility,' but such a conformity to God in knowledge, righteousness and holiness as prompts them to love him and cleave to him with all their heart. And if so, we cannot think that it was otherwise with the primal image of God as it was impressed on our progenitors. Undoubtedly, to love God, to trust in him, to delight in his fellowship, to submit to his appointments, and cheerfully to obey his will, was part of the original constitution of the human soul before sin had ruined and depraved it.

"And what then? May we not reasonably conclude that God, having brought such creatures into being, 'will not forsake the work of his own hands'? Having so far acted towards them as a father in giving them existence and imparting to them his own likeness, we cannot suppose that he will thereafter leave them orphans. The same love which originally moved him to the creation of them will move him still to watch over them with paternal care, and to provide for them with paternal kindness and liberality. And even when, like prodigal sons, they have departed from him, forfeited by their sins all title to his favor, and striven as far as they could to disserve, or at least to disown, the bonds of their relation to him, it is no incredible thing that his fatherly love may still yearn after them, and may devise means whereby, without prejudice to the authority of his law and the majesty of his government, his banished ones may, if penitent, be restored to the comforts of his home and the endearments of his fellowship" (Pp. 15-17).

Professor Crawford overlooks the distinction between a *relation* and an *affection*. The love of God is an attribute of the divine nature, and may manifest itself towards the servant as well as the son. If God be regarded as sovereign and man as a subject, and nothing more, still his affectionate nature could display itself in governmental and ruling acts and provisions directed towards this human subject. As a matter of fact, he is a loving king. In the single sphere of government, it may be of the wealthiest kind. The argument cannot proceed directly from the existence of love in the divine bosom to the relation of God as a father. The nature of the love must first be determined as parental, which is the very matter in issue. But to do Professor Crawford full justice, he ought to be allowed to say, "I have little confidence in such reasonings, whether as regards the divine sovereignty or the divine fatherhood."



While distrustful of any purely speculative reasoning on the subject of the fatherhood of God, we must admit that Adam knew his *status* before God. If he were a mere subject, he must have known the fact, and if he were created a son as well as a subject, he must have known and rejoiced in it. We cannot conceive of a matter so important and so radical to duty being concealed from him. He must have known his *status* to render intelligent service and worship. Consequently, if he were the created son of God, the divine fatherhood would have been an article in natural religion, and a complete and comprehensive theology of natural religion would report it to us. But through the fall some of the contents of natural religion—the religion of Adam unfallen—were lost, and are not now discoverable without the aid of revelation; and so far as we can see, this doctrine of the original fatherhood of God is, upon the supposition that it was a content of Adam's knowledge, now lost to the race, and stands in need of republication in the volume of inspiration. Hence we take the ground that the question of God's common fatherhood of the race must be answered at the bar of "the law and the testimony," and not at the bar of the reason unenlightened by revelation. The answer, when obtained from this source, will be perfectly reliable.

I. After tracing a series of fatherhoods and sonships, the inspired and infallible evangelist reaches Adam, and, employing the precise formula which he had used in all other cases, says, "Adam which was the son of God." (Luke iii. 38.) The same relation which Seth sustained to Adam, Adam sustained to God, if the genealogical record is to bear its face meaning. If, therefore, it can be affirmed in any proper sense that Adam was the father of Seth, it may be affirmed in the very same sense that God was the father of Adam. The fact of the descent, and not the method, is affirmed. It would be false to reason that Adam is the product of divine generation as Seth is the product of human generation. This record only asserts the fact of divine paternity, and leaves it to other scriptures to tell us that the relation was constituted, not by generation, but by creation.

Because "son" is not in the Greek original, Dr. Candlish objects to its being put there. He says:

“In reality, there is no idea suggested in this whole pedigree, or family-tree, but that of descent—son descending from the father until Adam is reached, whose descent is from no human father, but must be said to be of God. There is nothing of real fatherhood and sonship, as a permanent and personal relation, asserted here. Or if it be held to be asserted in the case of the first father named, why not in the case of the others also? But, on that supposition, in strict consistency, Adam must be regarded as sustaining a relation of true and proper personal fatherhood to each and all his descendants individually, and so must all the others down the line. The truth, I repeat, is, that the words ‘the son’ have no right to be in the genealogy at all. The phrase throughout should be, ‘which was of.’”

True, the question is one of descent, but of what sort of descent? As the words “which was of” are applied to tell the relation between Seth and Adam, what else can they mean than “son of”? And the phrase necessarily has this meaning throughout the genealogical table. Why change its meaning when you get back to Adam? Was it impossible for him to have been the son of God by creation? Is it inherently wrong for him to sustain such a relation? Is it contradictory of other passages of the Scripture? If so, where are they? Why this objection to the reading, “Adam which was the son of God,” as an equivalent of the elliptical Greek, “which was of God”? Dr. Candlish admits that it is a case of “son descending from father, until Adam is reached; whose descent is from no human father, but must be said to be from God.” If he had only written, “whose descent is from no human father like the others, but from a divine Father,” he would have described Adam’s case as it was.

II. The next passage asserts of the human race what the preceding one asserted of Adam in particular. It is a quotation from the Athenian, Aratus, made by Paul in his famous address delivered from Mars’ Hill, “For we are also his offspring.” (Acts xvii. 28.)

The ultimate design of the apostle in this address before the Areopagus was to assert and vindicate the claims of Christianity upon the faith and conduct of men; and his proximate end, or means to his main end, was to convince the men of Athens of the utter unreasonableness and absurdity of idolatry. To do this, the apostle begins by reminding them of the religious aptitudes of the human soul, which an old mystic describes as an “unutterable sigh for God,” and which their multiplied altars proved that they

felt: "I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious." He then appeals to them in the name of their divine creation, preservation, and paternity, not to liken the Godhead to graven images of gold, silver and stone. The argument may be stated: "Ye men of Athens, ye feel impelled to worship some being, as your devotions in your temples and at your altars testify. But this being is to you the 'unknown God,' as the inscription upon one of your altars declares. Now this unknown God I have come to make known to you. By him all things were created, and he dwells not in temples made with hands. He gives life, and breath, and all things. He has made all nations of one blood, and determined their times and the bounds of their habitation. He invites all to seek after him, and he is not far from any of us. In him we live, and move, and have our being. He is our Father as well as Creator, and we are his offspring. Inasmuch as he is our Father, it is a shame that we liken him to images of gold, silver and stone. Therefore your idolatry is wrong, because it is a degradation of him who is confessedly your own Father." The whole argument hinges upon the paternity of God.

But is not this a mere *argumentum ad hominem*? Did not the apostle assume, merely for the sake of the special occasion, the truth of the quotation from the heathen poet? Was he not arguing the question simply from their point of view? This is the interpretation of Dr. Candlish:

"Paul quotes this verse of the heathen poet for a purpose in an argument *ad hominem*. He does not quote it as inspired, nor does his quoting it make it inspired. . . . Here, however, we have not a text of Scripture at all, unless Paul's citation of it is believed to canonize it. We have simply an uninspired verse of poetry, of which that consummate master of oratory avails himself most happily on a special occasion for a special purpose. And neither his comment, nor the verse itself, can be legitimately brought forward as of divine authority, beyond the special occasion and the special purpose." (P. 23.)

This attempt to fritter away the meaning of this passage is born of sheer desperation. As an argument, it "begs the question." It subjects the wisdom of God to the shameful stoop of resorting to mere trickery to silence objectors and establish the gospel. Has it come to this, that an inspired apostle, when he fronts an intelligent audience, must plant himself upon that which

he believes to be false in order to establish what he regards as true? "We are his offspring," cried the apostle; but the statement was untrue, and he knew it; and yet he grounds an argument for Christianity upon it! Has he been reduced to jugglery with terms? Is his cause weak? Are reasons scarce? Is he a dissembler? Would he speak that which was false to prove that which was true? Is this the method of inspired argumentation? Has God stooped to contend for the mastery with man in the arena of debate? This commentary of Dr. Candlish upon that masterly address before the *elite* of Athens degrades it to the arts of the sophist and the stump-politician.

This phrase, "we are also his offspring," meant to its author and to the men of Athens, *We are the offspring of Jupiter*. The very essence of the *argumentum ad hominem* requires the debater to assume the correctness of the position of his opponent, and then show that his conclusion does not follow from his own premise. It is the opposite of the *argumentum ad rem*, which assumes that the premise is both materially and formally correct, and deduces conclusions of a like nature. If Paul, on this occasion, was employing the former species of argumentation, he must have employed the quotation from Aratus in the identical sense which it had in the minds of his auditors. If he imported into the phrase any other idea than that which it really involved, then he made a material change in their premise, and so barred himself from reasoning to their silencing. This quotation meant to the men of Athens, *we are the offspring of Jupiter*; to Paul, *we are the offspring of God*. The two propositions are substantially different, and the *argumentum ad hominem* is inapplicable.

Undoubtedly this verse, as it stood upon the page of the heathen poem, was uninspired; but when the pen of inspiration transcribed it upon the page of the sacred volume, and made it a fundamental postulate in an argument against idolatry and for the truth of Christianity, it was canonized. There the words were the vehicle of a heathen idea; here they are the vehicle of a divine doctrine. Inspiration changed their meaning, for Paul did not quote Aratus in the sense in which he wrote. We are his cast-off offspring.

III. Dr. Crawford adduces the parable of the Prodigal Son as a proof of "the general paternity of God." (Luke xv. 11-32.)

"It seems to me impossible to put any fair or just interpretation on this parable, without assuming that general paternity which God, as our creator and preserver, may be held to sustain towards all men as his intelligent creatures, and recognizing the subsistence of this relation as at once a most serious aggravation of their sins, and a most powerful motive to urge them to repentance. On the opposite assumption, the parable ought to have begun thus: 'A certain king had two subjects,' or, 'A certain master had two servants.' But who, in that case would have discerned in it the same matchless power and pathos by which, as it actually stands, it is characterized? Evidently its whole point is lost and its scope perverted, if we suppose it to be in any other character than that of a son who had wandered from the paternal home; that the person represented by the prodigal is joyfully welcomed by the Great Father when returning to him." (P. 44.)

To this exposition Dr. Candlish objects on both critical and doctrinal grounds. He charges this exegesis with violating that canon which forbids "drawing doctrinal conclusions from the minute and incidental details of illustrative narrations or stories." It is true that there is an interpretation which deduces too much from the parables and figures of Scripture, and there is another interpretation which falls short of extracting their full meaning. A safe exposition, therefore, must content itself with following these accepted laws of interpretation.

1. The central truth of the parable must be given a controlling influence over all details of circumstances and incidents. Meaning is to be given to the details, consequently, only as they may minister to the main doctrine.

2. Regard must be had to "the analogy of faith"—the great *trend* of revelation—and particularly to the immediate context. Consequently, those details may have meanings which are in harmony with the spirit of the Bible and of the immediate context.

3. Whatever is circumstantial and incidental in the parable cannot be made the basis of a doctrine not elsewhere revealed. Such matters can be used only as collaterals.

4. "We should not assume anything to be non-essential except when, by holding it fast as essential, the unity of the whole is marred and troubled." (*Trench.*)

Now, will the application of these rules bar Prof. Crawford's interpretation? By an application of the principle of the adage,

“A man is known by the company he keeps,” the scribes and Pharisees sought to break down the influence of Christ: “This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. If he be not like them, why does he keep such associations?” To defend his character against this reproach, he spake the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money, and the Prodigal Son. The argument in the latter is: If it is not disgraceful for the father to receive the prodigal son with such assurances and exhibitions of welcome on his repentance, it surely cannot be disgraceful in Christ to associate with sinners with a view to persuading them to return to their divine Father’s house. The doctrine of the parable is the doctrine of reconciliation, but the reconciliation of a father and son, rather than of a king and subject. The divine paternity is the very pith of the parable, and violates none of the foregoing rules, but harmonizes them all.

Dr. Candlish expounds the parable:

“Let it be conceded that the prodigal represents sinners generally, the sinners with whom our Lord was accused of being too familiar. The parable is his defence against that accusation, and nothing more. And what is his defence? Virtually it is this: He is the elder brother in the Father’s house. He puts it to his accusers to say whether he best sustains the character and does the part of the elder brother, by acting as he is wont to act, in the way that seems to them so objectionable, or by behaving, as they would have him behave, like the elder brother in the parable.” (P. 131.)

The elder brother in the parable has usually been regarded as representing the carping Pharisees and scribes, who blamed Christ for associating with sinners; and the view of Dr. Candlish, which makes him represent Christ as, in the opinion of his accusers, he ought to be, is peculiar and surprising. It can hardly be that all commentators have so badly missed the passage.

IV. Biography delights to point out the marks of similarity and difference between the descendants of a common parentage. Traits of mind, methods of thought, forms of expression, characteristics of heart, habits of life, inclinations of the moral nature, physical features, are all made the subjects of comparisons. The qualities of the parent are expected and sought for in the child; and when one man shows decided marks of likeness to another, we are disappointed if there is not a blood-relation between them.

The fourth argument for God's fatherhood of the race, as distinguished from his special fatherhood of believers, appeals to the family-likeness between God and man, and quotes the text: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." (Gen. i. 27.)

It is this divine image, imprinted in the very morning of his creation, that mainly differentiates man from the balance of creation, and constitutes the ground of his sovereignty over all lower orders of earthly creatures. As the image and superscription upon the Roman coin determined the question of allegiance and tribute, so do the image and superscription of God upon the indestructible soul of man determine his position and duty before God. Bearing that image, he owes obedience and tribute to him who had the right thus to stamp and subscribe his moral character. Bearing that likeness (sadly defaced, it is true), not merely as a coin, but as a *person*, the natural expectation would be that he was the child of the Being whom he so closely resembles. We could rest in this belief if it were not contradicted. Nowhere in the Scriptures is it contradicted. Of course we are writing about Adam as he was, and man as he ought to be.

In the *regeneration* we are "renewed in the whole man after the image of God." The qualities which are renewed are those which were lost, "knowledge, righteousness and true holiness." (Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 24.) It is universally conceded that in regeneration we become the sons of God; but the qualities which are communicated in regeneration, and expanded in sanctification, are "knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness," or the elements which go to make up the image of God. But Adam was created in the image of God, and so possessed these three constituents. Now, it is difficult to see why the re-creation of man in the image of God constitutes him a son, while the first creation of him in the very same image constituted him only the servant of God. Why does the *restoration*—in the regeneration of the Spirit—of the lost qualities of "knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness" evince the regenerate to be sons of God, when the very same qualities, given in the first creation to Adam, proved only a servile relation? We cannot answer. If the possession of the image of God by the regenerate is the evidence

of their sonship, then the possession of the very same image by Adam ought to evidence his sonship. And furthermore, the regenerate are imperfect. The image does not, at the beginning at least, stand out with perfect clearness and beauty; and yet these imperfections do not destroy the fact of their sonship; but Adam and Eve, as they came fresh from their Creator's hand, bore the divine likeness without spot or blemish. If the possession of an imperfect image of God by the Christian proves him to be the son of God, the possession of an immaculate image of God by Adam and Eve must prove them to be the children of God.

We have been writing about Adam as he was, and man as he ought to have been. We turn now to man as he is; and the formula which expresses his relation to his God since the fall is, *A proscribed subject and an outcast son*. As a judge, God has withdrawn from him the rights and privileges of a citizen, and left to him nothing but the contents of the curse; and as a father, he has ejected him from his house, disinherited him of his patrimony, and made him a stranger and an alien. These were the acts of a righteous Judge and Father predicated upon human guilt. Man's present *status*, therefore, reveals the enormity of human guilt, the pathos of human sorrow, and the glory of divine grace. The guilt was of that heinous and parricidal nature which constrained a just and loving Father to banish his son with one final word of command forever from his presence; the misery is that of a wicked and abandoned son, who might have stood but a little lower than an angel, starving among swine in a foreign country; and the grace is that of Christ, which regenerates the heart of the degenerate son, and reinstates him in his Father's house and heart.

The sentimental theology of to-day prates much about "the fatherhood of God" and "the solidarity of the race" as constituting the ground of atonement and of the universal hope of mankind. But this theology forgets far more than it remembers. It forgets that "the fatherhood of God" was completely disrupted by the fall, and vacated of all its contents to man, except wrath and indignation, which were emptied upon him without stint. It forgets the "solidarity of the race" is only in sin, and that it is electing grace alone which has broken up that "solidarity." It forgets that, while



God still has a Father's heart, he is a Father only towards his own children ; and he emphasizes the fact that the non-elect are not his children, but "the children of the devil." It forgets that every father has the inalienable right to specify the terms upon which he will be reconciled to his expelled son, and that God has laid down his ultimate conditions in Jesus Christ. It is an awful delusion which would lead men to trust in a "fatherhood" which does not exist, and in a "race-solidarity" which grace has destroyed. God is an angry and outraged Ruler, who has proscribed the sinful citizen, and he is an angry and outraged Father, who has disinherited his disobedient child. Sin is thus revealed in its enormity, and hope appears only in the atonement of Jesus. The doctrine of election saves theology from universalism.

R. A. WEBB.

#### IV. THE SPOILING OF DOCTOR DRYASDUST.

WE purpose to write an article upon "the homiletic study of the English Bible." We wish to preface this, however, with some brief observations, biographical and otherwise, upon our lamented brother, Dryasdust. The main outlines of this distinguished brother's career are too well known to the readers of this periodical to require any extended notice here. Nor do his personal characteristics need any but the briefest mention. It is well known that his theological erudition is prodigious, and his decision on a nice problem of exegesis is final, and he is thought to know more of the early history of the church than did the Fathers themselves. And there is another thing well known about this brother, but not so often spoken of, and that is, *nobody likes to hear him preach*. We notice that he is not sent for to assist in special services at neighboring churches; nor is he even put up to preach at Presbytery, if there is any way of getting around it. We have accounted for our brother's lack of pulpit popularity—he is not in his dotage, by the way; he could hardly be called middle-aged—by supposing that nature had denied him those oratorical gifts which she has lavished upon others. Having always had this impression, we were surprised to learn recently that he was once quite an orator. An elder of the church which sent him as a candidate for the ministry to college and the seminary, told us a few months ago that Dryasdust was the brightest young speaker he ever knew. "But," said this good elder, "the theological seminary spoiled him." "You know," he continued, "Dryasdust has been for several years pastor of that big church over in —, and I had not heard him preach since he entered the seminary. Last week he was on a visit home and preached for us, and such a change! he gave us the driest sermon I have heard in many a day. Oh! he is such a dry preacher! and I believe it is the theological seminary that made him so." So much, then, for Dr. Dryasdust, an orator by nature, yet in the judgment of a reputable elder of our church so transformed by his theological training that we might well say of him,

“*Dryasdust* is his name,  
 And we will not deny,  
 With regard to the same,  
 What that name might imply.”

Now, beloved reader, we raise the question, Was this good elder correct in his views upon the spoiling of Dr. Dryasdust?

From his judgment on the merits of Dr. Dryasdust as a preacher we are not disposed to appeal. In a matter of this sort the voice of the pew is final. The question is, How did Dr. Dryasdust become a “dry” preacher, and therefore (we say it without hesitation) a comparatively useless one?

In discussing this question, we wish to say at the outset, that we believe most heartily in theological seminaries, and appreciate the value and commend the work of our existing theological institutions. And when any one asks us the question, “What advantage, then, hath theology, or what profit is there in seminary training?” we are prompt to answer, “Much every way;” chiefly because, by a theological course, most men are “spiked down” for all time to the bed-rock of a sturdy orthodoxy. When a man leaves the theological seminary, it is his own fault if he ever has any more theological perplexities. While in the seminary, he ought to have fully learned how to settle the religious problems which can be settled, and to leave those which cannot be settled alone. He has learned this most valuable lesson, to detect all the old heresies under their modern disguises. In every new controversy which he may meet in after years, he quickly recognizes the familiar visage of Socinus, Arminius, or some other old-time heretic, whom he dissected and laid on the shelf, in Dr. P.’s or Dr. G.’s class-room, five or ten years since. A man thus educated will go on quietly preaching the gospel, when the hottest cannonade of “advanced science” and “new theology” is roaring above his head. He knows that the noise he hears is that of blank cartridges; the balls were taken out of those guns for him, when he was in the seminary twenty years ago. We acknowledge ourselves a debtor to a seminary training on this very point, and that beyond calculation. For ten years we have been a Gallio who cared for none of these things, when the “higher critic,” the “modern scientist,” the “larger hope” man

has buzzed about our ears. And we owe it to a seminary training that we can say, not with blind, but, as we trust, with intelligent faith,

“Let all the forms which men devise  
Assault my faith with treacherous art,  
I'll call them vanity and lies  
And bind the gospel to my heart.”

Nor is this all the advantage of a seminary training. Why is a young man, who is to be a practical chemist and assayer, first given a course in one of our own colleges and then sent to the School of Mines at Freiburg, Germany? Why does a young lawyer take the law course at Vanderbilt University, Johns Hopkins, or the University of Virginia? In like manner, why should not a young man who is going to preach be sent to those institutions where the religion he is to enforce on men is studied in orderly, scientific form? We venture the assertion, that your young assayer will learn more in the two years at Freiburg than in seven years of “piddling” in his own laboratory. And may we not expect that the young preacher will get a fuller, clearer mental perception of divine truth in two years of theological training than in twice that time spent in his own study? There should be—and if our personal testimony goes for anything, there is—large profit in a course of seminary training; and we are firm in our belief, that nowhere is larger advantage to be gained from a theological course than in the seminaries of our Southern Presbyterian Church.

The question, then, comes up again, How did the spoiling of Dr. Dryasdust occur? If there be this undeniable advantage in seminary training, how could the good elder above be in anywise correct when he said, “The theological seminary spoiled him”? You may think us paradoxical, beloved reader, when we answer that while we stoutly maintain the great advantage of a seminary course, yet we think that, to a large extent, the spoiling of Dr. Dryasdust is to be laid at its door. Have you never seen a complicated machine which was theoretically perfect, yet had a weak spot in its practical operation, a rusty joint, or a loose screw, that caused it to turn out now and then a faulty piece of work? This is just our opinion of our theological seminaries: the ideal is

well-nigh perfect; we are ourselves under lasting obligations to our own seminary training, yet there is, we fear, more than one loose screw in these most excellent preacher-making machines. We have already made the effort in these pages<sup>1</sup> to put our finger on one of these weak spots, and are glad to note a recent tightening of the machinery just at that point. In the present article we call attention to another loose screw. This is done, it need hardly be said, only in a spirit of friendly suggestion. The seminaries already produce good fruit; our desire is that they may bring forth more fruit. And we take up the line of suggested improvement the more boldly, because, in this instance, we are following a path broadly marked out for us by the action of three of our most important church courts at their meetings in the fall of 1889. The Synods of Virginia, South Carolina and Alabama, at those meetings, each took action looking towards making the study of the English Bible a special feature of the curriculum in Union and Columbia Seminaries. While, in its general direction, the action taken by the three synods was the same, we naturally prefer the shape in which that action was formulated by the Synod of Alabama: "instructing her directors to urge before the board the expansion of the chair of Pastoral Theology, so as to include *the homiletic study of the English Bible. . .*" We shall, we think, justify our preference when we explain just what is meant by this somewhat peculiar phraseology, "the homiletic study of the English Bible"; and we will make this explanation very simple, by saying, that when you study Scripture for your spiritual nourishment, that is the devotional study of the Bible; when it is studied to put its truth in scientific form, that is theological study of the Bible; when it is studied with the intention of preaching it to others, that is the homiletic study of the Bible. A little thought will show the reader that no two of these ways of studying the Bible are the same. For here is an humble Christian, who feeds upon the word and grows thereby, yet who is utterly incompetent to preach it; and here is Dr. Dryasdust, profound theologian and accomplished exegete, whom nobody cares to hear preach; and here is D. L. Moody, ignorant of theology, and oftentimes faulty

---

<sup>1</sup> Article, "Pastoral Theology," April, 1889.

in exegesis, but mighty in the Scriptures, and him the common people hear gladly. Or, to take another view: the learned reader will understand our explanation still more clearly, when we say, that the devotional study of Scripture is *nature*, theological study of Scripture is *science*, and homiletic study of Scripture is *art*. Nature furnishes the facts, science groups these facts together and interprets their laws, art takes the natural facts with the scientific laws and applies them to some practical use. So, by devotional study of Scripture the precious facts of God's word are impressed on the mind; theology takes those facts and gives them systematic form; then comes homiletics and teaches how to take that same Bible, thus experimentally and scientifically known, and use it as the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe. Now, just as it would be a great blunder to give lectures on anatomy and physiology, and yet not teach your young surgeon the use of the lancet and the probe; so our church is beginning to feel that a similar blunder has, to some extent, been committed among us. Our young preachers have been taught the *science* of theology, which ought to have been done; they have not been taught the *art* of preaching, which ought never to have been left undone. It was right here that the spoiling of Dr. Dryasdust was accomplished. That learned brother left the seminary fully qualified to write a volume upon justification by faith, yet not capable of giving an acceptable exposition of the fifth chapter of Romans. We do not charge the entire responsibility of this upon his theological *alma mater*. We know that the same institution has sent out scores of other men who are excellent preachers; but that seminary certainly did give to Dryasdust that "crystallizing tendency" which has developed him into a theological fossil, instead of a preacher of the living word. We ourselves heard in that same institution a student deliver as a sermon the fifty-second chapter of Dabney's *Syllabus and Notes on Theology*, with slight alterations of the wording, and some small condensations here and amplifications there; and this he did without rebuke by the faculty, who criticised him in the presence of the students for numerous other things. The faculty might have suggested to him with great propriety, that we are directed in the Scriptures to feed the

people upon milk, and also upon strong meat, but nowhere are we commanded to set before them a dinner of *bones!*

Now, should there not be in the seminary curriculum something to counterbalance this fossilizing tendency? Ought not the Bible to be studied there with a view to preaching it, as well as to constructing systematic theology out of it? This is what the homiletic study of the English Bible means; it has in view the making of a preacher out of the man, who is becoming at the same time a theologian. We think this will appear still more distinctly as we now go on to give our ideas as to what sort of teaching a course of homiletic study of the Scriptures would embrace. We would say, that it is not intended to furnish by this chair in the seminary a course of instruction in the English Bible parallel to that in Greek and Hebrew furnished by other chairs in the same institution. This was objected to in the course of debate on this subject in the Synod of Alabama, and we think properly. We hope the student will have taken already the Bible course at Davidson, Clarksville, or Hampden-Sidney, and will not need any more of this specific teaching. And this would be our objection to the shape this matter is taking at Union Seminary, where it proposed to annex to the Fifth Professorship—now, we are glad to say, so nearly an accomplished fact—the department of Biblical Theology. We see in this proposed alliance of biblical with pastoral theology, just another step towards the continued manufacture of Dryasdusts. Biblical theology and homiletic study of the English Bible are as distinct as are a lecture on anatomy and the practical manipulation of splints and bandages. Let the reader bear in mind that we are commending such study of the Bible as is an adjunct to the art of preaching, and not a department of the science of theology. We believe that a preacher should know his English Bible as a mason knows his trowel, or as a fencer knows his sword. He should have a practical familiarity with the very copy before him when he preaches, such as shall enable him to handle it, hold it up, lay it down, turn easily from page to page, from verse to verse—make that very Bible which is before the people's eyes an instrument of power in his hands; and all the lectures which ever were heard in a theological seminary on "the author-

ship, period and contents of each book in the Bible, the central thought in each book, its relation to the other books in the development of doctrine,"<sup>1</sup> while valuable in themselves, would be of little worth in imparting this special power.

And again, it is not supposed that a three-years' training in a seminary, even on the plan which we commend, would give a young preacher that ease in the pulpit manipulation of the Scriptures which ten or twenty or thirty years of preaching hardly suffice to impart. But we do think that he could be given such hints even in a brief seminary course, and have such principles of the art of preaching instilled into him as should guard him against becoming a theological or exegetical lecturer, and start him on the road towards being a real preacher of the word.

Now let us indicate what sort of hints we would give and what sort of principles we would lay down. And, in the first place, the occupant of the chair of pastoral theology and English Bible study should not disdain to give a hint which can be found in most Sunday-school or Young Men's Christian Association manuals, but which, so far as we know, has not yet appeared in any work on homiletics; and that is, let the very first book purchased as the nucleus of the young preacher's library, be a serviceable edition of the English Bible. This should be bound so as to stand wear and tear, should have good paper, clear print, and *reasonably wide margins*. We emphasize this last, inasmuch as we believe in making that very Bible a store-house of your theological and exegetical studies, your illustrative reading, your pulpit preparation, and even your own spiritual history; and the larger part of these treasures must be tucked away on those "reasonably wide margins." We know that objections have been raised to "marking up" your Bible, and to the practice of adorning its margin with "neat nuggets of exegesis"; we leave these objections to those who make them, except to say for ourselves, that having made several manuscript volumes of Scripture annotations, and worked the Bible over and over again with the help of commentators, about all that remains in our dull brain is that which we have put down on the margins of our working Bible. There it is before

---

<sup>1</sup> See action of the Synod of Virginia, 1889.



our eyes, and whenever we open that Bible for daily use, we cannot help seeing it, and after awhile cannot help remembering it.

Having, then, a good Bible, with clear paper and ample margin, we would have our theological student taught to make a daily business of referencing his Bible for himself. Let the margin of his Bible bear daily witness to the habit of "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." This habit will soon teach the student how true is that declaration of the Confession, that "the infallible rule of the interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself. . . . And the true and full sense of any Scripture may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly." And this business of hunting up parallel scriptures will soon become the most delightful in the world. If the reader would see what a passion this searching of the Scriptures can become, let him look at the pretty picture of that ardent Bible student, as well as sweet singer of Israel, Frances Ridley Havergal, given on page 259 of her *Memoir*. Sitting off at her desk on a bitter winter morning, marking references on the margin of the Bible before her, she is urged by her sister to come to the fire and warm, and makes this half-playful, half-serious reply: "But then, Marie, I can't rule my lines neatly; just see what a find I've got! If one only searches, there are such extraordinary things in the Bible!"

The reader will see that, by pursuing this plan of Bible study any length of time, the student will soon have the key-words and phrases of the Scriptures, such as *grace, salvation, kingdom of God*, etc., interpreted by the word of God itself, and every instance of their occurrence in the Bible noted and compared, and the results of this study put away on the margin of his own Bible. The same will be true of every leading fact of redemption as portrayed in the Scriptures. For example, the passages where the incarnation, atonement and resurrection of the Lord Jesus are described, will be lit up by the marginal references in the student's own hand, to the parallel type and symbol and prophecy of the Old Testament, and sermonie and doctrinal discussions of the New. Nor is it only the more important words or doctrinal topics of the Bible which will furnish basis for references. The reader, if he has never tried this for himself, will be surprised and

delighted to see how a comparatively trivial scriptural expression, an adjective, or even a preposition or conjunction, will furnish the line and plummet for deep soundings in the ocean of divine truth. We wish we had space for extended illustration of this. We give just one example. Let the reader take his Bible and concordance and see how two such insignificant words as "*one thing*" bring before him a striking Bible study. "One thing is needful," (Luke x. 42); "One thing I know," (John ix. 25); "One thing I desire and seek," (Psa. xxvii. 4); "One thing I do," (Phil. iii. 13);—could you ask a better sermon on single-hearted religion than this?

We would also have the student put in the margin of his working Bible brief analyses of more prominent scriptures. Let him transfer to the margin of his Bible his own or others' expository outlines of familiar scriptures. Take the following, for example, on Isaiah xlii. 1-4, which we condense from Spurgeon's *Sermon Notes*. "Messiah's character: (1,) Servant; (2,) Elect; (3,) Well-pleasing to God; (4,) Endowed with the Spirit, conf. John iii. 34; (5,) Gentle, conf. Matt. xi. 29; (6,) Tender, conf. Isa. xl. 11; (7,) Resolute." We have this set down on the margin of a small Bagster Bible, with the numbers (1), (2), (3), etc., put in the text over the word to which they apply. All the *loci classici* of Scripture should be thus analyzed, such as Isaiah liii. and lv.; Psalms xxii. and xxiv.; the Conversion of Zacchæus, the Healing of Bartimeus, the Ten Virgins, etc. And the same sort of analysis should be made of individual verses. Take for example, a little analysis of 1 John v. 4; you can easily put opposite this verse on the margin of an Oxford or Bagster Bible the following: "(1,) *The believer born of God*; (2,) *Proves his divine parentage by overcoming the world*; (3,) *Overcomes the world by faith.*"

And along the same line we would have the student taught to *read back* into his Bible that which his theological text-books have gotten out of it. The margin of his Bible may be made a compendium of many a theological lecture and critical commentary. And even where the results of theological and exegetical study cannot be put in such brief compass, the ever ready margin can bear references to a whole library of theological lore. (Every student of Columbia Seminary will remember that Bible of Dr. Smyth's on the library table, with the results of a quarter century

of study on its margins, constituting a biblical index to a library of over twenty thousand volumes.)

The reader may now be tempted to exclaim, "How can you put all this on the margin of one Bible?" To this we answer, try it, and you will be surprised to see how elastic even a small Bible may become. And suppose you do fill out the margins of one Bible, buy another and use it up. We ourselves have pretty well used up one small Bagster, and are beginning to work up another and much wider margined edition, and we are only a beginner in the art of Bible study. And better Bible students have done far more. Take the following from Rev. G. F. Pentecost:

"The Bible I most use is a wide margined Bagster, the gift of a friend. When it was first given to me it was beautiful and clean; now, its edges are worn, its margins covered with notes, its pages lined, its lines underscored. I have put the results of five blessed years of study into that Bible with pen and ink—here a little, there a little, a thousand precious things are stored up in that book; with it in my hand I am never at a loss for a sermon or a word of instruction and help. The best thoughts of many Bible students are tucked away on half blank pages; the outlines of scores of sermons, the indicated analysis of many books, the testimony and comments of saints upon many passages." (*In the Volume of the Book*, p. 147.)

And now let us suppose a student has been made to spend a half-hour of each day in his seminary life in Bible study, as above roughly outlined, with frequent blackboard exercises, Bible in hand, on "Bible readings," "expository outlines of familiar passages," "scriptural outlines on prominent texts," etc., does the reader need to be told the effect on his future ministry? If, along with this, he is given some training as a speaker, and has any grace of God and love to men in his heart, can you suppose him "evolved" into a Dryasdust when he emerges from seminary walls? or, can you suppose him, after twenty years of preaching and studying the Bible thus, making the astounding statement, which a brother who had been several years the occupant of one pulpit once made to us, that he "had used up nearly every good text in the Bible"? This last statement impressed us very much as if some one had told us that good Mrs. Partington had not only turned back the waves with her celebrated mop, but she had actually used up the Atlantic ocean in scouring her front piazza!

But the professor of pastoral theology and English Bible study should not only give such hints on Bible study as the above, but

he should also lay down certain principles of the art of preaching, upon which those hints are based. And we find these principles ready made to our hand, in such scriptures as these: "Preach *the word*;" "This day is *this scripture* fulfilled in your ears;" "He opened to us *the scriptures*;" "They read in *the book of the law* distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the reading." Do not these scriptures embody the uncompromising principle that preaching must largely consist of the very words of the Bible, with simple comment thereon, or else, according to Bible standards, be no preaching worthy of the name? and as a corollary to the above, that the highest, if not the only form of preaching, is that popularly known as the expository style? The reader will perceive that the above methods of Bible study go directly to this end, so that when a preacher thus taught to study the Scriptures begins to preach, he goes to his Bible for the sermon as well as the text. His outline is already on the margin of his Bible, taken from the text and kindred scriptures, or drawn directly from an analysis of the context. His argument is suggested to him in the way inspired writers have handled the same theme. His illustrations are from inspired history; "his speech bewrayeth him," for the very wording of his discourse is in the diction of the sacred book. His "telling points" are apt quotations of Scripture; his "sublimest perorations" are nothing more than some fitting extract from the same inspired source. This is what all that referencing and analyzing above described means. It is to have a young preacher so taken up with studying the Bible itself, that he will not know how to preach anything else. It is to have, so far as practicable, all his theology, philosophy, exegesis and church history, put away on the margin of that Bible of his, so that they cannot but seem secondary to the inspired text, and useful only so far as they serve to elucidate the sacred page. We do not know how far the readers of the QUARTERLY will agree with us in our advocacy of this rigid principle, but we are glad to find confirmation of our view in that stirring little book of Dr. Pier-son's, *Evangelistic Work in Principle and Practice*, p. 82:

"If the sermon is the unfolding of a scripture *germ*, it will naturally take largely even a scripture *form*. As to the sprouting grain, so to the seed of his own truth God giveth its own body; hence Paul says, 'Which things also we speak, not

in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.' He conceived of the gospel as having a dialect of its own. Effective preaching gets not only its idea, but its form of speech, from above."

And, we have as we believe, greater attestation of our view than that of Dr. Pierson. Let the reader take his Bible and turn successively to Acts ii. and Acts xiii., where he will find recorded two model sermons, one by the Apostle Peter and one by the Apostle Paul. He will note that these two sermons are of the "epoch making" kind. The first is on the day of Pentecost; the second is Paul's first recorded discourse as he begins his first missionary journey. Each may be taken as a fair sample of what Peter and Paul would preach during all their subsequent ministry. Now give to each a brief examination. You see that Peter's sermon, Acts ii. 14-36, twenty-three verses in all, consists of twelve verses of Scripture quotations and five verses in direct exposition of these quotations, leaving six verses of original matter. The same noticeable feature is seen in Paul's sermon, Acts xiii. 16-41, twenty-six verses. You notice an introduction of seven verses which is strictly scriptural, being an epitome of Bible history from Abraham to David. You note six verses of quotation and exposition (vs. 32-37), and the conclusion, two verses of quotation from the prophet Habakkuk (vs. 40, 41); a scriptural beginning, middle and end, fifteen verses scripture, eleven verses original with Paul. And these eleven original verses might be still further reduced when it is seen that they largely consist of references to matters of New Testament history. Here, then, are two sermons preached at the outset of two eras in apostolic history, recorded in the inspired word for our learning, and presenting the same remarkable feature of sermonic method. Each is the "unfolding of a scripture germ largely in scriptural form;" each of them embodies that principle of the art of preaching on which our ideas of homiletic Bible study are based. And we are presumptuous enough to affirm that were the preachers of these two sermons to return to earth on a special mission, and that to occupy homiletic professorships in the theological seminaries of the Southern Presbyterian Church, they would there inculcate some such homiletic principles and methods of Bible study as are herein set forth. There would be inscribed over their class-room

doors these words, which one of them uttered while still in the flesh, "*Preach the Word.*" The Bible in the vernacular would be the text-book, and such methods of referencing and analyzing it, preparing expository outlines and Bible readings, would be taught, as would give each student a preaching acquaintance with its every page.

We do not think that these apostolic colleagues would make light of the work done in the other professorial chairs. We certainly do not think they would decry the study of those languages in which the Holy Ghost inspired holy men to put on record the oracles of God. Nor do we imagine that they would belittle the presentation of divine truth in systematic form, and the scholarly defence of it from its ancient and modern foes. Still less can we suppose them speaking against the study of God's providence as seen in the history of his church. But while they would belittle none of these things, we are persuaded that they would magnify a practical study of the English Bible preparatory to preaching it, which, in our judgment, has been too much and too long neglected.

Alas for Dr. Dryasdust! the day of apostolic occupancy of homiletic professorships had not yet dawned when he set foot in theological halls. In his day and generation a theological student might, without let or hindrance, indulge the notion that the word of God is the scaffolding, and theology, exegesis and church history are the house. No wonder that his career as a fisher of men has been so far a dismal failure. We say, *so far*, for we are not without hope that in the brighter day now dawning, even Dr. Dryasdust may be made over again. If we could just whisper in his ear this suggestion: Dear brother, the common people do not hear gladly theological profundities and exegetical niceties; but they hunger and thirst to hear you "read in that English Bible distinctly, and give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading,"—if he would only hear this whispered warning, all might still be well. We would not then have to read this epitaph, which, we fear, a sorrowing but truth-telling church may one day inscribe above his mortal remains: "HERE LIES ECCLESIASTICUS DRYASDUST, A LEARNED THEOLOGIAN, AN ABLE AND WELL-MEANING MAN, BUT OH! SUCH A DRY PREACHER!!"

ROBT. A. LAPSLEY.

## V. THE UNION FOR WHICH JESUS PRAYS.

THE interpretation which the Romish Church puts upon John xvii. 20-23 is that all the children of men are to be gathered into one grand visible church organization, with one form of government and one order of worship, under one so-called infallible head. And to accomplish this end, she goes forth with thumb-screw and fagot to make disciples of those whom she regards as recalcitrant; or when these violent means cannot be employed, she resorts to the pleasing ways of flattery and intrigue for the accomplishment of her set purpose.

But so far as history gives us light on this subject, we may justly conclude that the Author of this prayer is not on her side, else this consummate union would have been established long ago. Not only has Rome hitherto failed to bring about this state of affairs within the ranks of the visible church, but now that her temporal power is broken, never again to be welded, her chances for doing so become less and less probable as the years pass by and the masses of the people become more and more enlightened. Evidently, therefore, there is a mistake along the line of the Roman Catholic Church's interpretation of this passage. A failure on her part to accomplish her self-imposed task is inevitable. Upon the walls of her temples everywhere "the fingers of a hand," tracing in letters of blood her defeat, in this particular at least, are clearly to be seen. This prayer will not be answered in her way.

This, too—not so much, however, from the external forms of worship as from a doctrinal standpoint—is the view maintained by Alexander Campbell and his disciples. They tell us that this prayer can be answered only by the gathering of all the followers of Jesus into one visible body. This was the avowed purpose of Mr. Campbell, and is the rallying cry of those in his church to-day. They preach and pray against "creeds and confessions as bonds of union and communion," because these, in their judgment, delay

and hinder, and even constitute an insuperable barrier, to the fulfilment of this prayer. They tell us that this outward, visible union must be accomplished; that anything short of this is a very grievous sin; and since all can never be united on "mere opinion," that is, on what *others* believe, therefore all others must unite with them on *their opinion* as to what the word of God teaches. And as an evidence of their willingness to accommodate other parties who may desire to come into this compact, they assume as their corporate title the name common to all the followers of the once meek and lowly Nazarene, "Christian." But here, again, guided by the facts as they have come to light in the history of the church since the "Reformation" of the nineteenth century began, we have no foundation upon which to base the conclusion that all professing Christians will ever be brought into the Campbellite fold. To make the statement yet more comprehensive, I would say that we find nothing in either the word of God or in the march of events, to warrant even the shadow of the belief that the time will ever come when all the followers of Jesus in this world will be united in one organic body. But, without controversy, if this were the true interpretation of our Saviour's prayer, this condition of affairs in his church would most certainly be brought about, for his prayers are always heard and do prevail. Such an outward compact is not even referred to in this passage of Scripture, and those who interpret it in that way make a grievous blunder.

Another view of this subject, and it is the one usually maintained by those who do not claim a monopoly for their own particular branch of the church, is, that Jesus here prays, not for an outward, but an *inward, spiritual union*; that all his children, by whatever name they are known among men, may be united upon *the fundamental doctrines* of his word, and thus possess and enjoy a *spiritual oneness*. This interpretation of this prayer has been held up by some of our ablest church papers in answer to the individuals who have pointed us to this passage as the ground of their demands for organic union between the two branches of the great Presbyterian family in the United States. But how, I ask, can this be the object of our Lord's prayer, since there *now is*, and *always has been*, *this spiritual union*, not only between the



several divisions of the Presbyterian Church, but likewise between them and all other true Christians? So far as the Lord's people have been gathered out from the world, in whatever age or clime they have lived, or do now live; by whatever name they have been known, or whether they have been in a visible church organization at all, *they are an unit*. The fact is here plainly declared, that true believers are in Christ, and Christ is in them. Now, as the Son is in the Father, and is one with him, so each individual believer is in the Son, and is one with him; they are, therefore, one with each other. The Holy Spirit does not tell us *what* this union, in either of its relations, is, nor yet *how* it can subsist. By reason of our own weakness, perhaps any such attempt would have been fruitless. The thought is too high for the human intellect to grasp it. We stand with uncovered heads in the presence of the mysterious, yet blessed, fact here plainly declared. As is the union between the Father and the Son, such is the relation sustained by believers to the elder brother and to each other. All the saints, therefore, whether in heaven or in earth, are united with each other in one body. Hence Paul says, "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Evidently, then, this spiritual oneness, which is already firmly and indissolubly established, cannot be the true interpretation of our Lord's thought in this part of his prayer. He could not pray for that which has been truly present in every period of the church's existence.

Another interpretation of this passage is, that our Lord here prays that his people, comprehended in the various denominations of his church on earth, may live in peace and harmony with each other.

This, at first glance, appears quite plausible; but let us examine this interpretation in the light of the facts given us in the passage itself, and see whether it will bear the test. Evidently certain characteristic results will follow the union for which Jesus prays.

(a,) The world will believe in the divine mission of the Messiah; that the Father has sent the Son. "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (Vs. 21.)

(b,) The world will not only *believe*, but *know*, that the Father has sent the Son. "That the world may know that thou hast sent me." (Vs. 23.)

(c,) The world will know that the Father loves those for whom Jesus prays, just as he loves the Son. "That the world may know that thou . . . hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." (Vs. 23.)

These results do not necessarily flow from a state of peace between the different branches of Christ's family here on earth.

While an unholy contention among them is sinful, and often is to the enemies of the cross an occasion of stumbling, yet the plain truth is, the world is not specially attracted to the Saviour and to the church by reason of the harmony within her pale when it actually does prevail. Many a community has, for long years, enjoyed undisturbed freedom from strife between the particular churches within its bounds, and yet very many individuals within the sound of the Sabbath bells have walked blindly on in their own chosen course, neither thinking of nor caring for the beauties of peace and holiness as they have shone forth from the sanctuary.

What is true of individual communities may safely be applied to more extended circles, until the whole world is encompassed.

Without entering fully into the discussion of this point, it is evidently clear that this view of the passage cannot meet the conditions embraced in it. The Master would have all his servants to "be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves;" but this is not that for which he here makes request of the Father.

These four interpretations of this passage are the only ones with which the writer is familiar. To his mind they are very unsatisfactory. He believes this petition in the prayer of our High-priest reaches far beyond either one of these views.

In entering upon the further examination of this subject, let it be distinctly noted that the question here involved is not as to *the kind* of union to be attained between Jesus and believers, or between believers themselves. Whatever it may be, that relationship is already determined. It is the same as that which subsists

between the Father and the Son. In this all are agreed. The prayer of the Son here, then, is that *all those who have been given him by the Father in the covenant of redemption may be gathered into his fold, and thus be made one with him and one in him.* That these are they of whom he is speaking, and this is the end for which he is praying, it seems to me, there can be no doubt; for no less than seven times in this intercessory prayer does he refer to them as those given him by the Father. That the thought may stand out in a clearer light, let us draw upon the Scriptures for an illustration here. The church is held up to our view under the figure of the human body, with Christ, her King, as the Head thereof. The Head is now complete. His resurrection was the seal to his perfect Headship. That point is settled. This body of which Christ is the Head is made up of all those chosen in the council of the Trinity before the foundation of the world, "according to the election of grace." That body is not yet complete, but is being perfected as the souls who have been purchased by the blood of the Lamb are, one by one, brought in.

A little while ago Jesus said, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." And here he says, "Neither pray I for these alone," those already gathered into the fold, "but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, *that they all may be one; . . . that they also may be one in us.*" "I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one."

This, then, is the true scope of the prayer. It is not lost in the dead past, but comes with mighty power and sweetness down through the ages. It is that those parts of Christ's body, scattered here and there throughout the generations that come and go between the hour of his passion and the final consummation of his redemptive glory, may be gathered, each to its place, that this body may be perfected in symmetry and beauty.

This view of the passage before us, as I conceive, is not only in perfect harmony with all the scriptures bearing upon this subject, but is the only one that fulfils the conditions laid down by

the Saviour himself as the *necessary fruits* of this union. Look at the facts. Since "the world" is without the enlightening power of the Holy Spirit, by which alone they can see and know spiritual things (1 Cor. ii. 14), what more convincing evidence can they have of the fact, (1), That the Father has sent the Son, than that given them in the regeneration of these chosen ones, especially when they are the notoriously wicked; and (2), Of his love for them, in that they are adopted into his own family and are treated as his own sons? Wherever the gospel goes the world has this evidence of the divine mission of the Son and of the Father's love. Almost every community has its own demonstration of the divine power and love, in the effectual calling of some Manasseh, or Saul of Tarsus, or Colonel Gardiner, or John Newton, or John Bunyan, or Jerry McAuley. They are found in every decade and in every land; and thus from generation to generation the world is receiving multiplied evidences of the divine mission of Jesus, and of the Father's love for sinners; and when the redemptive work is completed, these facts, standing forth then in all their fulness and clearness, will be seen and known throughout the intelligent universe to the praise and glory of the eternal King: "And every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

With this light of truth shining upon us, we can hear with more distinctness than before the angel notes of joy over the sinner born again. That holy company before the throne strike their harps anew, not only because they love the soul now saved, but especially because one more ray of glory shines forth from the diadem of the dear Redeemer.

The truth as set forth in this discussion is consistent with the entire Scriptures, and in full accord with that form of doctrine which we, as Calvinists, assuredly believe is taught in this word. It holds up to our wondering view something of the sweetness and grandeur of God's electing love. Even the darkening shadows that gathered about the King in that night of his awful sorrow did not shut out from his heart those given to him in the covenant of redemption, nor lead him to forget or to neglect their interests at his Father's throne. Well may we, in wonder and praise, exclaim,

“Oh! for a shout of joy,  
Worthy the theme we sing;  
To this divine employ  
Our hearts and voices bring;  
Sound, sound, through all the earth abroad,  
The love, the eternal love, of God.”

And then, too, what encouragement it brings us in our labors for the Master as we go forth to gather in the sheaves from the great harvest-field about us, to hear our Great Highpriest offering up this prayer right along the line of our work towards this blessed consummation! The blood he presents before the mercy-seat is *his own*. How can *we* fail?

In the light of these truths, what a grand perspective, like an enchanting vision, rises up before the Christian worker of to-day! How it lifts the clouds from his horizon and lets in the cheering rays of the approaching noon-day! And with God's inspired poet he begins to sing, “Let us get up early to the vineyards; let us see if the vine flourish, whether the tender grape appear, and the pomegranates bud forth. . . . At our gates are all manner of pleasant fruits.”

A. W. MILSTER.

## VI. NOTES.

---

### NEW TESTAMENT TERMS DESCRIPTIVE OF THE GREAT CHANGE.

THERE are two groups of terms in the New Testament used to express the great change which is experienced by him who enters upon the Christian life. The one of these groups includes such terms as *μετανοέω*, with its substantive *μετάνοια* and its cognate *μεταμέλομαι*, and *ἐπιστρέφω*, with its derivative *ἐπιστροφή*. These describe the change from the manward side, and inform us what part man himself takes in it. The other group includes such terms as *ἀναζαίνω*, *ἀναζαίνωσις*, *ἀνανεόω*; *ἀναγεννάω*, or the simple *γεννάω* with various defining adjuncts, *παλιγγενεσία*; *ζωοποιέω* or *κτίζω*, with defining adjuncts, and the like. These describe the change from the Godward side, and tell us what part God takes in it. Man repents, makes amendment, and turns unto God; but it is God who renews him, begets him again, quickens or creates him into newness of life. The two groups describe the two sides of the same great occurrence, and must be combined in any complete conception of its nature and implications.

I. Archbishop Trench<sup>1</sup> states very judiciously the relations of *μεταμέλομαι* and *μετανοέω*. It is plain that the two words stood for the heathen writers as practically synonymous. Both are used for the displeasure that is felt in reviewing an unworthy past; both for the amendment that may grow out of that displeasure. Etymologically, they differ in that *μεταμέλομαι* lays the stress on the affliction or pain that is experienced on the contemplation of our former folly; while *μετανοέω* points primarily to the change of mind, issuing in amendment, which afterthought brings to us. *Μεταμέλομαι* is best represented, therefore, by the Latin word *poenitentia*, the etymological reference in which is to the pain one suffers who rues his past deeds, as Augustine advises us in his perfectly just definition: "*Poenitentia est quedam dolentis vindicta, semper puniens in se quod dolet commississe.*"<sup>2</sup> *Μετανοέω* would be better represented by the Latin word

---

<sup>1</sup> *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § lxix.

<sup>2</sup> *De Vera et Falsa Poenitentia*, viii.

*resipiscentia*, as Lactantius, with equal justice, writes: "He who repents of what he has done understands his former error, and therefore the Greeks say better and more significantly *μετάνοια*, which we may call in Latin *resipiscentia*; for he comes to his senses and recovers his mind, as it were, from unsoundness, who is grieved for his error; and he reproves himself for madness and strengthens his mind for living better."<sup>1</sup> Starting thus with a somewhat different etymological impress, it is not strange that, although the words acquired a parallel usage, yet *μετανοέω* remained the nobler word throughout the classical period, and lent itself better to the usage of the New Testament when the breath of the Spirit began to adapt the old Greek to Christian conceptions. It is no less natural, however, that before it became fixed as a *terminus technicus* in Christian speech a period of uncertain usage should intervene.

It seems as if we have a relic of this uncertain usage in the New Testament itself. In the Gospel of Matthew, the two words are not very disproportionally employed, and stand as practically synonymous. After the Gospels, *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια* are frequent, while *μεταμέλομαι* almost passes out of use, and never occurs in the full sense which has become invariable with *μετανοέω* and *μετάνοια*. A comparison of Matt. xxi. 29, *et seq.*, with 2 Cor. vii. 8, *et seq.*, is very instructive in this point of view. Our Lord in this parable uses *μεταμέλομαι* throughout. "A man had two sons, and coming to the first he said, 'Son, go work to-day in my vineyard.' But he answered and said, 'I will not;' but afterwards he *repented and went*." Here *μεταμέλομαι* appears to be used of a repentance which issued in the amended act. And likewise in the application: "But ye did not *repent* afterwards so as to believe him." In 2 Cor. vii., on the contrary, Paul seems instinctively to confine his use of *μεταμέλομαι* to a sense not far from "regret," substituting *μετάνοια* when he speaks of "repentance," technically so called. He had made them sorry in a letter, and for this he had felt regretful pain (*μεταμέλομαι*), though he now sees that this was misplaced and consequently rather rejoices that he made them sorry, since the sorrow worked a repentance (*μετάνοια*) in them which is not to be regretted (*ἀμεταμέλητος*). Here *μεταμέλομαι* stands for the painful review of the past, and *μετάνοια* for a change to the better life. So little is *μετάνοια* mere sorrow for the past, that the sorrow is spoken of as no part of, but rather a preliminary to it, and *μετάνοια* appears as the result of a godly sorrow. "They sorrowed unto repentance;" "their godly sor-

<sup>1</sup> *The Divine Institutes*, VI., 24

row wrought out repentance unto salvation." The order is, therefore, godly sorrow, repentance, salvation, each lying at the base of the other. The growth of the word towards a purely technical sense is very observable here, and Jeremy Taylor, in the extract quoted by Trench,<sup>1</sup> is perfectly right when he tells us that a right *μεταμέλεια* is the first beginnings of *μετάνοια*.

What the *μετάνοια* consists in, as distinguished from what it grows out of, we may learn from the immediately subsequent verses to those just quoted; in these the apostle, after telling his readers that their godly sorrow wrought repentance in them, develops the meaning of the word in the special case in hand. The Corinthians had grievously sinned in permitting one of their number to commit a hideous crime, not only without rebuke, but also with entire indifference on their part. When repentance came, it came in the way of a total reversal of their indifferent attitude, or, as the apostle describes it in a series of rapid *epanorthoses*, correcting statement after statement, thus declared one after another to give insufficient expression to their change: "What earnestness did it work in you; nay, excusing; nay, indignation; nay, fear; nay, eager desire; nay, punishment." We trace the path of the sorrow working repentance here, step by step. Were they indifferent to foul sin in their midst? As repentance began in them, they became first earnestly attentive to it; then full of excuses for themselves for having neglected it; then rather indignant at the sin; then full of fear for their condoning of it; then burning with eagerness to do right; and then the repentance was fulfilled in the actual infliction of the punishment on the guilty party. The roots of it were planted in godly sorrow, its issue was amendment of life, its essence consisted in a total change of mind and heart toward their sin.

So clearly is the sense thus arrived at the standing meaning of the term, that there is but a single passage where it seems at all natural to confine its meaning to sorrow for sin, however intense; and this, perhaps characteristically, is in the Gospels. "Take heed to yourselves," said our Lord, as reported by Luke (xvii. 3, *et seq.*); "if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent (*μετανοήσῃ*), forgive him. And if seven times daily he sin against thee, and seven times turn to thee saying, 'I repent' (*μετανοῶ*), thou shalt forgive him." Here "repent" may, but need not, be restricted to the sense of "sorrow." Elsewhere it never can be. Its growth above the classical usage is evident further in that in heathen Greek the word is only used for a

<sup>1</sup> *Synonyms of the New Testament*, pp. 242, 243.



specific repentance of a specific fault, while in the New Testament this is the rarer usage. In the passage from Luke which we have just quoted, the reference is to a special act of repentance for a special sin against a brother. In Acts viii. 22, Simon Magus is exhorted to repent of his simony. In 2 Cor. vii. 7, *et seq.*, we read of the repentance of the Corinthians in the matter of the incestuous man; in Heb. xii. 17, of Esau's inability to find place of repentance for his sin; and in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse exhortations are made to the churches to specific acts of repentance.<sup>1</sup> But the prevailing usage of the word is for that great and normative act of repentance in which we turn from all wrong to all good, in which the trend of our life is altered, in which, in a word, we turn our backs on Satan and all the works of the flesh, and our face to God and his service. The repentance of the New Testament is a total change of mind and heart, not only from some sins, but from sin itself.

Such a change of mind and heart necessarily implies a perception of sin as sin, an apprehension of its sinfulness, accompanied by a suitable regret and sorrow for our participation in it. What *μετάνοια* emphasizes, however, is not this sorrow, but the change of mind and heart which it accompanies. But neither must it be confused with the *change of life* which succeeds it. Repentance is known by its fruits, but it is not its fruits. John called on his hearers to show their repentance by their deeds: "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance" (Luke iii. 8; cf. Matt. iii. 8); and thus distinguishes the reformed life from the reformed heart and mind, as its outgrowth and evidence. *Μετάνοια* may be used in so broad a sense as to include, on the one side, the sorrow for sin out of which it grows, and, on the other, the amendment of life into which it issues. But it may be distinguished from that sorrow as at 2 Cor. vii. 7, *et seq.*, and from that amendment as at Luke iii. 8. What it specifically means, and what it, in all cases, emphasizes as its body, no matter how widely it spreads its garments on this hand or that, is the inner change of mind and heart. In reading the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv.), we reach a point, after the famine had arisen and he had felt the pinch of want, and before he arose and went to his father, which is signalized in the narrative by the words, "And when he came to himself" (Luke xv. 17). At this exact point we discover the *μετάνοια*. As such, our word "repentance" scarcely expresses it, its failure being part of the infelicity arising from the adoption of *poenitentia* by the Latins as the equivalent of the Greek.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; Apoc. ix. 21.

It is that inner change of mind which rests on sorrow for sin and will issue in a better life, but which is, in itself, simply "a coming to ourselves."

The New Testament word which expresses the change of life into which *μετάνοια* eventuates is *ἐπιστροφή*, translated in the English version by "conversion." The noun occurs but once, Acts xv. 3, where Paul and Barnabas declare the "conversion," the "turning to [God]" of the Gentiles; but the corresponding verb is tolerably frequent. Its relation to *μετανοέω* may be gathered from a passage in Luke, which has already been quoted (xvii. 4). Our Saviour, in commanding forgiveness of an injuring brother, says, "Even if seven times a day he sin against thee, and seven times turn (*ἐπιστρέψῃ*) saying, 'I repent' (*μετανοῶ*), thou shalt forgive him." Here the change of mind in the *μετανοῶ* is the ground of the turning to the injured brother. The same relation holds good of repentance in its fullest technical sense, as Acts iii. 17 may advise us, "Repent ye, therefore, and turn." Perhaps this is made even plainer in Acts xxvi. 20, where Paul declares that his whole ministry had been one long summons to men "to repent, and to turn to God by doing works worthy of repentance," if we may so resolve the participle. As, according to Luke iii. 8, "doing works worthy of repentance" is the fruit of repentance, so here *ἐπιστροφή*, which is identified with the former, is represented as its fruit. The external character of this turning is perhaps illustrated by its relation to faith. The order is *μετάνοια* and faith, but faith and *ἐπιστροφή*. We read, "Repent and believe in the gospel" (Mark i. 15; cf. Matt. xxi. 32), but "believe and turn to the Lord" (Acts xi. 21). We need not press such phraseology beyond its capacity for bearing, but it seems at least to suggest the order *μετάνοια*, *πίστις*, *ἐπιστροφή*; that there is first a change within, then faith, and then a corresponding change without. In any event, we must set over against *μετάνοια* as the inward word its complement in *ἐπιστροφή* as an outward word, denoting the changed course of life; *ἀναστροφή* standing for the course of life itself, *ἀποστροφή*, as in the LXX. of Isaiah xxx. 15, for that course of life as turned *away from* evil, and *ἐπιστροφή* for that course of life as turned *unto* God.

All this, now, is man's work. Men are exhorted both to *μετάνοια* and to *ἐπιστροφή*; men are commanded to change their minds and their lives. Nevertheless, *μετάνοια* is declared to be the gift of God; Christ gives it to Israel (Acts v. 31); God to the Gentiles (Acts xi. 18); and he may give it in his grace even to those who are now opposing

his ministers (2 Tim. ii. 25). This already advertises that there is a divine side to the change described by these words, and leads us to its consideration.

II. As has been already intimated, the divine side of man's change is designated in the New Testament by a group of words which represent it as a renewing, a rebegetting, a quickening, a resurrection, and even as a re-creating of him. The Greeks had a word for "renewing," *ἀνακαινίζω*; but this occurs only once in the New Testament, and then apparently in a literal sense (Heb. vi. 6). Instead of it, Paul uses a cognate term, which he may have coined, *ἀνακαινόω*. This is once used in a quasi-literal sense, in 2 Cor. iv. 16, where Paul speaks of his outer man as being worn away by his sufferings, while his inner man is renewed daily; *i. e.*, apparently given ever new strength and vigor. Elsewhere the verb, its derivative noun, and its cognate *ἀνανεώω*, are used in the full spiritual sense of *renewal*. We learn that this renewal takes place in the mind (Eph. iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2); that it eventuates in knowledge (Col. iii. 10); and that it is brought about by the action of the Holy Ghost (Titus iii. 5), but not so as men may not be exhorted to secure it (Eph. iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2). There is thus a synergism of the Holy Spirit as efficient agent and man in his own efforts to the production of an internal effect. The result is, in the highest sense of the term, a new man (Col. iii. 10), which we are on the one hand exhorted to put on after having put off the old man, and on the other hand told is created by God in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. iv. 24, and Col. iii. 10). In virtue of the latter fact, he is called a "new creation" (Gal. vi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 7), with reference to whom old things are passed away and all things have become new (2 Cor. v. 17). It is clear that in these representations we are dealing with a somewhat wide conception<sup>1</sup> — a conception which from the divine side corollates in general with *μετεάνοια* from the human. Both represent a complete inner change, which is the result of the co-activity of man and God, and which issues in a new life. But in the terms now before us we are made aware of how great a part the divine element plays in working this change, and that at some point in the line of its activity it is nothing less than creative in its potency, securing that the product is not only new, but a new creation.

In harmony with this idea of renewal the New Testament writers

<sup>1</sup> The dogmaticians recognize the breadth of the idea of "renewal." See Dr. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, III., 217, and Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, *Biblical Theology*, II., 429.

make use of other terms, which describe God's act as a restoring of man to life. Thus both John and Paul employ the term *ζωοποιεῖν* in this connection. Parallel with it, the term "resurrection" is used in the same sense; for the quickening is always a quickening of what has died, and is therefore a revivification. It is along with Christ that we are made alive or raised again from our death in sin, and the conception seems to be that of reviving dead powers of well-doing within us consequent upon our union with him. His work furnishes the meritorious ground of our quickening, so that it is only as that work is made ours that his dying may be at the same time our dying, and his rising again our revival unto good works (2 Cor. v. 14, *et seq.*; Rom. vi. 8, *et seq.*). Faith is, therefore, the condition of our reception of life (Gal. iii. 22). No man can quicken himself; this is a thing the law is incapable of, and hence no good deed can obtain it for us (Gal. iii. 21). It is the Holy Ghost who is the efficient agent in the work (2 Cor. iii. 6; John vi. 63), but only as the efficient of the Father's will (Rom. viii. 11). Who are quickened is sovereignly determined by the Son (John v. 21); and the power involved in the act is the almighty power of God, such as was exerted in raising Christ from the dead (Eph. i. 20); for we were dead in trespasses and sins, and it is God who has quickened us and raised us up together with Christ (Eph. ii. 5, 6). Accordingly, again, we are even said to be "created" anew by God in this great change. The new man, which we are exhorted to put on, is not one which we can frame by our own powers, but one created by God in righteousness and holiness springing from the truth (Eph. iv. 24). And so little do we make for ourselves the change of life that is required of us by doing good works, that our salvation is in no sense the product of our acts, but as saved souls we are the workmanship, the made-product (*ποίημα*) of God, created in Christ Jesus *unto* good works which God has afore prepared that we should walk in them (Eph. ii. 10). Thus along this line of advance also we come to see the Christian as a new creation (2 Cor. v. 17), in so radical a sense that the old things are gone, and all things have become new.

This re-creation of man is given further expression under the figure of "regeneration," and that primarily in such a way as to emphasize the initial stages of "renewal." We have been rebegotten, says Peter (1 Pet. i. 3, 23), not out of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by means of the word of the living and enduring God,<sup>1</sup> who has begotten us unto a living hope by means of the resurrection of Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>Or "by means of God's living and enduring word."

Christ from the dead. Here is a renewal of which the efficient agent is God, the means his word, including the proclamation of the resurrection of Christ, and the result, the awakening in the soul of the graces of the Christian life, hope and love. Again we are looking at the divine act in the gift of *μετένοια*, and are made pointedly aware of the intensity of the divine action necessary to its gift by its comparison to a rebegetting, issuing in a new birth. Hence we become the children of God, God's sons—a prevailing Pauline locution (Rom. viii. 14, 19; ix. 26; 2 Cor. vi. 18; Gal. iii. 26; iv. 6, 7,)—by the inner operation of the Spirit and the exercise of faith. We learn most of this divine sonship, however, in the aspect in which it is now before us, from the writings of John.<sup>1</sup> We are told that it is the result of a true begetting from God, independent of the activity of the human will, “not from blood, nor from the will of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God” (John i. 13; cf. 1 John iii. 9). It is the indispensable condition, not only of doing righteousness (1 John ii. 29), but also of the birth of Christian love (1 John iv. 7), and even of faith in Christ (1 John v. 1,) in the heart; while, on the other hand, it inevitably produces in its recipient righteous conduct (1 John iii. 9; v. 18), and the overcoming of the world through faith (1 John v. 4). In the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus himself reveals to us the essential nature of the new birth. It is the indispensable prerequisite to entrance into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5), without which no one can “see” that kingdom (John iii. 3). Its source is defined as “water and the Spirit” (John iii. 5), by which is perhaps meant, not “baptism and the Holy Ghost,” but the Holy Spirit in his purifying activities symbolized by water. It eventuates in the spiritualizing of our antecedently fleshly nature, so that, as born of the Spirit, we are no longer flesh, but spirit (John iii. 6). And its advent upon the soul is unobserved, its process inscrutable, and its reality only to be known as an inference from its effects; it is like the wind, of which we know nothing, except lo! it is here! (John iii. 8.) It is very evident that in these statements we are brought much nearer to an understanding of how God gives us that change of mind and heart which, on the human side, we call *μετένοια*, and on the divine, broadly, “renewal.” No doubt he is active all through the process—the passages before considered leave no room to doubt that—but clearly he is active in an especial way at its inception; and it is the character of his activity here which gives most fully to the process the right to be called a new birth, a regeneration, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Candlish, *Fatherhood of God*, (ed. 5, 1870,) pp. 151, *et seq.*

the product the right to be called a son of God. Paul does not use the phrase *γεννάω ἄνωθεν*, which John so fully explains by the record of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus, nor yet Peter's cognate term *ἀναγεννάω*; but in one place he employs a somewhat similar term, *παλιγγενεσία*, in the phrase, "Not out of works *done* in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saves us, by means of the washing of regeneration and renewing from the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5). As the word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, it is impossible confidently to fix its exact shade of meaning. But whether it refers to the initiation or to the whole course of renewal, it at least emphasizes God's hand in man's great change to the exclusion of man's. That we are saved does not spring out of our works done in righteousness. It is a matter of mercy, of grace, of the rich outpouring of the Holy Spirit, whose work is an again-begetting and a renewal.

If now we bring these results together in recapitulation, it is plain that *ἀναζώνωσις* expresses both a broad and a radical process; it is broad enough to cover the whole process of our inner renewing, inclusive of what we now technically speak of as regeneration, conversion and sanctification, all of which it ascribes to God; and it is radical enough to represent this process as resulting in a totally new creature, full of good works. *Ἀναγεννήσις* is narrower, but no less radical; it apparently includes only the opening stages of *ἀναζώνωσις*, inclusive of what we now should call regeneration and conversion, which it represents as a work of God begetting us into a new conscious life by the word, "of his own will bringing us forth by the word of truth" (James i. 18). It is thus a sovereign act, as well as an efficacious one. It is also a composite act, including an action on the soul and an action of the soul. John's record of our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus cuts to the roots here, and analyzes this composite act still further, speaking of the originating act of the new birth, separate even from its first conscious results, as an action on the soul prerequisite to its own holy activity, a direct and sovereign and inscrutable act of the Spirit as the precondition of the influence of the word.

The scriptural phraseology thus lays before us as its account of man's great change a process, and a process which has two sides. It is on the one side a change of heart and mind issuing in a new life. It is on the other a renewing from on high issuing in a new creation. There is thus a true synergism indicated. Man works out his own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing it is God who is working

in him both the willing and the doing according to his own good pleasure. But an enabling act of God is required at the basis of all the human activities. From that moment of the first divine contact the work of the Spirit never ceases, and while man is changing his mind and his life, it is God that is renewing him in true righteousness and holiness. Considered from God's side, the renewal results in the production of a new creature, God's workmanship, with new activities, newly directed. Considered from man's side, the new heart and mind exhibit themselves in new activities. We obtain thus a regular series. At the root lies an act seen by God alone, and mediated by nothing, a direct, creative act of the Spirit, the new birth. This new birth pushes itself into man's own consciousness through the call of the word, and his conscious possession of it is thus mediated by the word. It becomes visible to his fellow-men in a turning to God in external activities. A man must be born from above to become God's son. He must be born anew by the word to recognize himself as such. His renewal must pass into works meet for the new heart he has received to be recognized by his fellow-men as such.

*Princeton.*

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

### ON LICENSURE.

It is a significant fact, that, in the face of the clear statements of our Book of Church Order, and the uniform practice of the church, one of our Synods still thought it worth while to send up to the Chattanooga Assembly this overture: "Is the formal licensure of a candidate for the ministry a prerequisite for ordination?" Evidently, the real utility of licensure has been seriously called in question, and, if we mistake not, there is an increasing tendency to look upon it as a form which, in many cases at least, may be safely dispensed with.

If we inquire as to the end contemplated in the licensure of a candidate, our Form of Government gives a clear and explicit answer: "Presbyteries shall license probationers to preach the gospel, in order that, after sufficiently trying their gifts and receiving from the church a good report, they may, in due time, ordain them to the sacred office." (*Book of Church Order*, Par. 129.)

It is required of a minister that he should be a man of piety; and the candidate's fitness in this respect may be ascertained, with at least

a reasonable degree of certainty, by an examination touching his experimental acquaintance with religion. He should possess also a "competency of human learning;" and his attainments may be readily ascertained by an examination upon the various branches as prescribed in our standards. He must be able to interpret the Word of God, and formulate its truths in a living message; and as evidence of such ability the candidate is required to present to Presbytery certain exercises, including a sermon. But a minister must also be "apt to teach;" able to stand before the people and speak to them "all the words of this life;" but above all he must be *called of God*. While a strong presumption may be afforded that the candidate is "apt to teach," yet no examination, however rigid, can show that he has been called of God; this must be demonstrated by actual experiment.

Hence the Presbytery, having examined him, as far as it is possible to do so, licenses him to preach the gospel, in order that, after sufficiently trying his gifts and receiving from the church a good report, it may, in due time, ordain him to the sacred office.

It is assumed here that the candidate has not yet "*tried his gifts*," having had no authority to do so; that the Presbytery must receive from the church a favorable report as to the result of this trial; and then, *on the strength of this good report*, supplementing the previous examination, he is to be ordained to the sacred office.

The Presbytery, as a court of the church, is called upon to decide as to the genuineness of that call to the gospel ministry, which the candidate claims to have received from the Lord Jesus, and, as a basis for its decision in the matter, it must have the concurrent testimony of the church, rendered by those among whom he has "*tried his gifts*"

Thus we see that the prime purpose of licensure is to secure, in an orderly manner, the testimony of the church as to the candidate's call to the ministry, and consequently, if this be not accomplished the *raison d'être* of licensure is lacking, and it becomes a meaningless form.

What now is the practice of the church in this particular? Are candidates uniformly, or even usually, licensed with this end in view? The writer recalls at least two cases, coming under his own observation, in which no such end was reached, or even contemplated in the remotest degree. In the first instance, an unlicensed candidate, under the care of a distant Presbytery, was called to the pastorate of a church which he had been serving for several months. At an adjourned meet-



ing of Presbytery, held in this church, he was received under its care, examined, licensed, the call put into his hands and accepted by him, all in the same day. There being a doubt in the minds of some as to the lawfulness of licensing and ordaining a candidate at the same meeting, Presbytery adjourned to meet *two days later*, when it proceeded to ordain and install this licentiate of two days.

In the other case, a candidate was under appointment for the foreign field. A few weeks before he was to sail he was licensed by his Presbytery, and would have been ordained at once, but as his licensure took place at the very close of the meeting, and no arrangements had been made for an ordination service, it was decided to postpone his ordination for ten days, when he was accordingly set apart to his work. In the published proceedings of another Presbytery, but a short time since, the statement occurs that A. B. was "*licensed and ordained*," as if it were a common occurrence.

But it is entirely needless to multiply instances, as any one may readily call to mind cases in which the licensure was not, and could not have been, for the purpose of allowing the candidate to try his gifts; nor was his ordination based upon the good reports from such authorized trials. In all such cases licensure is but a meaningless form, and probably it was because it was impressed with the absurdity of such a procedure that the Synod of North Carolina was moved to inquire of the General Assembly whether the formal licensure of a candidate is a prerequisite for ordination.

But it must not be supposed that in these and similar instances Presbyteries rashly ordained these candidates before they had tried their gifts, and without having received a good report from the church. Far from it; for these candidates had for a considerable period made trial of their gifts, without having been formally licensed to do so. They had done without a license precisely what a licentiate is authorized to do. Nor was a good report from the church wanting, as was evidenced by the formal calls for pastoral and evangelistic services that came to Presbytery.

In a word, licensure was granted in all these cases, when the very end for which licensure is appointed was already accomplished.

It is as if one should, with pomp and ceremony, introduce a man to his betrothed just before the marriage ceremony, on the ground that they had never been formally introduced, and that in the nature of things an introduction precedes marriage!

Did the Assembly err, then, in declaring that licensure is a pre-

requisite for ordination? By no means; for its decision is in full accord with our Form of Government, and sound reason as well. It is clear (*a*), that no one should be ordained without the testimony of the church; (*b*), that the candidate should try his gifts, and so afford an opportunity for such testimony; and (*c*), that he should not try his gifts unless duly authorized by the proper authority.

The prevalent and growing practice of deferring licensure to a late period, in many cases barely antedating ordination, may be traced mainly to two causes.

In the first place, the practice of the church is such that the candidate has every opportunity to "try his gifts" without formal licensure.

With rare exceptions our theological students spend their vacations in supplying vacant fields, and many of them render most excellent service. Theoretically there is a wide difference between a licentiate and a candidate, but practically there is none. The candidate does everything that the licentiate is authorized to do. He goes into the pulpit and conducts the service in all respects as a licentiate, or even minister, would, and in the eyes of the people he is a full-fledged "preacher."

Generally the benediction is omitted, as an indication of the character of the service, but if the benediction is the invocation of a blessing merely, there is no reason why this should be singled out for omission; and if, on the other hand, it is an authoritative and official blessing of the people, then neither he nor the licentiate has any right to pronounce it; so that they do not differ in this respect.

On a recent occasion a certain Presbytery met in a church which had been supplied for some months by a theological student, a candidate under the care of another Presbytery. During the opening exercises he occupied the pulpit with the moderator, and then, when the Presbytery was called to order, at the request of the moderator, he opened the session with prayer; after which he was received under care of Presbytery and licensed to preach! At the same meeting a church asked for leave to employ (as a supply until the next meeting) another unlicensed candidate under the care of a distant Presbytery, and leave was granted, *nemine contradicente*.

Is it any wonder, under such circumstances, that the candidate having the fear of an examination before his eyes, is constrained to ask, *cui bono?*

Why seek a license to do that which he can do equally well without

a license? Why undergo the ordeal of *two* examinations when one will answer the same purpose? For full well does he know that, if ordination follows close upon the heels of licensure, the examination for ordination will be the merest form, and sometimes not even a form. Is it any wonder, then, that the candidate defers application for licensure even as has happened, in the very face of the expressed wishes of his Presbytery?

Growing out of this first reason for the anomalous position occupied by licensure in our practice, there is yet a second. As the candidate has been allowed practically to usurp the position of the licentiate, so the licentiate in turn has come to occupy, in part at least, the place of the minister. In the practice of the church licensure is tantamount to entering the ministry. True, the licentiate must (?) still be examined for ordination, but the result of that is a foregone conclusion. He is now in the position of a candidate who has successfully passed through a primary election in a State where his party has a safe majority. It does happen occasionally that a licentiate fails of ordination, but for every such case it would be easy to call to mind two cases in which men have been deposed after ordination. The candidate emerging from his Presbyterial trials, and bearing a certificate of licensure, naturally feels that he now occupies a different position from that occupied by him previously. It is not that he is at liberty now to "try his gifts," for that he did before without let or hindrance, and as he feels that there must be a difference somewhere, he naturally concludes that he is now "sort of a minister," albeit he cannot yet administer the sacraments.

The writer well remembers the look of mingled surprise and indignation cast upon him by a certain licentiate, to whom he chanced to intimate that he was not a "minister of the gospel." He instantly referred to the fact that he had been licensed "to preach the gospel of Christ," losing sight of the qualifying clause "as a *probationer* for the holy ministry." He does indeed "preach," in the wide sense of the term, but it is not an authoritative proclamation of the gospel, nor is he invested with any office whatever.

But the practical question which now confronts us, is: How shall licensure be restored to its normal position?

We answer unhesitatingly: Let the church return to its former uniform practice of refusing to allow a candidate to "try his gifts" until formally licensed to do so by his Presbytery, after due examination. Such a course would at once make licensure a desideratum in

the eyes of every candidate, seeing that the lack of it shuts him out from all our churches, and from the summer work, so eagerly sought after by theological students.

No call would ever come up to Presbytery for the pastoral services of an unlicensed candidate, as is now often the case; nor would Presbytery ever have occasion to follow a licensure with ordination; nor, indeed, would a Presbytery be found willing to ordain one who had never "tried his gifts." Then would the licentiate be, in deed as well as in name, a *probationer* for the ministry.

But just here a practical difficulty emerges. Experience, we think, has clearly demonstrated the practical utility of the candidate's beginning to exercise his gifts at a very early stage of his preparation, and objectors to this statement, if there be such, will be found chiefly, if not wholly, among those not conversant with the workings of this plan.

But our Book of Church Order requires that the candidate shall have spent "at least two years" in the study of theology before licensure, except in extraordinary cases; and indeed, if the requirements touching the topics for examination be complied with, it is difficult to see how licensure can take place at an earlier stage than this.

With the plain provisions of the law staring us in the face, we cannot, except in extraordinary cases, license a candidate until he has completed two years of theological study, and we are forced either to refuse to allow him to try his gifts previous to licensure, or else to allow him to do so without formal licensure, as at present. The former alternative is open to objection, as stated above; the latter is still more so. In addition to the fact, already set forth, that it virtually supersedes licensure and renders it a meaningless form, it is also extra-constitutional—a thing unknown to our standards. It is often urged that these services are conducted with the approbation of the Presbyteries, and are under the direction and oversight of some neighboring pastor, or Presbyterial committee; but without stopping to enquire how much this direction and oversight really amounts to, there still remains the indisputable fact that the candidate is discharging the functions of a licentiate, call it by what name you will, without having undergone any examination whatever save that upon which he was received under the care of Presbytery.

Our church, through its General Assembly, has formally condemned the system known as "Lay Evangelism," as being "irregular and contrary to the order of the church, with reference to the Christian ministry, and calculated to produce confusion and many other evils."

It is well known that many of these so-called evangelists expressly disclaim the idea that they are in any sense ministers, while virtually discharging the functions of a licentiate, if not those of a minister. If the approbation of a Presbytery, or the endorsement of a pastor, gives a candidate a quasi-license, and legalizes, in a measure, his services, then most assuredly we cannot object to the services of those men who have the coöperation of many of our churches and pastors. Can we consistently condemn them for doing the very thing which we habitually encourage our students to do?

The difficulty here pointed out can be fully met only by a change in our law touching the requirements for licensure. It is in order now for some brother to rise and offer the customary protest against "lowering the standards." It will no doubt ease his mind somewhat, but does not relieve the situation in the least. We are confronted with the fact that, either we are suffering candidates to try their gifts *without licensure*, and so rendering licensure a nullity; or, if they have a quasi-license, as some contend, it is a license *without examination*. Is it not the very height of folly to keep the gate locked hard and fast, and then, with our own hands, let down the fence by its side to the very ground! Far better to have a reasonable examination for licensure than to give a virtual license without any examination at all.

As the law now stands, the examinations for licensure and ordination are substantially the same; while in practice the examination for licensure is made the crucial test, and that for ordination slurred over. Why, we may ask, is licensure thus exalted over ordination, or even put upon an equal footing with it? It confers no office, as does ordination, nor does it change one's ecclesiastical status, but simply confers the privilege of exercising his gifts, and even this may be taken away without a trial. Reason teaches that there ought to be a wide difference in the requirements for these two. Let the requirements for ordination remain as at present, and let such a change be made in the requirements for licensure as will meet the case of those who are just entering upon a course of theological study; and let us do *according to law* what we are now doing *without law*.

In view of past discussions it is not likely, however desirable, that any such constitutional change will be made, at least for the present. In the meanwhile we deem it the part of wisdom for the church to discourage, and if need be forbid, all unauthorized trials of gifts, and at the same time urge candidates to apply for licensure at the earliest period permissible under the law; and while the church by

such a course will be denied their ministrations, and they will be deprived of the training, yet we will thereby avoid the evils that grow out of an extra-constitutional measure, make apparent the pressing need of a change in our organic law, and at the same time restore licensure to its normal place in our ecclesiastical system.

T. R. ENGLISH.

---

### THE RELATION OF ENGLISH TO ANGLO-SAXON.

PROFESSOR WHITNEY defines philology as "the science of speech, and all that speech reveals of the origin, history, and character of man." Few branches of study have received more attention within the last twenty years than this. The results of this study have been very gratifying to the student of language, because the facts established have thrown a flood of light in all directions, and have made scientific grouping and generalization possible. Naturally the languages of Western Europe have been most carefully examined. It has been proved that they have certain well-defined points of resemblance, a fact which indicates that there was once a common language from which all have sprung. Furthermore, the development of each has been in accordance with laws differing with its peculiar environment. The resemblances are so marked, and the differences are of so peculiar a nature, that philologists now think themselves justified in stating that all the principal tongues of Europe belong to the Aryan, or Indo-European, branch of languages. When the primitive speech originated, where and by whom it was spoken, is not known, but it is supposed that it had its home somewhere in Central or South-western Asia. In some fertile valley, or on some pleasant table-land, the mother language was born, sheltered, and developed.

As those who spoke it increased in numbers, they were forced to send out colonies. These emigrants moved westward, carrying with them, of course, their native language and their national customs. But time and chance happened to them all.

Long years of separation made the colonies forget the mother-state, and different surroundings developed in each peculiar habits, peculiar characteristics, and peculiar forms of speech. So it happened that the fact of a common ancestry was soon entirely forgotten, and the languages diverged so rapidly and so far, that scholars have only recently suspected that similarity really exists. By careful investiga-

tion the existence of a common origin has been proved beyond a doubt. Of this primitive original, no literary monuments exist, but by tracing the languages which remain back to the earliest times in which they were written, by collecting the points of resemblance, and disregarding the points of dissimilarity, scholars have been able to construct this original with theoretical accuracy.

The Sanskrit is the oldest representative, and has not been spoken as a living speech since 300 B. C. Other representatives are: the Iranian of Persia, the Hellenic of Greece, the Slavonic of Russia, the Celtic of Gaul and of the British Isles, the Italic of Rome, and the Teutonic of Northern Europe. The Teutonic has for its subdivisions the Gothic, the Old Norse, the High German, and the Low German.

Anglo-Saxon is a branch of the last, and of that it is proposed to speak. This task is undertaken, not with the desire or expectation of saying anything new or original, but only with the hope of aiding by a synoptical arrangement those who may not have time or inclination to arrive at the results for themselves.

It may as well be stated in the outset, that Anglo-Saxon scholarship is a thing of recent growth. Prior to 1825, Anglo-Saxon did not hold a place in the course of any college in America. At that time it was introduced into the University of Virginia by Thomas Jefferson, who wrote an Anglo-Saxon grammar, once used as a text-book in the University. This far-seeing statesman declared that it was of the greatest importance that English-speaking people should be thoroughly familiar with their own language, and this familiarity could best be obtained by a mastery of the old as well as of the modern forms. Notwithstanding Jefferson's earnest efforts, Anglo-Saxon did not flourish in the University, and the course did not amount to much until it was revived by that eminent scholar, M. Schele de Vere, who has done so much to promote the historical study of English.

Time has proved the soundness of Mr. Jefferson's judgment on this as on other subjects, and now every college in the land gives instruction in Anglo-Saxon, and maintains that this is necessary for a thorough understanding of the language of to-day. Anglo-Saxon has come into our colleges, and it has come to stay. It is insisted that what is said in this article is not intended for those who have recently quitted the "academic shades," but for those *old* graduates, who, like the writer, went out from college walls before Anglo-Saxon was made an essential part of the college course.

As has been already stated, Anglo-Saxon is a sub-division of Low

German, which is itself a sub-division of the Teutonic branch of the Indo-European family of languages. Now the question arises, where did Anglo-Saxon originate? In order to answer this question, we must relate briefly the well-known story of the Saxon conquest of Britain. As is well known, about 450 A. D., the Celtic inhabitants of Britain applied to the Northmen for aid against the Picts and Scots. Aid was sent, but the last state of the Celts was worse than the first, for the savage warriors from over the sea, attracted by the fertile soil and genial climate of Britain, commenced a series of invasions which ultimately resulted in the subjugation of a large part of the island. The Celts fought bravely, but in vain. The heathen conquerors drove the unfortunate natives from their homes and took possession of their lands. The common theory is, that the invaders belonged to three tribes. Is this true? Many assert that it cannot be historically proved. Furthermore, the names *England* and *English* indicate, say they, that the conquerors were one people, the Angles, who came from Angeln, a small district in Sleswick. From these facts, and from the further fact that quite early the language was called *Englisc*, they are led to conclude that Britain was conquered by one people, whose language was but an undeveloped form of modern English. But this reasoning is not sound. Even if it could be proved that there were not *three* tribes, it would not necessarily follow that there were only *one*. The fact that the name *Angle* has been preserved in the word *England* proves nothing. It might seem to indicate that the Angles were more numerous and energetic than the other invaders, though it would be difficult to reconcile this with the generally accepted view that the *West-Saxon* kingdom finally overshadowed all others.

There must have been Saxons also among the invaders, as the names Wessex, Sussex, Essex, etc., abundantly attest, and is further indicated by the fact that Ælfred is referred to as *Rex Saxonum*. An examination of the case makes it evident that it is much more natural to suppose that the conquerors represented many tribes than to assume that they all belonged to one. The Romans on the continent had driven towards the north many of the Gothic tribes with which they had come in contact. Thus, at the time of the so-called Saxon invasion of Britain, there existed fragments of tribes and fragments of languages collected in communities along the northern shores of Germany. These communities were often at war among themselves, had little intercourse the one with the other, and consequently there must have been little mingling of people or language. No one community was



large enough, probably, to furnish the numbers which poured into England. We conclude, therefore, that the invaders must have belonged to several communities, and that they spoke different dialects of Low German. Besides, we know as a matter of fact that there were at least three quite distinct dialects in England—the Northumbrian, the West Saxon, and the Midland. In most cases the conquered impose their language upon the conquerors, but it was not so in this instance, for this was a war of extermination; consequently the language of the conquerors became the language of the island. Therefore, in spite of efforts to prove the contrary, we may regard it as a proved fact that these conquerors represented three tribes—Jutes, Angles and Saxons. The Jutes seem to have settled Kent in the southeast; the Angles, apparently in scattered parties, seized the eastern coast as far north as the Forth; the Saxons occupied the southern coast, and gradually extended their power into the interior. As by degrees the West Saxon kingdom gained political ascendancy, its dialect became the prevailing one, and was the Anglo-Saxon used by Ælfred and Ælfric. Strictly speaking, then, Anglo-Saxon was developed on English soil, having the West Saxon dialect for its basis, and modifications and additions from neighboring dialects.

This point settled, the next question to be considered is, are Anglo-Saxon and English essentially the same? Is the latter merely a developed form of the former? The two theories on this point can be best set forth in the words of two distinguished scholars. Dr. William Hand Browne, in his *English Literature*, page 32, says:

“We constantly hear of the English tongue being ‘derived from the Saxon,’ of ‘the Saxon element’ in it; while others speak of a Norse, a German, or a Gothic origin. The student should learn once for all, and never forget, that *the English is derived from none of these, nor, in the strict sense, from any known tongue.* It is a distinct branch of the Teutonic family of languages, and has been, *from the very origin of English history, known and spoken as the English tongue.*” [*Italics all mine*]

On the other hand, Professor Lounsbury, in his *English Language*, page 24, says:

“The differences between the earliest and modern English are *essential differences: they are not the characteristics of a development of language, but of an actual transformation*. A nomenclature which, in the history of our tongue, includes under one name the English of Cadmon and of Tennyson, is *unsatisfactory and misleading.*”

According to one, the language used by Ælfred and the present speech should both be called English; if differences exist, they are

merely differences caused by development in a language at all times really the same and marked by the same general characteristics. According to the other, the differences are essential, and a nomenclature including under one name the language at all periods of its existence would be misleading. The second view seems correct.

If modern English is nothing more than developed Anglo-Saxon, we must expect to find in it an alphabet and vocabulary, a grammatical structure, and a periodic arrangement essentially the same as the alphabet, vocabulary, structure, and arrangement possessed by the Anglo-Saxon tongue. Now, what are the facts? The Anglo-Saxon alphabet had twenty-three letters, though the number usually given is twenty-four. English has twenty-six. Anglo-Saxon lacked j, k, q, v, and z, but it had two letters which English has lost, Ð (a crossed *d*) and þ. These two letters represented the two sounds of *th* heard in *thin* and *thine*. K was introduced after the Norman Conquest and is commonly counted in the alphabet; q rarely occurs in English except in the combination *qu*, and in Anglo-Saxon this was supplied by *cw*. *E. g.*, Anglo-Saxon, *cwéthan*; English, *quoth*; Anglo-Saxon, *cwén*; English, *queen*. V is much like w in the Teutonic tongues; z found no place in Anglo-Saxon. Thus the two alphabets show seven differences—a fact hardly in line with the statement that the languages are the same.

That the vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon was very different from that of English, may be seen at a glance by any one who takes the trouble to look at the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the portion of Anglo-Saxon literature least difficult to read. Here and there the student will notice a familiar root, but he will feel much like a stranger in a strange land. Words once common have become obsolete, significations once prevalent have been changed, and more than all, immense additions from other tongues have been made. It is true that the Saxon element—the supporters of the opposite theory will pardon the expression—in the vocabulary of the present is by far the most important, most of the words used in every-day life being derived from Saxon stems. Still the fact remains, that more than half the words in our dictionaries are foreign words, and have been permanently adopted into the language. We cannot get along without them. “We must use them even in denouncing them.” When sulphuric acid and zinc are brought together a chemical compound is formed, called sulphate of zinc, unlike in appearance and properties the elements from which it was derived. So when Anglo-Saxon came in contact with Celtic, Danish, Latin, and Norman-French, each has so acted upon the others, and been reacted

upon in turn, that a new and composite vocabulary has been evolved, to which we give the name English.

But some may object that a language should be tested by its grammatical structure rather than by its vocabulary. Accepting this as true, let us see whether the identity of Anglo-Saxon and modern English can be established by an examination of the grammatical structure of the two. In doing this it will be necessary to mention briefly those particulars in which Anglo-Saxon differed from English, omitting points of existing similarity and leaving the reader to supply mentally the English usage.

Of the Anglo-Saxon noun there were two declensions, one of which had sub-divisions. There were five cases: Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accusative, and Instrumental. The gender of nouns was determined by termination and declension rather than by sex. *E. g.*, *Wif*, a woman, and *mæden* = a virgin, were neuter. The adjective had three genders and two numbers, and had two forms of declension, according as the limited noun was definite or indefinite. *E. g.*, Of *the* good son = *Thæs góðan byres*; of *a* good son = *gódes byres*. The personal pronouns had five cases, which were the same as those of the noun, and three numbers, singular, dual, and plural. *E. g.*, *wit* = we *two*; *git* = you *two*. The dual, however, soon began to weaken and give way. The demonstrative pronouns had three genders, two numbers, and five cases. The interrogative pronouns were somewhat like the English equivalents, with the first two letters reversed. Thus, *hwá* (masculine and feminine) = who; *hwaet* (neuter) = what. These pronouns had the singular number only, but *hwaether* had both numbers. There was, strictly speaking, in Anglo-Saxon, as in all the Teutonic languages, no relative pronoun, and its place was supplied in four ways: by the demonstrative pronoun, by *þ* alone, and by joining *þ* to the demonstrative or personal pronouns. The verb had the same moods as in English, though the usage differed somewhat from English usage. The infinitive had a dative case, a gerundial, preceded by the preposition *to*, from which our infinitive is derived. *E. g.*, the infinitive of the verb *to love* is *lufian*, of which the dative was *to lufianne*. Anglo-Saxon had two tenses only, the present and preterite. These discharged the office of all the existing tenses until a later period, when the auxiliaries shall and will, have and had, were added to express tense relations. There was no distinct form for the passive voice, and the relation had to be avoided or expressed by a dreadful combination of auxiliaries—a usage which English has in large mea-

sure inherited. Many of the rules of Anglo-Saxon syntax much resembled rules in Latin and Greek, proving that, before the classic period of Anglo-Saxon literature, the language had been modified by ecclesiastical Latin, and by the Greek of the school-men, or else that the syntax of the common ancestor had been retained to a remarkable extent by the descendants.

From this meagre outline, it is evident that Anglo-Saxon differed widely from English in grammatical structure, and this difference could be shown in a much more striking manner, were it possible in the limits of this article to give a more detailed account of Anglo-Saxon inflections, and to illustrate by paradigms and examples. Some of these grammatical differences, to be sure, have arisen naturally following the regular course of development, but others have been produced by outside influences, such as the friction of one language against another, and the upheaval of political conditions.

Striking and real as the above-mentioned differences are, the diversity between the two languages in periodic arrangement appear even more striking and remarkable.

Grammarians divide languages into two classes—analytic and synthetic. A synthetic language is one in which the relation of one part of the sentence to the others is expressed by different terminations, and in which the meaning is not at all dependent upon the order of words. In an analytic language the relations are expressed by prepositions, and the meaning changes if the order of words is varied. For example, a Roman knew precisely what *puer puellam amat* meant, no matter how the words were arranged; but by inverting the English sentence, *The boy loves the girl*, we obtain another and a very different meaning from exactly the same words. Anglo-Saxon, like Latin, was synthetic in its periodic arrangement; English belongs to the analytic class.

Another striking difference between Anglo-Saxon and English will be observed in the poetry of the two. In Anglo-Saxon poetry final rhyme was not found, nor was it necessary to have in the verse any fixed number of syllables or regular recurrence of accent. It was alliterative in its character; that is, the line was usually divided into two sections, and two words in the first section and one in the second section were supposed to begin with the same letter. As an example, I will quote a few lines from the *Vision of Piers Ploughman*, a poem not written until after the Anglo-Saxon period, but retaining its alliterative character.

“For she is *frele* of hire *feith*,  
*Fikel* of hire *speche*,  
 And *maketh men mysdo*  
*Many score tymes.*”

Modern English derived its poetical forms from classical and Romance sources.

As the conclusion of the whole matter, we feel justified in denying that Anglo-Saxon and English are the same language; the one the weak and feeble infancy, the other the mature and developed growth. The relation is rather that of parent and child. From the union of Anglo-Saxon and the Latin of France has been born our own compact and beautiful English, which has retained so many traits of both parents, but upon whose growth the freshness and beauty of the Saxon has had a controlling influence. Just when this new creature was born we cannot tell. The period of pregnancy was long, for, as in the womb of Rebekah, “two manner of people” struggled for the mastery. But after the pains of travail, a national language was born, beautiful even in its infancy and of marvellous capabilities in its mature years. The date of this may perhaps be placed at about the end of the old English period, in A. D. 1350, for though changes had been taking place gradually and slowly for centuries, it was not till Chaucer lived that the changes were crystallized into literature. His master mind first understood the vast possibilities of the English tongue, and to him is due the praise of seating English so firmly upon its throne that its supremacy as the national language has never since been questioned.

But though the language of the nineteenth century differs so widely from that of the ninth, we must not suppose that the two have no points of resemblance, or that the former owes nothing to the latter. In many respects they are similar, and it is the Saxon element which has exerted the controlling influence.

Let us inquire what Anglo-Saxon has bequeathed to English. Its bequests have been special and general; it gave to its offspring *words* and *characteristics*. As has been already remarked, the words handed down are the good, strong, homely words of every-day life, the words which give life to the language. They are the words which are the names of familiar objects and the symbols of familiar thoughts.

*Objects of sense* have, as a rule, Saxon names, *e. g.*, day, night, hill, dale, water and stream. *Particular names* are usually of Saxon origin, while *general terms* come from Latin. Thus the general term *move* is

Latin, but particulars under it, *run, jump, walk, ride*, are all Saxon. Marsh remarks: "When we come to words which indicate different states, emotions, passions, mental processes, all, in short, that expresses the moral or intellectual man, the Anglo-Saxon vocabulary is eminently affluent." This is true, unless we are using scientific language, and many of our words expressing these ideas are lineal descendants of the language of the West Saxons, *e. g.*, *afyrht* (afear'd), *bewepan* (beweep, bemoan), *blis* (pleasure), *blithe* (joyful).

Likewise, the *words first used in childhood* and the words expressing the closest ties of relationship and the sweetest association are Saxon. Thus the words *father, mother, brother, sister, husband, wife, home*, are all Saxon, and it is only when we have become hardened by contact with the world that we begin to speak of paternal and maternal relatives, of habitation, residence or domicile.

Thus briefly and imperfectly we have referred to some classes of words for which English is indebted to Anglo-Saxon. Now let us notice some of the characteristics which the latter stamped indelibly upon the former.

Anglo-Saxon was vigorous, direct, and monosyllabic, and these qualities equally characterize the language of to-day. Latin and Romance words have their special place in our language. For some kinds of writing they are peculiarly adapted, and not to use them would mar composition. If we write upon metaphysics or philology, if we engage in scientific discussion, or enter upon æsthetic criticism, we find that we must use Latin and Greek derivatives very often; and it would be absurd to use a Saxon word simply because it was Saxon, or to reject a foreign word on account of its foreign origin. But when, in the common affairs of life, we wish to use a vigorous expression, our thoughts naturally clothe themselves in plain Saxon words. In the heat of debate or under the excitement of anger, when we wish our language to be as clear and forcible as we can make it, the Saxon words come pouring from our lips, not from design, but because from their very nature they give inherent strength.

It is sometimes thought necessary to use many words and say nothing. But when this is the case we must avoid the words of native birth. In the language of circumlocution Anglo-Saxon was deficient. The very words *circumlocution* and *periphrasis* are foreign words and express foreign ideas. The natural taciturnity of the Saxon caused him to state his meaning with directness and in as few words as possible. There was no dodging issues, but what he had to say he said

forcibly and directly. (These statements need qualification in one particular. Anglo-Saxon poetry is often utterly unintelligible, and the translator thereof must be a good interpreter.) For perspicuity English cannot be surpassed, and this characteristic is largely due to the Saxon element, modified and strengthened by Latin syntax.

This same spirit of reserve and taciturnity made the Saxon use short words. This tendency, strengthened by the French custom of making final vowels silent, has made English even more monosyllabic than its progenitor, as far as the Saxon element is concerned. This gives it great power. Here are given two quotations illustrating this monosyllabic nature of our tongue. The first is from Macbeth:

“That is a step

On which I must fall down or else *o'erleap*,  
 For in my way it lies. Stars, hide your fires,  
 Let no light see my dark and deep *desires*.  
 The eye winks at my hand. Yet let that be  
 Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see.”

Here out of fifty-two words fifty have one syllable only.

A sonnet written by Dr. Addison Alexander runs as follows:

“Think not that strength lies in the big round word,  
 Or that the brief and plain must needs be weak.  
 To whom can this be true who once has heard  
 The cry for help, the tongue that all men speak,  
 When want, or woe, or fear is in the throat,  
 So that each word gasped out is like a shriek  
 Pressed from the sore heart, or a strange wild note  
 Sung by some fay or fiend! There is a strength  
 Which dies if stretched too far or spun too fine,  
 Which has more height than breadth, more depth than length.  
 Let but this force of thought and speech be mine,  
 And he that will may take the sleek, fat phrase,  
 Which glows but burns not, though it beam and shine—  
 Light, but no heat; a flash, but not a blaze.”

You will observe that there is not even a dissyllable in the whole passage and nearly all the words are Saxon.

It would be a pleasant task to trace the changes through which the language has passed between the days of Ælfred and the present time, but it is a work of too great length to be condensed into one article. Suffice it to say that the changes have tended to make the language simpler, and the result is that we have a speech of the greatest compass and widest adaptation. Jacob Grimm, the great master of linguistics, said of it: “In wisdom, wealth, and strict economy, no living

language can vie with it." It fully merits and will richly repay all study put upon it, and we may well rejoice that the day is not far distant when the historical study of English will be required by our colleges; when all educated English-speaking people will be able to trace the stream of our language back to its sources; and when a flood of light will be thrown upon it by deep researches into the misty past.

*Millwood, Va.*

WM. H. WHITING, JR.



## VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

### BRACE'S "UNKNOWN GOD."

THE UNKNOWN GOD; OR, INSPIRATION AMONG PRE-CHRISTIAN RACES. *By C. Loring Brace, author of "Gesta Christi," "Races of the Old World," etc.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. (All rights reserved.) 8vo., pp. ix., 336.

One is strongly attracted to this book as soon as one looks at it and lays hold of it. Its outward form is highly engaging, and its title piques the curiosity and sets the mind to thinking along the most important and at the same time most abstruse lines. The author's name is that of one of the accepted masters in his own chosen department, that of antique, and especially Oriental studies, considered particularly in their relation to the problems of comparative ethnology and religion. His lamented name and his works are by this time alike famous. We do not, however, care to be prejudiced one way or the other by this admitted fact. On the contrary, we intend to deal with the volume before us pretty much as if its author had never been heard of until now. We purpose, in other words, to consider Mr. Charles Loring Brace's discussion simply from the point of view of what we conceive to be its intrinsic merits or demerits.

The book we have in hand is one of high pretension, and, notwithstanding its immense range and the aridity of many of the fields it traverses, singularly captivating to any one at all competent to appreciate such investigations. The author of this massive treatise might seem at the first glance to have been able to cope with Dominie Sampson, or even with the younger Scaliger, in erudition, or at least in the erudition bearing mainly and directly upon his subject. He is in every sense a scholar, and apparently a ripe and good one. His style is clear and neat, if now and then a little diffuse, and, what is an admirable trait in a writer upon great subjects, he is never afraid to say right out just what he means, without parley or mitigation, and without regard to consequences. Mr. Brace could not have belonged to what Archbishop Whately, with injurious application to Maurice and his followers, denominated "the magic-lantern school." He does not put things in a half-luminous fog or leave them in an iridescent haze. His skies are wind-swept and utterly bare, and his ancient and foreign stars shine keen and cold.

If the writers from whom Mr. Brace quotes are at times hesitating or ambiguous, or for any reason obscure, Mr. Brace himself is always downright and always perspicuous. If, as we have intimated, this book to the sober and thoughtful reader is one of profound interest, we feel constrained to add that it is not to the attentive critic one of profound ability. There is, we grant, no little skill displayed in the marshalling and displaying of such an array of widely separated opinions, and opinions seemingly in diametrical conflict with each other, and so dressing the line as to make them appear to be in mutual harmony. The whole presentation of

the case is, we own, one of pleasing symmetry, and at last one of unity. The same praise may be bestowed upon Schelling's or Spinoza's scheme of pantheism. We do not mean to allege or to insinuate for one moment that Mr. Brace is himself a pantheist. We only mean that what the great Arnauld wrote upon the face of his copy of Mallebranche's Philosophy might, in our judgment, with some color of appropriateness, be written across the face of this fascinating work on "The Unknown God,"—"Nova, palchra, falsa."

The doctrine of this book is that the various pagan religions are due to a process of *evolution* from fetichism to fire-worship, at which, or at some kindred point, a pure theism has been detected through the symbols, a process which has been helped on by the inspiration of certain great sages and seers.

A large part of the author's contention is indeed by no means new. For in large part the effort would appear to be to reëstablish the shattered structure of the so-called "Absolute Religion" of Theodore Parker and his forerunners and successors, who held that all forms of religion upon the surface of the earth and in the history of the world, no matter how superstitious or perverted, are at bottom but phases or varied manifestations of the same *êtres suprême* and universal father.<sup>1</sup> This is the Catholic creed maintained in Pope's terse and sharp-witted line in the *Universal Prayer*, where it is the same Being essentially who is worshipped under the several names of "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord," and who makes all the necessary allowances and smiles with impartial benignity upon all the wrangling devotees. This might seem to be hinted even in the preliminary statement of the agnostic, Mr. Herbert Spencer, that there is always a core of good even in things evil. It is far more conclusively determined to be the view entertained by eminent continental writers, Mr. Baring Gould, Mr. Moncure Conway, and we suppose the great majority of comparative religionists of the day.<sup>2</sup> Surely there is nothing new in all this. Nor is there anything new in the theory here propounded of inspiration, which is confessedly *au fond* that of Morell (who borrowed it from Schleiermacher), and if we understand the Yale teacher, substantially also the improved theory of Professor Ladd; nor in the view that the difference between the inspiration of the canonical writers and that of the pious founders of religions (and we suspect Mr. Brace would concur with Morell in holding even that of ordinary Christians) is only a difference of degree. The novelty of Mr. Brace's exhibition of the doctrine of a universal, or nearly universal, spiritual religion and a world-wide inspiration may be said to lie in the splendid supremacy and final, and perhaps exclusive, triumph assigned in his ground-chart to Christianity, and the complacent, yet audacious, *sang froid* with

<sup>1</sup> If our author had gone no farther than to contend that the most debased forms of heathenism in our day were the deformed relics of a lofty, pure, spiritual monotheism that underlies some or even most of them, and originally preceded them all, we should not have demurred so strongly to the position he has taken up. In this, indeed, also there would have been nothing new. What we object to on the threshold is that he should seem to make so little of the prohibitions in the first and second commandments, and should, with so many other religious optimists, adopt an attitude of tolerance, not to say friendship, rather than one of stern resistance towards the avowed enemies of Jehovah. We object once more to his theory of a variable inspiration—variable we mean in degree—and to his contention that certain pagan sages and theosophists were endowed with an inspiration which (if we take his idea) was the same in kind with that of Moses and Isaiah. We allow that the word is legitimately used in lower senses, and that we may have failed to catch his true drift.

<sup>2</sup> "The Egyptian faith at one period seems only another form of the highest belief; it is one aspect, apparently, of the Absolute Religion." (Page 292.)

which this whole mixed scheme of undoubted truth and specious error is articulately formulated.

In venturing to depreciate to some extent the ability of this book, we were far from any thought of depreciating it altogether, and meant to confine our animadversion wholly to the logic and the theology which go to make up so much, in sooth the major part, of its anatomy and sinews. What we have the temerity (as it will appear to some of Mr. Brace's admirers) to contest, is the cogency and often the applicability of very much of Mr. Brace's fundamental and subordinate argumentation. His assertions of fact are, we believe, for the most part, unassailable, being not only correct in substance, but accurate in their minute shape.<sup>1</sup>

Our quarrel with this entertaining and accomplished guide is not at all usually with his alleged facts, but with his airy and sophistical inferences. We would not take him to task for his data so much as for his deductions. His exegesis of Scripture, for instance, nearly always contents itself with a *prima facie* impression. His logical procedure is of the most superficial character. We have reference to the logic by which he would support his distinctive whimsies. A similar process in physics might be made to prove that the earth is stationary in the heavens, and that the moon is made of green cheese.

We have adverted to the ambitious nature and scope of this volume. Some idea of this may be obtained from a recital of the topics of which it treats. Egyptian monotheism, the Jews and Egyptians, certain Akkadian penitential psalms, the Greek mysteries, Zeus regarded as the spiritual God, the religion of Socrates and Plato, the faith and writings of the Stoics (with prominent reference to Seneca, to Epictetus, and to Marcus Aurelius), Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Buddhism and its sacred books, heathen inspiration and the Scriptures, and the conversion of non-Christian nations, all come in for a somewhat full share of attention. There is a learned and awakening preface, a short appendix on "The Unknown God as revealed to the ancient Peruvians," and a good index. The chapters are introduced with brief quotations from such sources as the inscription on the temple of Isis, the Agamemnon, the Rig Veda, and the Bible.

The learned writer sets out by telling us that he will follow the "modern method," and search the Ethnic or heathen religions, not so much for their defects as to find out what good is in them. The aim would also be to try to put the reader in the place of those old pagans, so as to enable him to look through their eyes at the great mystery that lies beyond us. His further and more distinctive endeavor would be to evince that mankind in all ages and races have had traces of God and higher inspirations of the Divine Spirit. He takes for his theme the memorable words of Paul on Mars Hill, "The Unknown God," which he contends were applied by the apostle himself to "the spiritual Zeus" of the ancient Greeks. "The effort of the writer is to show the ancient belief of man in the unknown God, and that the great Father of all has granted his inspirations to many of very different countries and tribes and races." He begins with the Hamitic and Semitic races, including the Akkadians, and passes on to the Aryans. There is much that is of value in what is said of the civilization and historical environment of the ancient Egyptians, and of their contact with the Jews. He credits the scholars and priests of Misraim with a profound belief in the one God.

<sup>1</sup> Yet neither the Greek nor the history will bear him out in such exegesis as that of Acts ix, 2. There is a kindred shallowness about other of the expositions in this book.

The chapter on the Akkadians and their penitential psalms is peculiarly interesting, and the psalms (if we may rely on these translations) do certainly have a true Semitic ring, and a positive resemblance up to a certain point to those of David and his associates in the Psalter. This primitive folk were at an extremely remote period mountaineers of northern or northeastern Babylonia. They had some, a good deal, of cultivation, and are thought to have invented the cuneiform mode of writing. Akkad, or Agade, their city, is mentioned in the book of Genesis. They used to be generally regarded as "Turanians," possessing, as was supposed, an agglutinative tongue, and to be connected in language with such races as the Finns, Madjars, Turks, Mongols and Tartars. But Halévy, Delitzsch, Lyon (1887), and now Mr. Brace, think (or thought) it probable that the Akkadians were in the main Semitic in blood, though perhaps with strong Turanian mixture. We feel safe in saying, however, that the weight of authority is still on the other side. Our author surmises that the "language of their inscriptions and tablets may have been a kind of classical or sacred dialect of the Semitic Assyrians." The people, it is declared, were considerably advanced in civilization between two and four thousand years before Christ.<sup>1</sup> They had founded great libraries, and written treatises on astrology, magic and mathematics, besides histories of the wars and exploits of the Assyrian kings. They had built temples and many public edifices, and seem to have been extensively engaged in commerce. Our author makes the following important observations:

"This race of people is deeply interesting to the students of religions, because it manifestly drew its traditions from the same source with the Hebrews. And from the region inhabited or influenced by the Akkadians came forth one of the great figures of history—Abraham, the father of Monotheism." (Page 52.)

The investigation of the annals and records of the Aryan races leads our author to speak of those remarkable associations among the Greeks, "like secret churches," known as the Mysteries. All this, too, is highly interesting. From the rites of these secret societies it is argued that a certain number surreptitiously adhered to the belief in God and a future judgment.

The early Greek poetry is then examined, and the conclusion is reached that there was such a thing as faith in a spiritual God, or Zeus, before the notion had been marred and degraded by mytho-poetic fancy. The evidence from the Greek dramatists, and many other ancient writers, is regarded as overwhelming in favor of the averment that one spiritual God was at certain times worshipped by considerable numbers of the Hellenic race.

The close study of Plato and Socrates and the Stoics leads to similar results. "Pure monotheism" and "genuine religion" were not unknown.

We are then carried once more to the Orient, and to the Persian and Indian branches of the great Indo-Germanic stock.

The religion of Zoroaster, as exhibited in the Zend Avesta and elsewhere, is next subjected to critical tests, and pronounced the simplest and purest of the pagan systems.

The old Vedic hymns are made to furnish proof of Hindu monotheism in the worship of Varuna, the heaven-god.

---

<sup>1</sup> The date of Sargon the Great is now put back by some as far as 3800 B. C. We are not to be understood as endorsing such statements.

Ample extracts are laid before the reader from the Egyptian, Akkadian, Persian and Indian sources. The most extended description in the book is devoted to Buddhism, and copious selections are given from the *Dhammapada*, and other sacred writings of the Buddhists. "The author," (so he tells us himself,) "regards Buddha (or Gautama) as in a high degree inspired, and as an instrument in the hands of Providence for the elevation and purification of Asia." Buddhism and Christianity are contrasted, and the causes traced which have interfered with the success of the more strictly oriental system. Buddhism was intended and is suited only for the subtle philosophic mind. On the other hand, Christianity was designed for and is adapted to the masses.

The last chapter in this notable volume respects the biblical argument for the inspiration of the heathen, and modest advice is given as to how the missionary should carry on his work of religious teaching, especially among the Buddhists.

Our author earnestly protests that his treatise is not to be regarded either as a critical attack on heathenism or as a critical defence of Christianity. "The endeavor is rather to show what great truths have inspired the pious heathen of the past, and how far the influences of the Divine Spirit have reached remote and separated tribes of men, and revealed to them the nature of God, and their duties to their fellow-men. It is an effort to manifest the ways of God to men in a field not hitherto much traversed. It is believed the most devout disciple of Christianity will find little to shock his faith in these presentations, but will rather be strengthened by this broader view of the providence of God to men."

The limits allotted to this notice do not admit of the adequate treatment of so large a subject. If Mr. Charles Loring Brace had contented himself with his faithful and invaluable exhibition of the extent to which a simple, a pure, a heaven-descended monotheism has been recognized among the ancient nations beyond the pale of Judaism, there would have been little exception to be taken to the manner in which he has executed that task. This, however, would have been merely restating and proving over again what was already familiarly known.<sup>1</sup> To cite a single example of such knowledge, Mr. Gladstone, in his *Juventus Mundi*, finds a tradition as well as a poetic element in the poems of Homer, and refers the mythology to the poets and the earlier monotheism to tradition. A moiety, indeed, of Mr. Brace's discussion, we should say, might be met by the mediæval rejoinder, *Quis dubitavit?* It is surely quite late in the day to attempt by elaborate reasoning to establish the coexistence of natural and revealed religion. The notorious fact and tenor of Bishop Butler's argument would of themselves demonstrate (for they presuppose) the previous recognition of a religion based upon the postulates and deductions of nature unenlightened by a supernatural revelation.

The point where our author breaks down is in his attempt to account for the phenomena which in a majority of cases he has unquestionably ascertained. In

<sup>1</sup> Even the position actually advocated in this volume would seem to have been taken by many of the Christian fathers, and by a large body of saintly men of a later period, including probably the author of that immortal hymn, the *Dies Irae*, in reference to the Sibylline oracles. The view of the ancient church may or may not be expressed in the line,

"*Teste David cum Sibyllâ.*"

The prophecies introduced into those successive volumes are now known to have been *post eventum*, and are contained in those of the Sibylline books which most distinctly betray their Jewish origin and the later interpolations made by Christian hands.

attributing them to an inferior degree of divine and spiritual inspiration, he glaringly begs the whole question in debate, and commits himself to an indefensible and mischievous theory of inspiration.

There are several alternatives. In some cases the phenomena have been mistaken. As Edersheim has so ably evinced (in reply to Emanuel Deutsch's famous article on the "Talmud"), and Bishop Lightfoot, in his masterly excursus on the seeming correspondences betwixt the teachings of Christianity and those of the Stoics,<sup>1</sup> the apparent resemblance often turns out to be a resemblance in form only and not in substance. In the other cases it may be accounted for by referring it either to the operation of the natural intelligence and conscience, or to the widespread prevalence of the primitive tradition handed down by Adam, by Seth, by Noah and his sons, and by their immediate successors, or to direct revelations made in very early ages to men like Job and Melchizedek; in later instances even by referring it, as in the case of Mohammedanism, to the Christian Scriptures themselves.

Yet we have much to thank the author for, and we agree with him on a number of matters. We praise him for assigning reasonably moderate dates to most of the great founders of religions, and coincide with him on many scholastic points, as in his translation of the debated terms in Paul's Athenian sermon, including the phrase answering to the Unknown God.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

WATTS'S "NEW APOLOGETIC."

THE NEW APOLOGETIC; or, The Down-Grade in Criticism, Theology and Science. By Professor Robert Watts, D. D., LL. D., Assembly's College, Belfast. 8vo., cloth; pp. xxvii., 358. Price, \$2.25. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1890.

Readers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY need not be told that the author of this work writes in the interest of the faith as they hold it; the trumpet in his hand gives no uncertain sound; he is decisively and uncompromisingly on the side of that system of truth and doctrine set forth in the Westminster standards, interpreted according to the strictest sect of what is now generally styled the conservative, traditional school. With such readers it also goes without saying that Dr. Watts expresses his views with great clearness and defends them with great vigor. The reader may perhaps disagree with the author, but he will never be in any doubt of the latter's meaning; and if called upon to take issue with him, we judge, most readers will be ready to admit that he is no mean antagonist. These admirable qualities, clearness and vigor, will be readily accorded the work under consideration.

In his preface the author says: "The articles now contained in this volume were originally produced from time to time, as occasion offered and the claims of truth seemed to demand." Of course this fact very materially affects the character of the volume. We cannot avoid the feeling that a more suitable title might have been chosen. One feels naturally some surprise at coming across an elaborate critique

<sup>1</sup> The reader would do well to compare with this the masterly and evidently impartial treatment of the same subject by Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve of the Johns Hopkins University, in an elaborate disquisition embodied in his admirable edition of *Justin Martyr*.

of the views of Albert Barnes in a volume entitled "The New Apologetic," more particularly when the critique refers to Dr. Barnes as still alive. The same is true of the criticism of Horace Bushnell's views. We regret that our author did not confine himself to more modern material. His work would then have had a freshness and a unity that are now somewhat lacking to it. One cannot, without manifest sacrifice, throw into a volume a collection of isolated essays, published at long intervals, treating diverse subjects, and called forth by very diverse occasions. We regret our author's course the more because there is ample material for an entirely "timeous" discussion, and we know of no hand more competent to this valuable service than that of Dr. Watts.

The book contains thirteen chapters; of these the first six deal mainly with the doctrine of inspiration. Chapter *third*, with the exception of a few introductory paragraphs, is a reprint of our author's excellent article contributed to the October, 1889, number of this QUARTERLY. In these chapters the different phases of the doctrine of inspiration, as defined and defended by the advocates of the "Progressive Theology," are discussed. It is needless here to specify; our readers are doubtless familiar with the subject. Dr. Watts dissects these erratic views with his wonderful skill. Something more than one-third of the entire volume is devoted to this general topic, and it is space well and wisely expended. We deem this *the* battle ground of doctrinal controversy. In their last analysis all the assaults on traditional orthodoxy will be found to impinge directly upon this great doctrine. We believe the time has come for a restatement and vindication and emphasis of the doctrine of plenary, verbal inspiration, with especial reference to the developments of the last twenty years.

The *seventh* chapter is a criticism of a St. Giles sermon, preached by Dr. Dods, and treating of the essentials of Christianity. This distinguished minister is represented as having maintained in the venerable cathedral of St. Giles that neither the doctrine of Christ's deity nor the orthodox doctrine of the atonement is essential to a true faith! The preacher is also criticised as opposing, rather than favoring, the Westminster doctrine of the atonement.

Chapter *eighth* is a reprint of an article appearing in the *Catholic Presbyterian* for April, 1883, contributed to a symposium on Progress in Theology. When read in that periodical it impressed us as perhaps the best of a series of able and attractive papers.

The *ninth* and *tenth* chapters deal respectively with Albert Barnes and Horace Bushnell on the atonement. They furnish a vigorous vindication of the Westminster doctrine of the nature and extent of the atonement. Next we have a criticism of Prof. Le Conte's work on Evolution, a criticism which appeared in this QUARTERLY for January, 1889.

The *twelfth* chapter is a short and sharp attack upon Prof. Drummond's popular little tract, "The Greatest Thing in the World."

The last chapter is entitled "The Confessional Controversy."

Such is the outline of a strong discussion, one very creditable to its author and very serviceable to the cause of truth and of sound, consistent, scriptural doctrine. We have read it with pain and pleasure—pain, that there should be anywhere a call for such a discussion, and particularly in a church with which the names of such men as Chalmers, Cunningham, Melville, Candlish and Knox have been so indissolubly and so gloriously associated; it is a pleasure, however, to find in

the breach such a champion as Dr. Watts, a man who believes with all his soul and defends with all his might the faith once delivered to the saints.

As we read the radical divergence of eminent men from the standards to which they have solemnly covenanted their loyalty, we cannot resist the anxious reflection, what will the end be? The maintenance of such views under such auspices is an indication that bodes exceeding ill for the future. We feel as if the very air were electric with disturbance, and the foundations themselves were trembling. Every month brings evidence of a widening unrest, and we shall not be greatly surprised at a revolution in the near future. Either the whole theory of creed-subscription must be revolutionized or there will be such a rupture of church connections as has never been witnessed. Indeed, we are sometimes tempted to fear that this revolution has been already wrought, and that by tacit consent there has been a "revision" already effected: a revision that renders all change of creed superfluous; a revision that reaches far beneath all symbols of faith, more radical than any yet dreamed of even by the most advanced progressive.

*Columbia, S. C.*

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

#### CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. *By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary.* Vol. VII. Pp. 410. Price, \$1.50. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 1890.

This volume of "Current Discussions in Theology," or the "Annual Review," covers the period from March 31, 1889, to March 31, 1890. It will sustain the reputation of its predecessors, and has found a hearty welcome at many a study table. For the benefit of those who have not had the pleasure of forming its acquaintance hitherto we offer the following statement of its scope from the publishers:

"The seventh volume of this annual review of current theological discussions has about the same characteristics which have marked the previous issues, and which have made them valuable. It gives a comprehensive outlook as to what has been done in the whole range of sacred learning during the past year. In its preparation, critical reference has been made to the most recent literature, and while the consideration of new works necessarily is brief, yet enough of the results of the latest investigation is given to make the book of immediate value to the student. While the writers of the various departments are not in sympathy with mere theological novelties, yet nothing is omitted which should have a place in such an annual survey. The necessity of noticing that which seems to be new, and which claims to be better than the old, naturally gives prominence to radical teachings and criticisms; but it is of these things especially that the student and pastor desire to be advertised. The discussions cover exegetical, historical, systematic and practical theology. They present such a summary of that which is agitating the theological world as makes the volume indispensable to the pastor and the student who would keep abreast of the times and have an intelligent apprehension of the drift and progress of ideas."

So much for the scope of the book. Its comprehensiveness is little short of audacious. If any one fancies that it must of necessity be a mere crude catalogue of the books and review articles which have poured from the teeming presses of England, Germany, France and America, during 1889-'90, he will find himself mistaken. The boldness of the conception is redeemed from the charge of reck-



lessness by the success which marks its execution. Many a busy pastor, with little money and less time, will find the book a godsend. It will give him in brief compass, clear outline and readable form, a practically exhaustive summary of the several phases of the theological thought of the period covered. Every intelligent pastor will find the book one not only of present interest, but of permanent value.

The volume as a whole furnishes not only much valuable information, but much food for thought. Take, for instance, the following statements from the pen of Dr. Boardman, who represents the department of systematic theology: "The unrest of the theological world, noticed in the last number of *Current Discussions*, has increased during the last year." "There are many causes combining to throw this denomination (*i. e.*, the Congregationalists) into a ferment. The considerations demanding attention are so many that it is impossible to draw party lines; persons may agree on one point who differ on another. It may also be said that the questions in dispute are of such a character that *there ought not to be*, probably *will not be*, any rupture of denominational lines" (italics ours). "The Presbyterian Church is in a ferment more general than that of the Congregationalists. It is agitated over the question of a new creed or the revision of an old one. . . . The aim of the agitators will be understood when it is stated that the effort is to bring the creed of the church into accord with popular preaching, and that the popular preaching has of late drawn upon the Arminian vocabulary." There are other passages not less significant which might be quoted did time permit. These are not the words of an alarmist, hence they may well strike us with genuine alarm. We do well to ask, Why this unrest in the sphere of systematic theology? Are we far wrong in seeking the answer in the unrest that pervades the sphere of exegetical theology, using the term in its broad sense? If the foundations are being rudely assaulted, it is little wonder that the superstructure trembles visibly under the shock. Are we mistaken in thinking that it is upon the foundation—the integrity, authenticity, genuineness, supernatural origin and divine authority of the Bible—that the church needs to centre her most serious attention at present? If it were only that the high winds of popular sentiment were swelling into a hurricane, and beating fiercely against certain graceful "cloud-capped" spires of theological speculation, we might abate our anxiety, and watch to see whether their inward strength would be equal to their external symmetry; and even if they should fall, we might still chasten our souls into a silent though sorrowing submission. But the case is quite different. It appears that the effort is being made to reduce the very foundations of the Christian system into rubbish for the antiquarian, to convert them into putty or wax, out of which the plastic but weak fingers of religious sentimentalists may construct systems provided "with all modern improvements" and ornamented with a proper amount of gorgeous and imposing nineteenth century "gingerbread work." This, or something very like this, will appear if one will examine the current of thought in "exegetical theology," as set forth in this seventh volume of the "Annual Review." Now only let it be remembered that a very slight displacement of the foundation is sufficient to wreck the most massive superstructure, and the real criticalness of our present position will stand out distinctly before the mind.

Would it be a matter for great surprise if, within the next ten or fifteen years, there should be ministers put on trial for their ecclesiastical lives in our own church in connection with these very questions of biblical criticism? Is the church prepared to meet such an issue? It cannot be fairly or finally met by any amount of pious

declamation or bitter denunciation. Questions of Greek and Hebrew etymology and syntax, questions of archæology, questions of the *usus loquendi*, questions of interpretation, cannot be disposed of in this way; nor can they be settled by *a priori* speculations. They can only be settled by a painstaking, patient, prayerful study of the Bible itself in the original languages. Clearly these are questions in the decision of which sound scholarship must tell, will tell, ought to tell. It will not be enough for us to claim that we have all the piety, if we leave to those who oppose our most cherished convictions the palm, not of general culture or general scholarship, but of biblical scholarship. God calls us as never before to the study of his own word. We refuse to heed the call at our peril.

*Columbia Seminary.*

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

BLACK'S "FATHERHOOD OF GOD."

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD. *By Rev. William Henry Black, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.*

Pp. ix., 108. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House. 1889.

This is a minim of five sermons. They were delivered to the congregation of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church by the pastor, who takes pleasure in saying that he is still in the thirties. They profess to be theological, but they are far more sentimental. A few quotations will show the reader that we are bound to dissent from the teachings of the little volume.

Our author, in his opening sentences, indicts all the theology which has preceded him. "Very early in my ministry . . . I was impressed with the idea that it would be profitable in many ways if the science of theology could be constructed upon a method which would be *preachable*. I felt that the scholastic Augustinian method was good as far as mere science is concerned, but that it was not adapted to the necessities of popular discourse. It is too abstract, too bald of practical forms, too esoteric in its terminology. I felt the need of a concrete method, of an Anglo-Saxon expression." To say that Chalmers and Guthrie, Robert Hall and Charles Spurgeon, were the disciples of a theology that was not "preachable," is superlatively monstrous. We literally despise this demand, erected in the name of "popular discourse," for a theology of an "Anglo-Saxon expression." That theology which systematizes the facts of the Bible is as "popular" as it ought to be, and must be "preachable," as Christ has commanded it. Our author lifts his lamentation out of his feelings. Perhaps his feelings need the reconstruction instead of his theology. Many to-day are revising the wrong thing. We are reminded of the pitiful cry of a New York pastor: "Few think of the stupendous task of finding something new and striking and edifying to say on an old, old theme. . . . Hearers, sympathize with us men in the pulpit." What will Dr. Black do when the theology of Fatherhood has become hackneyed?

Our author postulates the fatherhood of God as "the genetic principle" of theology, "the principle which interprets and adjusts all the facts of the science." The fall of man, the punishment of sin, the partial salvation of the race—can a theology with this central principle construe such facts as these? If the fall occurred under fatherly government, it is a mere calamity, to be pitied and not punished. Are all inflictions but fatherly chastisements? It is a strange father who can forgive some of his children and not all, where all are alike disobedient.

“In this system fatherhood takes the place of divine sovereignty in the Calvinistic system, the place of justification by faith in the Lutheran system, and the place of divine immanence in the so-called ‘New Theology.’” All the portraiture of the book is that of a “father bending over his sin-sick child watching for a small sign of recognition.” “The word ‘lost’ in the Bible is not intended to describe the condition of the sinner, but the vacancy in the heart of our Father.” This looks as if redemption was in order to soothe the bereaved heart of God! This gospel makes the reinstatement of the sinner in his Father’s house a condition necessary to the relief of his own heart. With the carnal it ought to be popular.

Charleston, S. C.

R. A. WEBB.

DODS’S “BOOK OF GENESIS.”

THE BOOK OF GENESIS (Expositor’s Bible). By Marcus Dods, D. D., author of “*Israel’s Iron Age*,” “*The Parables of our Lord*,” “*The Prayer that Teaches to Pray*,” etc. Pp. viii., 445. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1890.

The author of this volume is just now the most conspicuous person in Scotland. He has long been known as an accomplished scholar, a solid preacher, and an uncommonly strong and prolific writer. The excellent quality of his work is better known than its amazing quantity. He became an author at a very early age, publishing his *Translation of Augustine* just as he left college, and following it with his book on the “*Lord’s Prayer*,” even before he had a church “to lend a fulcrum to his authorship.” He has written steadily ever since, so that he is now the author of eleven books, has edited fifty-eight different volumes besides, and has contributed innumerable articles to magazines and reviews. This seems almost incredible, especially when we remember that he has always devoted the greater part of his time and attention to the duties of a large and laborious pastorate. The wonder would be less, too, if the work were inferior; but it is no less vigorous than voluminous. Such a man must become known. But, in addition to all this, recent events have thrown him into extraordinary prominence. He has three times been accused of heresy. “It is surely one of the cruelest features of the strained theological situation,” says a great writer of our day, “not only that a public man takes his life in his hands every time he opens his lips, but that he is liable to have his influence marred and his spirit troubled for years by any spark of suspicion regarding him that may be idly dropped on the combustible elements of religious intolerance.” But there are compensations, for, however painful to a man like Dr. Dods, such a charge, whether true or false, is certain to give him the ear of the Scotch people; and if he be a man of real ability, and can disprove the allegations against him, his popularity will be permanent. Witness the fact that since his appointment as professor in the New College, Dr. Dods’s class-room has been full to overflowing, while everything from his pen is read with avidity. Some Scotchmen are said indeed to like mildly heretical doctrine. Two gentlemen in a Glasgow hotel on a recent Sunday were considering at the supper table what preacher they would go to hear that evening, and finally decided on a certain gentleman, by saying, “There’s a dash o’ *heeresy* about him.”

But whatever the reasons, Dr. Dods as a writer and teacher is now known the world over. As a preacher he is less famous. By some, indeed, he is regarded as

the foremost preacher of the Free Church. But his style of preaching is not popular. The massiveness of his thought and the tameness of his manner make against him with the average hearer. "There is too much ball for the powder." In fact he narrowly missed exclusion from all pastoral work on this account. For *six years* after his graduation he sought a field in vain. *Twenty-three times he was rejected by churches to which he preached on trial!* There is comfort in this for men who have experienced the horrors of "candidating." One congregation, however, did have the discernment to appreciate his worth. This was the Renfield Church in Glasgow, to which he continued to preach for twenty-five years, though often urged to leave it for places of greater emolument and prominence. His ministry was a fruitful one too. But there can be no doubt that he is better fitted for the chair of Greek Exegesis, which he now holds, than for any pastorate. His extraordinary power of analysis and his phenomenal biblical scholarship can be used by him to better purpose here than in the pulpit, while his wide acquaintance with English literature and his nervous style will by no means come amiss.

All these qualities and others appear to good advantage in the volume before us. Professor Henry Drummond's high estimate of Dr. Dods's preaching, which seemed to us too high at the time it appeared, no longer surprises us, after reading these lectures. The manner and style are for the most part excellent. As we turned one rich page after another we were reminded of a description of John Foster from the pen of Dr. Dods himself, which we read some years ago, and which we quote here as applicable to its author: "There is in him an intense thirst for knowledge, an affinity for what is spiritual, a keenness of observation, a closeness of reasoning, and a living vigor which give depth and felicity to his style and make his writing continuously trenchant and suggestive." A fine example of unconscious self-description.

The plan of the series to which this work belongs is too well known to require any extended description. Though called "The Expositor's Bible," the design is not to give a detailed exposition of each verse, but, by a broader treatment than that of the commentaries, to present the great practical lessons of a given portion of Scripture, and to convey a clear idea of each book as a whole. In order to the best work of this sort a man must have a critical knowledge of the Bible combined with a certain comprehensiveness of mind,—a rare combination, but it is found in Dr. Dods. Few scholars are as thorough as he, and few thinkers have as much breadth of view. Add to these his high qualities of conscience, and we have an almost ideal expositor. The work is characterized throughout by a singular fidelity to the meaning of the sacred writer and a severe exclusion of that allegorism which even in our own day too often substitutes the fancies of men for the word of God. There are of course here and there statements from which we would dissent. Of special interest are his chapters on the Creation and the Deluge. It would not be conceded by all that "in every branch of the human family traditions of the flood are found." The black race seems to have had no such tradition. The author adopts Kurtz's view of Jacob's wrestling, which is very different from the common view, but he presents it with great power. Altogether, the book is worthy of the man, and it will probably carry his influence to a wider circle of readers than he has ever before reached.

W. W. MOORE.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

## BURGE'S "ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES."

THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES. *By Lorenzo Burge.* Pp. 132. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1889.

The truth of Scripture is constantly receiving unexpected illustrations. The captious criticisms of yesterday are exploded by the startling discoveries of to-day. The correctness of this statement is strikingly confirmed in connection with the book now under review. From time immemorial skeptics have cavilled at the longevity ascribed to the antediluvians in Scripture. They can cavil no more. The nineteenth century, among its other glories, has produced a number of men whose longevity throws that of the antediluvians into the shade. Mr. Burge, for instance, seems likely entirely to eclipse the venerable Methuselah in the matter of age. The famous antediluvian only reached the age of nine hundred and sixty-nine years. Mr. Burge, however, seems to be, upon the most modest estimate, from two thousand to two thousand five hundred years old—possibly much older. He is, of course, too modest to give us his age in exact numbers, but he lets out his secret by giving us to understand that he lived upon terms of closest intimacy with "that eminent Persian nobleman Nehemiah," who himself lived about 350 B. C. This at least seems to be a not unwarranted inference from the way in which Mr. Burge writes. For example, he says:

"A careful examination of the Old Testament shows that the most important part of the book is the work of one person. Who that person is we shall see later.

"The main portion, including a part of Genesis to Esther, is a history of the covenants made by the Deity with Abraham," etc., etc.

"This history is written in a free and flowing style," etc., etc. "It covers the whole life of the Hebrew nation to the captivity, records . . . the formation of the Jewish nation and its history to and including Nehemiah, and could not have been the work of any one previous to his time." (Pp. 15, 16.) "In Nehemiah we have a continuation of the history of the new nation in the first person until he returned to Persia. . . .

"Still greater honor belongs to him for his labors in collecting the Hebrew records, scattered as they were throughout Persia and Babylonia, translating into the Aramaic tongue (the language of Babylonia) the contract made by their fathers with Jehovah, together with the law, and the blessings and cursings connected therewith, and also from the records mentioned translating into the same vernacular an epitome of the history of their people for a thousand years, with particular reference to the results of their contract with Jehovah, as shown in each period of their existence; a work without which we should to-day have no Old Testament, and perhaps no Bible." (P. 36.) . . . "When he (*i. e.*, Nehemiah,) returned to Persia, in accordance with his original promise to the king, he left the country prosperous. . . . He found the king at Babylon, and he employed his time while in Babylonia and in Persia in searching for and gathering together the various religious, biographical and historical works mentioned by him as authorities for *his history*." (P. 44; italics ours.)

. . . . "These 'writings and commentaries' of Nehemiah were ever after treasured by the Jews, and, with the prophetic works, became 'the law and the prophets' of the Hebrew Scriptures of the time of Christ."

All this, and much more in the same vein, would be profoundly interesting but for the deep-seated incredulity of the human heart. Let him speak with never so much assurance, yet there are those who will not believe that Mr. Burge ever saw Nehemiah, or sustained any such intimate relations to "that eminent Persian

nobleman," as are so delicately hinted at in the foregoing reminiscences. This is to be greatly deplored, not for Mr. Burge's sake, but for their own.

It is scarcely necessary to say, that should the reader of this belong to the class of unbelievers just referred to, it would be useless for him to purchase this admirable memoir of Nehemiah by his oldest surviving friend. We have not seen Mr. Burge's other books, but we have a shrewd suspicion that they would reveal the fact that he is a pre-Adamite. If so, he owes it to himself, no less than to science, to speak out. Adieu, venerable man, adieu.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

BESANT AND PALMER'S "JERUSALEM."

THE HISTORY OF JERUSALEM, THE CITY OF HEROD AND SALADIN. *By Walter Besant and E. H. Palmer, late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.* New edition. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1889. Pp. xiv., 525.

This is a new edition of a book which first appeared in 1871. So thoroughly was the work done in the first instance, however, that very few changes are necessary even after the lapse of twenty years. The chapter on "Modern Jerusalem" has been properly suppressed, because so many changes have taken place there in the last two decades that it was no longer a faithful account. But we do not see why the appendix to the first edition should have been omitted, since the recent discoveries in Jerusalem have only tended to confirm the positions there taken as to the site of the Holy Sepulchre and the location of Herod's temple. With the exception of these two omissions the alterations have been very slight indeed.

It must not be inferred from the foregoing remarks, by those who are not familiar with this work, that it is taken up with those interminable controversies about the topography of Jerusalem, from which, as Dr. Thompson prays, *libera nos, Domine*, though it was the study of these vexed questions that suggested to Mr. Besant the first thought of the volume before us. It is not a geography, then, nor a topographical polemic, but a history. It gives the history of Jerusalem "from about the year 30 to the present time," and as this period includes the siege and capture by Titus, the last revolts of the Jews, the Christian occupation of three centuries, the Mohammedan conquest, the Crusades, the Christian kingdom, the reconquest and the Mohammedan domination to the present day, there ought to be no lack of interest. And yet to how many scholars even is the history of Jerusalem during all these centuries a great blank!

In their collaboration Messrs. Besant and Palmer have used both Mohammedan and Christian sources; Prof. Palmer, who was the most accomplished Arabic scholar in Europe, contributing the chapters on the Mohammedan views of the city's history. These views had never before appeared in English. This book, therefore, was the pioneer of all such valuable works as Mr. Guy Le Strange's *Palestine under the Moslems*, which has just appeared, and which makes such scholarly use of the works of mediæval Mohammedan geographers and travellers. Jerusalem is a holy place to Moslem as well as Christian. The American tourist, when shown the projecting column of the wall at Jerusalem on which Mohammed will sit when he comes to judge the world, muttered the wish that Mohammed would judge the world "from some roost of his own at Mecca," and not interfere with *our* holy places. We all sympathize with the sentiment of our fellow-citizen. But we must

admit the fact that Jerusalem is, and for centuries has been, a holy place to the Mohammedans. And it were the blindest bigotry to decline the aid that may be gotten from Mohammedan authors in our study of her history and topography. It is freely and effectively used here.

No less thoroughly has Mr. Besant ransacked the Christian literature of the subject. To his practised hand is due also the charm of style which pervades the book. These brilliant chapters on the Crusades are almost enough to make one regret that Mr. Besant did not continue to work in this field instead of giving himself to fiction and philanthropy. He is an honest historian. The immoralities of the Crusaders are fearlessly exposed. When Saladin and Richard are described, the latter suffers in the comparison. Faithful research, historic imagination, and vivid style, these are the chief characteristics of the work, and it is the combination of these that make it the best book on its subject in our language.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

W. W. MOORE.

HUNT'S "STUDIES IN LITERATURE," ETC.

STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND STYLE. *By T. W. Hunt, Ph. D., Professor of English Philology and Discourse in the College of New Jersey.* New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889.

"About a page-and-a-half," says the potentate of the QUARTERLY. "Ten pages wouldn't do either the subject or the author justice," groans the tortured reviewer inwardly; but the powers are inexorable, and if injustice is done, theirs be the blame, not ours. Yet, if criticism is to be a sample, neither of the "foreordained favorable," nor of that "war-whoop-and-tomahawk" ferocity, so deservedly deprecated by Prof. A. S. Hill, one can do but scant justice in so limited a space. Here inductive or constructive criticism of literature and style is impossible, and a judicial view of the book itself only partly feasible.

But a truce to space-wasting apologies, called forth only by the undoubted merits of the book and its subject, both of which must be so slightly treated. Mr. Hunt's new book follows the beaten path of its predecessor, *Representative Prose Authors*, and illustrates the faults and excellencies of this work. The faults, however, are minimized in the later work, and the excellencies are more "sharply accentuated." The most conspicuous defect of the book is its style. Clear, clean-cut, correct, if we may be allowed to tease the initial letter somewhat, it lacks vigor, beauty and variety. The level is fairly high, but it is a level cultivated, well harrowed, and with but few patches of "greenth" and floral beauty. We could scarcely suspect the author of ever being guilty of an "impassioned parenthesis." He wields his intellectual scalpel with the precision of an expert. To change the figure, everything is neatly labeled, pigeonholed, and warranted to keep for an unlimited time. After going through with chapter after chapter of heads and sub-heads, flesh and blood revolt at so much unseemly obtrusion of the skeleton frame-work. Even if the book were intended only for the students, the teacher's passion for analysis should be held in abeyance, and more be left to the reader's penetration. But after all this is said, and it sounds much harsher than it really would if one only had space to explain one's self fully, the book is an admirable exhibition of judicious criticism, not warped by prejudice nor swayed by passion or favoritism. A genuine catholicity of taste, rare as it is commendable,

is displayed throughout. The author shows a wide acquaintance with the best literature, and always has "the courage of his convictions." His conservative estimate of such "men of light and leading" as Matthew Arnold and Emerson, well illustrates his fairness. These two chapters, and the one on "Prose Style and Poetry," are the freshest and best in the book.

In the introductory chapter, too, the author rises to the height of his great argument, and sets forth the dignity of literature, and its claims upon the time and attention of the student, with commendable zeal. We hope that some time in the future Mr. Hunt will add some more studies of individual authors. Such topics being more specific than the literary problems discussed by him, cannot fail to arouse greater interest and direct the reader's attention to the best and the worthiest names in our noble literature. Even in Pandemonium 'the lesser infernal deities were reduced to pigmies in the presence of the "thrones and imperial powers." But with us "the scrannel pipes of wretched straw" threaten to silence Milton's "organ notes."

Such a work as Mr. Hunt's makes the unreasoning public, bobbing up and down amidst the flotsam fads of the hour, look to their pilots, and ask the pertinent question, "Whither?"

*Davidson College.*

W. S. CURRELL.

#### VAN DYKE'S LECTURES ON THE CHURCH.

THE CHURCH: HER MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS. Lectures Delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in 1890. *By Henry J. Van Dyke, D. D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn.* 8vo., pp. 265. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 38 West Twenty-third street. 1890.

In his preface the author gives a cautionary statement, which ought to be held in mind. "It may be proper," he says, "though hardly necessary, to add, that while these Lectures were delivered in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., by invitation of its Faculty, no one but their author is in any way responsible for them." Any strictures, consequently, that may in this notice be passed upon the views presented in this work must not be construed as having reference to those taught in Princeton Seminary, except, of course, where it is a matter of notoriety that there is a coincidence between them. With his wonted manliness the author assumes the sole responsibility for his positions.

Dr. Van Dyke is known from Maine to the Rio Grande. It is, therefore, almost needless to remark that he is a prominent, able, distinguished minister of the Northern Presbyterian Church. We have been accustomed to hold him in honor and admiration for his great ability, his literary attainments, his splendid rhetoric, and his undoubted courage in maintaining his convictions in the face of odds the most formidable. These qualities are illustrated in the book before us. It is able, the style is clear, vigorous and elegant, and some of its doctrinal positions, boldly enounced, must have caused the atmosphere of Princeton to palpitate. While cheerfully rendering this tribute to the author, we confess that, as we have been disposed to regard him as a standard-bearer of orthodoxy, according to the conception of Calvinists and Presbyterians, we have been surprised by some of the views which are maintained in his work. We have no inclination to pass strictures upon



Dr. Van Dyke. If we were compelled to couch a lance we would much prefer to level it against some one else, rather than the man who has in past times so gallantly done battle for the great principle of the spirituality of the church. But where the interests of truth are involved, we are at liberty to make no compromise of our convictions, to know neither master nor father, neither mother nor brothers nor sisters. The deeply interesting question, to one who endeavors to scan the signs of the times as they are registered upon the ecclesiastical firmament, is, how far the author's views represent those of the great church of which he is so conspicuous a member?

There are, as was to be expected, many things in the work which are well and truly said, and had we room, in a notice like this, we would gladly expatiate upon them; but we must confine ourselves to the less pleasant, but perhaps more useful, task of pointing out some of those things from which we are obliged to dissent, and which we believe to be, either in spirit or in the letter, inconsistent with the traditional and scriptural orthodoxy of the Presbyterian Church. This is done, we say again, not from any wish to criticise the author, but for the purpose of indicating the answer, which is astonishingly in the process of rendition to the significant question that constituted the title of a preceding and notorious book—“*Whither?*”

1. The preface distinctly and candidly foreshadows the main contention of the work. It gives its essence. It uncorks the vial and sets free an aroma which impinges strongly upon the *emuncta nares* of Presbyterians. It reveals the fact that the author is under the spell of a dream, which mighty men before him have dreamed, of the unification of the visible church. It is, under the conditions which at the present mark the development of the church, but a dream; and the desire for its realization, even within the circle of Protestantism, in this period of its history through human effort, without a remarkable interposition of God's providence, is objectionable for several reasons: *First*, Because it supposes the relinquishment of important truths. It needs little argument to show that the only basis of such unity would be the mere essentials of the gospel; that is, those doctrines the holding of which is necessary to salvation. That would involve the excision by each denomination of what is peculiar to itself. Look at some of those which the Presbyterian Church would be called upon to surrender—the covenant of works, imputation, unconditional election, the covenant of redemption, particular atonement, perseverance of the saints, the parity of the eldership, the parity of the ministry, and its representative courts. *Secondly*, Because it is hopelessly impracticable. Will the Presbyterian Church give up those doctrines which have been mentioned? the Baptist Church the exclusive validity of immersion? the Episcopal Church the “historic episcopate” and the necessity of prelatical ordination? the Methodist Church its Arminianism? the Lutheran Church its efficacy of the word and the sacraments? the Congregationalist Church its independency of particular churches? It were a mere rhapsody to talk of such possibilities before the millennium. *Thirdly*, Because its expression does injustice to the Presbyterian Church. That church, while true to its principles, cannot be a high-church body. It recognizes every branch of evangelical Protestantism as a true church of Christ. It excludes none from its pulpits, none from its communion table. It is not correct to represent its denominationalism as inconsistent with the unity of the Protestant Church. It is not correct to intimate that it is chargeable with schism. It discriminates, and justly discriminates, between an external amalgamation and

a real unity of the church. It refuses fellowship to none but those who deny the essentials of the gospel; and surely no Protestant ought to require more. *Fourthly*, Because the prophecies of Scripture plainly indicate that, in the last days preceding the introduction of our Lord's millennial kingdom, the outward church will become more and more corrupt and degenerate. Even the elect are warned against the peril of deception. A church, therefore, which strives to make its calling and election sure, instead of relaxing its testimony to truth in the face of divinely predicted danger, should cling to it with unyielding tenacity. The signs in the sky of the church are ominous of defection from the truth of God. It is no time to sentimentalize about the beauty, the glory, the desirableness of an external unity, to be obtained by the sacrifice or the sinking out of view of principles upon which all nominal Christians cannot agree.

2. After a curiously fervent tribute, as emanating from a Presbyterian, to "the Episcopal Church in England and in this country," as "one of the grand bulwarks of genuine Protestantism," an indignant denial of her "kinship with the errors of Romanism," and the profession of "a sincere admiration for the decency and order of her worship," and after admitting that she needs some elimination of hindrances to "her progress towards the triumph of the gospel and the unity of the body of Christ," the author proceeds to remark upon the need of similar changes in the Presbyterian Church, and to vindicate those which he confesses to be actually occurring (page 161). The passage is significant:

"The Presbyterian Church is equally liable to changes, and by no means exempt from the need of them. Are they not now passing over and through us? Is not the atmosphere of our church different from what it was a generation ago? While there is no less zeal for essential truth, we know and feel that there is far more toleration for non-essential differences in opinion [!] and in forms of worship. We do not sympathize with those who are alarmed and troubled by these things; for we regard them, not as the changing colors of the autumn leaves that prophesy decay, but rather as the tender hues and budding fertility of the spring, which predict and produce the coming harvest."

There is little wonder that these changes are taking place, if the peculiar and distinctive doctrines of the Presbyterian Church have come to be regarded as "opinions." Adopted by man, they may be altered by him. But if they be divinely revealed doctrines, the case is vastly different; and it is a striking fact that changes in respect to *them* are commended by such a theologian as Dr. Van Dyke. There is a similar passage having reference to changes in worship which is so noteworthy that we quote from it:

"There has been a remarkable change during the past fifty years in all non-liturgical denominations in regard to forms of worship. This change is very marked among Presbyterians. . . . Fifty years ago the use of the Apostles' Creed and the responsive reading of the Psalms was unheard of, and would not have been tolerated in any of our churches; and even the occasional use of the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments in our public assemblies was looked upon with disfavor. But a change has come, noiselessly but manifestly, as the outbreak of the foliage in the spring. The change began in our Sunday-schools. We have trained a generation to the use of simple liturgical forms, and the logical result has followed. We must reform our Sunday-schools after the prevailing customs of fifty years ago, or we must disown our own children at the church-door, and send them elsewhere for the gratification of tastes we have cultivated in them; or, as the only remaining alternative, we must continue in the course upon which we have entered, and give the people some audible share in our public worship." (Page 54.)

That is, the people never *sung*, as God appointed, and as we must give them some audible part in worship, we must let them *speak*, as man appoints! The startling comment upon the tremendous influence of the Sunday-school challenges especial notice. The child of the old church, it has become the mother of the new church, and is stamping its features upon its offspring! Who can measure the responsibility of sessions for the management of Sabbath-schools?

3. On page 106 we find this utterance:

“We believe that the satisfaction which He, as the seed of the woman and the Saviour of the world, rendered to God’s broken law, takes away the guilt and condemnation of Adam’s sin from the whole human race. ‘Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.’”

If this be one of the changes which is passing “over and through” the Northern Presbyterian Church, it is indeed a mighty one. It would seem, if the author correctly represent her, that she has advanced a considerable distance towards the camp of Arminianism. Universal atonement has been substituted for particular on her banner; she has dropped from her grasp one of the key-principles of Calvinism. Let us be indulged in a few questions upon this point: (1), Does the author hold that original depravity is judicially grounded in the imputation of Adam’s guilt? or, that the imputation of Adam’s guilt is grounded in original depravity? If the former, what becomes of original depravity when Adam’s guilt is taken away? Does the effect remain, though the cause be removed? If the latter, how comes it to pass that, original depravity continuing, the imputation of Adam’s guilt is removed? Does the cause remain, and its effect cease? or does he hold that neither grounds the other, but that they are inseparably linked together in one concrete state? If so, is original depravity dragged out of the whole race by the inseparable link that connects it with the removed guilt of Adam? (2), How do infants suffer and die, if the imputation of Adam’s guilt is taken away from them? Is it because they are guilty of consciously violating the moral law of which they can have no knowledge? If they suffer and die without any guilt, either Adam’s imputed to them or that of their own actual transgressions, how are their suffering and dying to be adjusted to the principles of a just moral government? Does it arbitrarily inflict suffering and death? (3), Is the whole world of infants justified, as well those who grow to maturity as those who die in infancy? Is not the non-imputation of guilt an element of justification?

4. The visible church is made to include all Christendom. The definition of the Westminster standards, which limits the visible church to those who “profess the true religion, with their children,” is cited indeed, but construed as embracing all who profess Christianity; and it is assumed that the Christianity professed by Romanists and members of the Greek Church is “the true religion.” We will let the author speak for himself. Touching the statement of the Westminster Confession, he says:

“Rising above all distinctions based upon forms of church government, modes of worship and formularies of doctrine, it is as wide and as elastic in its embrace as the ever-extending bounds of Christendom. (1), It recognizes all who profess Christianity as members of the visible church of Christ. It leaves open the questions, What is essential to Christianity? and What constitutes a profession of the true religion? But we think no candid answer to these questions can exclude from the holy catholic church the members of the Church of Rome, of the Eastern Church, or of any of the Christian denominations which have grown out of the Protestant Reformation.” (Page 24.)

That individual members only of the communions designated are not meant, but the communions themselves as organized, is plain from the fact that elsewhere the author explicitly includes "the Roman Catholic Church" in the visible church. The attempt to discriminate the Roman Catholic Church from the papacy is as vain as would be one to distinguish the author's theology from himself. The very definition of that church—falsely so called—which is furnished by her own theologians, Bellarmin, for instance, includes the element of professed union and subjection to the pope. It is, therefore, a wretched gloss upon the Westminster Confession, that it "does not call the Roman Catholic Church, but only the pope, 'that antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God.'" Against this Presbyterian sympathy with the apostate communion of Rome, and against the arrogant assertion of Dr. Schaff, in his *History of the Christian Church*, quoted with approval by the author, that "to deny her church character is to stultify history and nullify the promises of Christ," we set off the irrefutable argument of Canon Wordsworth, of the Church of England, in his work on the Apocalypse, to prove that the Church of Rome is the Babylon portrayed in the book of Revelation as the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. Is it the *pope* who is specially designated as this *mother*, this "*woman* drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus"? It is something new under the sun to hear representatives of the Presbyterian Church claiming for her sisterhood with this "Babylonish merchant of souls"

5. In other particulars this work defends utterly latitudinarian views.

(1). It scouts the great "Puritan principle," as the author denominates it, a principle maintained in the Presbyterian standards (*Conf. of Faith*, Chap. I., Sec. VI.,; Larger Catechism, Ques. 109), that whatsoever is not explicitly or implicitly commanded in the Scriptures is forbidden (page 54). We have no hesitation in saying, that to remove this principle from the Presbyterian Church would be to sweep away her corner-stone.

(2). It affirms the power of the church to institute rites and ceremonies at her discretion. In this respect it is asserted that there is no difference between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches. The only check upon the exercise of this mighty power which is admitted, is that nothing be done contrary to Scripture, and nothing aside from Scripture be insisted on as necessary to salvation. The adoption of this detestable prelatric principle would revolutionize the Presbyterian Church; it contradicts alike her testimonies and her precedents. Its assertion is a revolt against Presbyterianism.

(3). It misconceives, misapplies and virtually denies the great, the indispensable doctrine of the *Confession of Faith* in regard to circumstances (Chap. I., Sec. VI.), that is, the circumstances which are conceded to lie within the discretionary power of the church (pages 26, 54). What a lamentable ignorance there is, even among the leaders of the Presbyterian Church, concerning this doctrine of circumstances! How can the people understand it if their spiritual guides do not? Did George Gillespie, a member of the Westminster Assembly; did John Owen, one of its contemporaries; did such Presbyterians as William Cunningham and James Thornwell, err in their expositions of it, so different from that given by the author of this work? Hardly. In order to show that what has been said of the entire misapprehension of this doctrine evinced in the work is not based on insufficient grounds, the following most extraordinary declaration is cited:

"The candid application of this principle [that is, the ordering of some circumstances concerning the worship and government by the light of nature and Christian prudence], sweeps away from all existing denominations of Christians the exclusive claim to a *jure divino* church government." (Page 26.)

Comment would be superfluous to one who has studied the subject, and meaningless to one who has not.

(4). It makes the following affirmation:

"Aside from certain great principles, *no definite form of church government is laid down in the word of God.*" (Page 51.)

We are not informed what the indefinite government is, but if there be such a thing possible, so far as the church is concerned, and it certainly is not possible so far as secular society is concerned, we would have a government partly divine and partly human, partly ordained by God and partly devised by man, an inconceivable mongrel.

Cognate to this latitudinarian hypothesis is the denial that a ruling eldership can be proved from Scripture (pages 52, 53). And yet the author holds to "three orders of church officers" (page 134). We are curious to know which are the three—those of ministers of the word, ruling elders, and deacons? If so, how does he get in the ruling elder? Are the other two, like the ruling elder, the creations of man? If not, have we two orders divinely and one humanly appointed? Again we confront an unspeakable conglomeration. We have only room to say, in the words of Calvin: "*Habuit enim prima Ecclesia suum Senatum, qui plebem in morum honestate contineret, quod indicat Paulus alibi, quum DUPLICEM ORDINEM presbyterorum ponit.* 1 Tim. v. 17." (*Com. on 1 Cor. xii. 28.*)

6. There are certain statements of fact in the work the accuracy of which we are obliged to question:

(1). That "the Thirty-nine Articles are just as Calvinistic as the Westminster Confession. There is no doctrinal difference in the Standards of the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches." (Page 169.) The Articles affirm universal atonement; the Confession particular. (Art. XXXI.; Conf. Chap. VIII., Secs. V., VIII., and Chap. XI., Sec. IV.) Surely, this is a mighty difference. The truth is, that the Thirty-nine Articles are more nearly Hypothetical Redemptionist than Calvinistic.

(2). That Calvin repeated in Geneva the error of Rome in "identifying the state with, and at the same time subjecting it to, the church." (Page 36.) Let the reformer himself answer. Speaking of the church as needing "a kind of spiritual government," he says: "This is altogether distinct from civil government." (*Inst.*, Vol. III., p. 227.) Again, "The church has not the right of the sword to punish or restrain, has no power to coerce, no prison nor other punishments which the magistrate is wont to inflict." (*Ibid.*, p. 331.) Once more: "In the use two things are to be considered: first, that this spiritual power be altogether distinct from the power of the sword; secondly, that it be not administered at the will of one individual, but by a lawful consistory (1 Cor. v. 4). Both were observed in the purer times of the church. For holy bishops did not exercise their power by fine, imprisonment, or other civil penalties, but, as became them, employed the word of God only. For the severest punishment of the church, and, as it were, her last thunderbolt, is excommunication, which is not used unless in necessity." (*Ibid.*, p. 233.) These passages not only refute the author's allegation, but throw a flood of light upon Calvin's part in the execution of Servetus.

(3). That "the divines of the seventeenth century all believed in the enforcement of church government and worship by the state. They all held that religious toleration was a damnable heresy." George Gillespie did not, and he was one of the ablest of them. Neither did John Owen, whom the author pronounces the prince of Puritan theologians, and who, like his great contemporary, John Locke, was an advocate of religious toleration. But we must close. We are weary of the ungrateful office of criticising, when we desired to praise.

The mechanical execution of the work is elegant. Those who wish to know the tendency of theological and ecclesiastical opinion in the Northern Presbyterian Church would do well to procure this book.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

## VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

DISCUSSIONS. *By Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas, and for many years Professor of Theology in Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.* Edited by C. R. Vaughan, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of New Providence, Va. Vol. I. THEOLOGICAL AND EVANGELICAL. 8vo., pp. xix., 728. Cloth, bevelled edges, \$3. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1890.

The appearance of this splendid volume, the forerunner of a set of four, just as we begin to print this number, precludes more at this time than a mere notice of it. Its appearance at last is a great gratification to the many friends and admirers of the great thinker whose best work is here put in permanent form, and is no less cause for congratulation on the part of scholars in every section. The author's reputation as a profound reasoner, an incisive writer, and a master teacher and leader in theological thought is national.

This volume comprises thirty-two papers, published in reviews or pamphlets at various times, upon subjects of a theological and evangelical character. The more notable are the masterly reviews of Breckinridge's and Hodge's Theologies; the discussion of the doctrine of original sin, in which the author's well-known views concerning imputation are clearly set forth and ably advocated; the discussions of the theology of the Plymouth Brethren and the system of Alexander Campbell; the examination of W. Robertson Smith's views, and of the arguments of Universalists against endless punishment, and the full consideration of the Sabbath, its nature, design and proper observance. In addition to these, there are various treatises on eminently practical themes, such as The Versions of the New Testament, The Reasonableness of Prayer, Parental Responsibilities, Christian Economy, etc., in which the common sense, no less than the acumen and scholarship, of this great worker for Christ is abundantly proved. It is a joy to his friends that, though now oppressed with years and blindness, the noble man, whose heart is as tender as his mind is great, lives to see his work assuming permanent written form, as well as strengthening and helping those who have had the privilege of his personal teachings, and who rejoice to see the ever-widening sphere of the influence which he has exerted in behalf of a true faith.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By the late Rev. William Henry Simcox, M. A., Rector of Harlaxton.* 16mo., pp. xii., 226. Cloth, 75 cts. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1890.

As the contributor to the Cambridge Bible Series of the *Commentary on Revelation* the author became widely known and recognized as an eminent scholar. The present work confirms this estimate, and makes his early death the more deplorable. It is not as full as other treatises, but it was not the author's object to traverse the

entire field. He designed, as we are told by himself, "to indicate representatively the points wherein the language of the New Testament differs from classical and post-classical usage," and so far as the grammar is concerned he seeks "to vivify the study of purely verbal grammar and bring it into connection with the wider intellectual interests and sympathies." To accomplish this end he gives, in the introduction, a fine sketch of the Greeks, their people and language, after the time of Alexander, and traces the establishment, uses and modifications of the Attic dialect which took place in the eastern half of the Mediterranean basin. He then discusses the "post-Alexandrine" or "common dialect," showing its modifications from the classical Greek by the local and dialectical peculiarities of Alexandria, the simplification of its grammar and idiom and rhetorical structure, the adoption of Semitic or Semitic-like idioms, the influence of the Septuagint, etc. This general study is followed by a multitude of grammatical details, in which, in a brief notice, we cannot follow the author. Those who are interested in this department of study will find this work philosophical and accurate.

**ESCHATOLOGY;** or, The Doctrine of the Last Things, according to the Chronology and Symbolism of the Apocalypse. *By F. G. Hibbard, D. D.* New York: Hunt & Eaton.

**THE WIDER HOPE.** Essays and Strictures on the Doctrine and Literature of Future Punishment. By numerous writers, lay and clerical, including Archdeacon Farrar, the Very Rev. E. H. Plumptre, D. D.; the late Principal Tulloch, Rev. William Archer, Rev. Henry Allen, D. D.; Rev. James H. Rigg, D. D.; the late Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, etc. With a Paper "On the Supposed Scriptural Expression for Eternity," by Thomas De Quincey, and a Bibliographical Appendix. Edited by James Hogg. 12mo., pp. xvi., 436. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

**THE HEREAFTER;** Sheol, Hades and Hell, The World to Come, and the Scripture Doctrine of Retribution According to Law. *By James Fyfe.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Of these three books the first is an attempt, unsatisfactory as usual, to trace the visions of the Apocalypse through history. The second is a volume embodying in permanent form the papers on "The Wider Hope," which Farrar's "Eternal Hope" called out, and which were published in *The Contemporary Review*. As will be recognized at once, from the names of the authors, they are, most of them, believers in some form of "the wider hope." The bibliography attached to the book will prove of special value. The third book named above is a thoroughly sound, orthodox, judicious treatise, dealing with the subject in a way which commends itself to the intelligence, common sense and piety of all students of eschatology. The author first fully sets forth the statements and teachings of the Scripture on the subject, and then applies these teachings to the various theories of annihilation, conditional immortality, restorationism, and eternal retribution. He believes that God's word, and not philosophy, must settle all the questions pertaining to eternity. He seeks "to understand and explain, not to defend, the word of God." This book, with the similar works, recently issued, of Drs. E. D. Morris and Alvah Hovey, is worthy of a permanent place on every theological student's and minister's shelves.



INSPIRATION AND THE BIBLE. An Inquiry. *By Robert F. Horton, A. M., Late Fellow of New College, Oxford.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1890.

The author's views in this little volume are such as to lead to the entire rejection of any doctrine of inspiration. His idea seems to be that the inspiration lies solely in the history which the Bible contains, whatever that may mean, and not in the account of that history. He accepts the recent Pentateuchal theories as established, collates and enlarges upon all the apparent discrepancies he can find in the Old and New Testaments, and otherwise deals with the Bible in a manner calculated to completely undermine its authority.

CALVINISM CONTRARY TO GOD'S WORD AND MAN'S MORAL NATURE. *By D. Fisk Harris, Harman, Ohio.* Published by the author. 1890.

THE CALVINISTIC DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND REPROBATION NO PART OF ST. PAUL'S TEACHING. *By John Andrews Harris, S. T. D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia.* 12mo., pp. 101. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. 1890.

We wonder if these authors are near of kin. Their visual organs appear to have the same defect. Both seem quite near-sighted, the one in the view he has of Paul's followers, the other in his view of Paul himself. The one has set up a Calvinism according to his own idea, attributing to it doctrines as to the atonement, damnation of infants, etc., which Calvinists do not hold; the other has run Paul clear out of his own Epistle to the Romans, and left him, by an exegesis which makes the election of which he writes an election to covenant privileges and not to salvation, in the sad predicament of both discoursing upon personal salvation and maintaining silence upon the subject! Perhaps if both gentlemen would put on their glasses they would get a better sight of the objects that now so terrify them, and find that the doctrine of election, as declared by their own seventeenth article, is full of sweetness and hope to the believer.

PRAYER AS A THEORY AND A FACT. *By Rev. D. W. Faunce, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 250. Cloth, \$1. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

This is the "Fletcher Prize Essay" for 1889. The subjects discussed are the possibility and probability of prayer as heard and answered; the law of personality in its bearing on prayer; the factor of sin as affecting prayer; the kingdom of God as related to prayer; prayer as related to natural law; negative answers to prayer are actual answers; the reactions of sin as they induce prayer; the circular motion of prayer; the Lord's Prayer as our model; supposed limitations of prayer; prayer in its prophecy. In dealing with the relation of prayer and natural law, the author carefully expounds the various theories proposed and properly rejects the mechanical and pantheistic ideas, and in presenting the doctrine of the divine personality, is careful to guard against that conception of the immanence of God in his universe which has been popularized of recent years in a certain school of thought. The chapters on the relation of prayer to the kingdom of God and the "circular motion" of prayer are particularly striking, and especially the latter, in its analysis of the subjective effect of prayer.

CHURCH AND STATE. A Historical Hand-book. *By A. Taylor Inness, Advocate.*  
Pp v., 275. Cloth, \$1.25. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner  
& Welford.

The book belongs to the series of "Hand-books for Bible classes and private classes," under the editorial preparation of Professor Marcus Dods and Dr. Alexander Whyte. It is a clear and succinct history of the relations of the church to the state from the time of the rise of Christianity down to our own day. Without presenting too many details, it keeps the mind interested throughout, and gives one a comprehensive survey of the entire field. The author rightly judges that the question is not yet practically settled, to see which one need but look at the various Christian lands and study the struggle yet going on.

THE CHURCH IN MODERN SOCIETY. *By Julius H. Ward.* 16mo., pp. 232. Boston:  
Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.

A well written plea for outward union of some kind among Christians. The author writes from the standpoint of an Episcopalian, but is very much more liberal in his views than most members of that communion. Like most who view the matter of outward unity from that standpoint, however, he places a little too high an estimate upon the adaptability of the Anglican sect to become the chief factor in shaping this "constructive unity." It is in his judgment the historical, natural, reasonable "channel of institutional Christianity to the English-speaking people." He suggests that that denomination, nay, he almost guarantees that even "the Roman Church, as well as the English, would, if Christian union were actually set about, contrive some way by which the Protestant ministry could be legitimated without accepting all that is implied in the supremacy of the Pope or in the apostolic succession."

THE PAPACY: Its History, Dogmas, Genius and Prospects. Being the Evangelical Alliance first prize on Papacy. *By Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL. D.* London: Hamilton, Adams & Co.

ARTICLES ON ROMANISM. Monsignor Capel, Dr. Littledale. *By the Rev. John Henry Hopkins, S. T. D.* 8vo., pp. 190. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1890.

ROMANISM AND THE REPUBLIC. A Discussion of the Purposes, Assumptions, Principles and Methods of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. *By Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, A. M.* With an Introduction by Rev. Leroy M. Vernon, D. D., late Superintendent of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy. Boston: Arnold Publishing Company. 1890.

Three books that will be an entire armory to the Protestant. They deal with the papacy in its history, its fundamental principles, its aims, its methods, its practical relations to civil government, in such a manner as to show most conclusively the insidious forms of Rome's errors, the danger connected with a prevalency of her principles, their menace to our republic, and the vulnerable points in the system.

OUTLINES OF JEWISH HISTORY, from B. C. 586 to C. E. 1890. With three maps. *By Ludy Magnus.* Revised by M. Friedlander, Ph. D. 12mo., pp. 388. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1890.

Written primarily for use in schools and among young people, and covering so long a period as from the Babylonish captivity to the present time, this book is necessarily but an outline of Jewish history. It is, however, a story of thrilling interest, and should awaken an earnest desire in every Christian heart to win the sons of Abraham to that One who came as the seed of Abraham to offer life to his own people. Written solely from the Jewish standpoint, it well portrays the Jewish life and thought, and most ably sets forth the grounds for Jewish pride and unity. That a race which has passed through such vicissitudes is destined for some future glory, who can deny? And what greater glory than to become the leaders after awhile in the conquest of the world for Shiloh? "How much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" And "if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?" While this book is intensely Jewish, we commend it to our readers, for we think there will be no better preparation for a genuine missionary work among this people than a thorough understanding of their spirit and an analysis of the bonds that hold them together and keep them away from the doctrines taught by men of their own race—Matthew, Luke, John, Peter, Paul, and, greatest of all, Jesus of Nazareth.

THE JEWS UNDER ROMAN RULE. *By W. D. Morrison.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

This volume is one of "The Story of the Nations" series, and embodies a brief, though comparatively complete, account of the Jews from B. C. 164 to A. D. 135. It is enriched by illustrations furnished by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, is carefully written, and shows not only diligent study, but careful examination of results of recent explorations as well as of original sources.

THE SAMARITAN CHRONICLE; or, The Book of Joshua the son of Nun. Translated from the Arabic, with Notes. *By Oliver Trumbull Crane, M. A., Member of the American Oriental Society.* 12mo., pp. 178. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

The Samaritan Book of Joshua sustains to the Samaritans about the same relation as that of the Apocrypha to the majority of Protestant Christians. It is not regarded as of inspiration, like the books of Moses, but is greatly revered and held in high estimation as a true and authentic history of the period of which it treats. The translation by Mr. Crane, who as an Arabic scholar was specially fitted for the work, is the first that has ever appeared in the English language, the Latin translation of Juynboll having been hitherto the accepted rendering among those not familiar with the original. The present translation is made from the Arabic text as printed by Juynboll, with a diligent and careful examination and comparison of the MS. in the British Museum. The translator has rendered good service, not only to orientalists, but to that large and growing class of readers who, while not versed in the Eastern tongues, are deeply interested in history, and especially

the history of a people who next to the Jews are the most interesting figure of the chosen country.

**SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE ORIENT.** With numerous illustrations. *By Krikor Hagop Basmajian.* 12mo., pp. 247; \$1. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

The author, a Congregational minister for awhile, and then a Baptist, is a native of the East. He gives first an account of his own life, followed by sketches of Armenia and the Armenian church, of Protestant missions among the Armenians, of Turkey, its government, religion, social life, manners, customs and amusements, and of the present state of the Eastern Church. Coming from one practically familiar with most of the matters of which he writes, it is a most engaging work.

**BIBLICAL HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY.** A Class-book. With numerous maps. *By Professor H. S. Osborn, LL. D.* 12mo., pp. 312; \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

A class-book of the Old and New Testament treated as consecutive history. It also includes the period from the close of the Old Testament to the beginning of the New. It divides the history into periods, or eras, as the ante-diluvian era, the patriarchal era after the flood to the death of Jacob, the theocracy to the judges, the period of the judges, the period of the kings to the captivity, the captivity of Judah to the close of the canonical period, the New Testament era. It is a book well adapted to its purpose. It is necessarily brief in its statements, and uses no space for speculations or mere opinions.

**THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE.** *By the Rev. Henry Fanshawe Tozer, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford, author of "The Highlands of Turkey," etc.* 8vo., pp. 198. 80 cts. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company.

One of the volumes of the publishers' "Epochs of Church History" Series. It is a succinct account of the foundation of the Eastern Empire by Constantine the Great, an outline of the history of the empire, of the orthodox church, the state and the people, and of the heretical churches, of the iconoclastic controversy, of the missionary efforts of the eastern church, of the monastic system, and of the final separation from the Latin Church. Like most of the series which we have examined, it is a valuable contribution to the popular knowledge of an important epoch.

**THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.** Its Origin, Development and Characteristics, *By David D. Demarest, D. D., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J.* Fourth edition. Revised and enlarged. 8vo., pp. 215. Cloth, \$2. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America. 1889.

The Christian public, no less than the members of the Reformed Church, is indebted to the author for this revised and enlarged edition of the history of that church which represents in this country the principles, characteristics and traditions of the church in the Netherlands. The work is divided into three parts, the first

tracing briefly the early history of the Netherlands, the rise of the Reformed Church there, and its history through the trying days of Alva's oppression and Arminius' heresies, up to the settlement of New Netherland and the planting of the church in American soil; the second gives a history of the church's general life, of her educational institutions, boards, mission work, etc.; and the third is a careful account of the doctrinal standards, of the liturgy, customs and usages, and of the government and discipline of the church. Standing midway between those who use a liturgy in all their services and those who reject it entirely, the Reformed Church claims that she has a vantage ground which no other holds. Her doctrinal soundness and conservative life have endeared her to all lovers of truth and righteousness, and have been the leading causes for that intimacy which has during the past twenty-five years existed between her and our own church. The History by Dr. Demarest, we should judge, would be of special value just now, in view of the pending negotiations between the church popularly known as the "Dutch Church" and her sister "German Reformed Church."

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH, from the Planting of the Colonies to the End of the Civil War. *By S. D. McConnell, D. D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia.* 8vo., pp. xiv., 392. \$2.00. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1890.

A candid work, in which the author appears as ready to see the faults and mistakes of his church as its merits and accomplishments. He asserts that he has prepared the book "on the principle that the church can afford to have the truth told even about herself." He makes mistakes, however, especially in unjustly minimizing the moral power of the Puritans, in a mistaken estimate of the adherence to ritualistic ideas of the early Wesleyans, and in the statement that the Southern Presbyterian Church was developed from the "nucleus" of a small body of New School Presbyterians which seceded from their Assembly because of its action on slavery. The author expresses himself plainly on the subject of church unity, advancing, of course, the not-altogether-before-unheard-of idea that the Episcopal Church is the one around which to gather. He regards his church, however, as not having always been awake on this and other subjects. It is a valuable book, not only for the members and ministers of his own denomination, but for all careful students of history.

THE BEGINNINGS OF NEW ENGLAND; or, the Puritan Theocracy in its Relations to Civil and Religious Liberty. *By John Fiske.* 12mo., pp. xvii., 296. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

The substance of the author's lectures in the Washington University, St. Louis, afterwards repeated in many places in the New England and Middle States. The subjects are the Roman Idea and the English Idea, the Puritan Exodus, the Planting of New England, the New England Confederacy, King Philip's War, the Tyranny of Andros. The influence of Puritanism, both in England and America, the shape it gave to thought and action, its gift to coming generations of New Englanders of that "tacit assumption of superiority" which is so common, its harshness and cruelty and narrow-minded bigotry and superstitious frenzy, the

merits and faults alike of the Puritan theocracy, are fully set forth in this admirable treatise. It is a book well worth possessing, and richly repays the reader.

**THE PERPETUITY OF THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT, and the Identity of the Jewish and Christian Church.** A Sermon. *By Rev. G. H. Cartledge, Homer, Ga.* Pp. 44. Paper, 10 cts. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson. 1890.

That the Abrahamic Church and the Christian Church are one and the same; that the law of infant church membership obtained in the Old Testament days and has never since been repealed; that believers have as much encouragement to hope and believe that God will save their children as that he will save them; that the remnant of Israel will finally believe and accept Christ as their Messiah; that the church ruled by presbyters is the only one which follows the divine pattern; these are the points admirably and clearly made and strongly enforced in this discourse. Following the sermon, which is published at the request of the author's Presbytery, are stirring appeals to Christians and Jews, to the one to meet their obligations to the Israelites, to the other to look upon their Redeemer, to remember that he must be a "pierced" Redeemer, and to come and take part in the blessings of that covenant which God made with Abraham.

**FROM SOLOMON TO THE CAPTIVITY.** The Story of the two Hebrew Kingdoms. *By David Gregg, D. D., and Lewis W. Mudge, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 292. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

A series of lectures by two eminent preachers on the leading events recorded in the history of the chosen people after their division. Each lecture deals first with the story, and then gives its practical, everyday lessons. The book is thoroughly sound, sensible and interesting. It is of special value in showing the profitableness for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness of a portion of Scripture which is often passed by as having no bearing upon present times and present duties.

**THE GOSPEL IN NATURE.** A Series of Popular Discourses on Scripture Truths Derived from Facts in Nature. *By Henry C. McCook, D. D., author of "The Agricultural Ant in Texas," etc.* 12mo., pp. 379. Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott.

The preacher of these twenty sermons, or lectures, rightly regards the use which those whom the Divine Spirit moved made of nature as justifying him in finding rich spiritual lessons in the sky, the sea, the earth, the stars, the flowers the birds, in cloud and murmuring brook, in storm and crystal, "books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything." The Bible is full of references to the phenomena of the world, and the devout student of the books which revelation and nature open will find that the one lights up and corroborates the other continually. Dr. McCook is widely known for his researches in certain lines, especially of entomology; he is also well known as an eminently successful and spiritually-minded pastor. The book before us has well illustrated both these facts. It shows careful study of the Bible, thorough acquaintance with science, a painstaking care to avoid errors in the interpretation of either, and, above all, a heart bent upon winning souls to Christ, or helping them to become like Christ.

**IMAGO CHRISTI.** The Example of Jesus Christ. *By Rev. James Stalker, D. D., author of "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc.* Introduction by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D. 12mo., pp. 232. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

The author, we are told by Dr. Taylor, is one of the most eminent of the younger ministers of the Free Church of Scotland. Especially by his labors among young people and by his active sympathy with evangelistic work has he proved himself eminently useful. The author tells us that his plan in this book is to divide the circle of human life, as it were, into segments, each of which represents an extensive sphere of experience and duty; and then to follow our Lord through them, that from his example we may learn how to conduct ourselves. These "segments" are in the home, in the state, in the church, in society, as a friend, as a man of prayer, as a student of the Scripture, as a worker, as a sufferer, as a philanthropist, as a winner of souls, as a preacher, as a teacher, as a controversialist, as a man of feeling, as an influence. It will be seen from this that the book is one on practical Christian ethics, with special prominence given to the fact that it is in imitation of Christ and dependence upon him that the surest development and performance of duty lies. The author's spirit is admirable, being full of unction and devotion, and the style is direct, clear and comprehensive.

**STORIES ABOUT JESUS: His Wonderful Words and Works.** With three hundred and eighty-nine illustrations. *By Rev. R. C. Blackwell and Mrs. Emily L. Blackwell.* Sm. Quarto, pp. 272. Cloth, \$1.25. Philadelphia: Benjamin Griffith. 1890.

The authors must have studied well, not only their subject, but the character and minds of young people. They have woven together the materials furnished in the Gospels and in the subsequent parts of the New Testament, in history, in geography, and in archæological research, into an account of Jesus and the land in which he dwelt when in the flesh, which by practical test we have found to be most instructive and interesting. The hundreds of illustrations, many of them full-page, will be found helpful. With the exception of its account of John's method of baptism at Jordan, written from the immersionist standpoint, it can be heartily recommended as one of the best of its class of books. Teachers in Sabbath-schools and parents will find it exceptionally useful and helpful.

**THE SERMON BIBLE.** Isaiah to Malachi. Pp. 511. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

This is the fourth volume of the series. It is constructed upon the same plan as those that have preceded it, and which have already been noticed. It is a volume of sermons, and outlines of sermons, on many of the most important texts in the books embraced within its limits, together with many references to other sermons or to the literature on the subject. Carefully used it will be helpful and suggestive; but to the lazy mind there is danger in so much ready-made material.

**PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.** Eight Lectures delivered before the Ohio Wesleyan University. *By Randolph S. Foster.* \$1. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1890.

Bishop Foster says some things forcibly and well, but he mars them by others neither sound nor thoughtful. His Arminian theology is made very prominent in his view of the facts of Christian experience. He does not hesitate to denounce Calvinism; and yet he appears sometimes to be as ready to repudiate his own Arminianism and retreat into bald Pelagianism and universalism as to reject Calvinism. He holds that "God's mercy" was obligatory on him as an immutable ethical principle of his nature, as much so as justice itself. The facts are against him. He holds that "the whole theory of substitutional punishment as a ground, either of conditional or unconditional pardon, is unethical, contradictory and subversive." He should read his Bible again.

**BEGINNING LIFE: A Series of Sermons to the Young.** *By Rev. Charles Wood, D. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. Price, 50 cents.

A series of delightful addresses to young people. The sermons cover many of the points in life in which the young need instruction—friendship, books, habits, temptations, home-making, etc. The style is familiar, and yet beautiful. The teaching is forceful and direct. Those who heard the sermons when they were first delivered were so deeply interested and impressed by them that they called for their publication, and it is in response to this earnest request that the volume is issued.

**SERMONS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS FOR 1891.** *By the Monday Club.* \$1.25. Boston: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 1891.

Used with the regular lesson helps, this volume will be found useful and suggestive. The plan of the work, familiar to those who have seen the fifteen similar volumes which have preceded it, is such as to insure both interest and variety. Each of the ministers of the club has taken one or more of the lessons of the year, and given a brief sermon upon its leading topic. It were well for our teachers to pursue a similar method, and thus, as far as practicable, to unify the work and instruction of each Sabbath. This book will help them in their effort.

**ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES ON THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSON FOR 1891.** *By Jesse L. Hulbut, D. D., and Robert R. Doherty, Ph. D.* New York: Hunt & Eaton.

**BIBLE STUDIES: Israel's Apostasy, and Studies from the Gospel of St. John, covering the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1891.** *By George F. Pentecost, A. M., D. D.* Pp. 406. Cloth, \$1. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co.

**SELECT NOTES: A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1891.** *By F. M. Peloubet, D. D.* Boston: W. A. Wilde & Co.

Teachers and older scholars will do well to provide themselves with these excellent lesson helps, in addition to the regular publications of our own church. Together they furnish a great store-house of exposition, methods of instruction, illustration, practical application, archæological notes, maps, etc. We make special mention of the Pentecost and Peloubet series, having used them for several



years with rare instances in which it was deemed proper to dissent from their interpretations or suggestions.

PERSONAL CREEDS; OR, How to Form a Working-theory of Life. *By Newman Smyth.*  
New York: Charles Scribner's sons. 1890.

The book contains eight chapters, or discourses, entitled Moral Beginnings, In Personal Touch with Christ, Nearer Ends of Heavenly Truths, God in Our Lives, Human Forgiveness a Measure for the Divine, Jesus' Argument for Immortality, Practical Views of Future Retribution, Points of Contact Between this Life and the Next. The author's object is to answer the question, How, amid the diversities of beliefs and unbeliefs in the world, shall I gain a living, personal creed? The first thing to do, he tells us, is to go and hunt through our experience until we come to something, however simple, before which we must and do say, "I see that to be true; I believe that; I can trust that;" to find something which our own life has proved to be true to us, as, for instance, "It must be right to do right;" that a man must first take root somewhere in moral reality, if he is to grow into a fruitful faith. This idea is skilfully developed, and in a very attractive form, which makes it the more insidious in its fundamental error, its ignoring the work of the Spirit, by whose regenerating and illuminating power alone the true beginnings and the development of a right personal creed are to come, if Christ's own words to Nicodemus and the disciples (John iii. and xvi.) and Paul's to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii.) be true. "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." The author's treatment of the subject of Forgiveness is even more unsound. We need but give some of his own words: "We learn, then, from such Scriptures [that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins. Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors] how Jesus at first would teach us, and how we should be content to begin, at least, our study of the doctrine of God's forgiveness of the sin of the world. We may best enter upon the study of God's love for the world by mastering the simple elements of divinity which a forgiving spirit may learn in a reconciling ministry among neighbors and friends." After speaking of the tenacity of certain churches to their faith, he adds, "But it will be better for the church, a thousand times better for the progress of the Lord's kingdom on earth, if through some further sacrificial and reconciling ministry among the social sins and sufferings of our world, it can proceed to gain some fresh and deeper insight into the heart of God's redeeming love in Christ." To prove that human forgiveness is a measure for the divine, he claims that in this way sin becomes known to one as a personal offence, which one would like to see put out of the way, that the forgiving spirit among men carries in itself a divine sanction, that this forgiving spirit is itself many virtues in one, and that human forgiveness is a costly thing. It is all very pretty writing, and the ideas are very satisfactory to the natural heart, but these "nearer ends," as he calls them, of great heavenly truths are too airy to grasp, much less to be a comfort or help to the soul.

IN POTIPHAR'S HOUSE; OR, THE YOUNG MAN IN PERIL. *By Rev. J. F. Flint.* With an Introduction by H. S. Pomeroy, M. D., author of "Ethics of Marriage." 12mo., pp. 178. Cloth, 75 cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

The author's object is to provide a guide for young men over the stormy sea

that lies just beyond the confines of youth. He deals with his subject candidly and plainly, but not indelicately, and makes a powerful plea for social purity, enforcing all his arguments from the teachings of both Scriptures and medical science and reason.

IN DARKEST ENGLAND, AND THE WAY OUT. *By General Booth.* Pp. 316. \$1.50. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1890.

Few books have made such a sensation as this, by the great leader of the Salvation Army movement. None will deny that its author is full of zeal, and has a heart that yearns for the amelioration of the condition of the masses. His book is the outcome of many years of effort in behalf of the very class concerning whom he writes. It is in two parts, the first "The Darkness," the second "The Deliverance." The first part depicts in awful, yet doubtless truthful, colors, the destitution, vice and crime of "the lapsed masses." In the second, General Booth proposes a scheme for deliverance, and appeals for help to carry it into effect. To bring about this deliverance, he would find homes for the homeless, build workshops for the unemployed, establish farm colonies and villages, and coöperative factories and farms, and facilitate emigration. By means of his proposed city colony, farm colony, and colony beyond the seas, he would draw off an immense number of those whose present environment of idleness, wretchedness, and overcrowding in the cities have been so fruitful of vice and crime. One great feature of his scheme is, that in it he recognizes and subordinates everything to the power of the Holy Ghost, and would have all true renovation, or reformation, begin in the heart. The practicability of it he argues from past experience in the Salvation Army work. Of the wisdom or unwisdom of the plan we are not now to speak. We merely bespeak for it, and for the sad picture drawn in the pages of this work, that attention to which the importance of the problem entitles them.

THE STORY OF THE TUNES. Illustrated with Anecdotes. *By Hezekiah Butterworth, A. M.* 12mo., pp. 257; \$1.75. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

A companion volume to the author's *Story of the Hymns*, published in 1875, and of practical value in the conduct of praise meetings, for home reading and lectures on sacred music. The history of *Adeste Fideles*, *Antioch*, *Arlington*, *Benevento*, *Bethany*, *Creation*, *Eventide*, *Greenville*, *Northfield*, *Old Hundred*, and scores of such tunes cannot fail to interest the reader, and at times to suggest happy remarks concerning them when in use.

WILBUR FISK. *By George Prentice, D. D., Professor in Wesleyan University.* 16mo., gilt top, pp. 289; \$1.25. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

One of the "American Religious Leaders" Series of the publishers, and beautifully printed and bound. Wilbur Fisk is represented as one of the early products of the mission begun by Jesse Lee in New England, in the interests of the Methodist Church, which had a great part to play, as Lee believed, "by the overthrow of formal and unspiritual religion wherever it had become rooted in pastors and churches, by assailing and putting to shame Calvinistic errors which were alike dishonorable to God and ruinous to souls, and by gathering churches with an Ar-

minian theology and a regenerate and sanctified membership." Fisk's life was an active and fruitful one, representing fully the intensity of zeal and fervor which characterizes the New England Methodists. He was the founder and first president of Wesleyan University, and a vigorous temperance reformer; but in the anti-slavery agitation was popularly regarded as a pro-slavery man, not because of his real views, which were against the institution, but because of his repudiation of utterances attributed to him by the metamorphosis of one of his temperance lectures, and because of his sound conservatism in respect to the proper manner for its abolition. The chapter of his life on that subject is one that will repay a reading, and shows Fisk to have been a man of courage, as well as of force, for he dared to oppose the great tide that set against his views, and to seek earnestly a solution of the problem which would have averted schism, secession, warfare, and many other ills. He was wiser than his day, and grandly more exalted than his surroundings. Fisk's chief work was in carrying his church forward by mighty strides in the work of education. For this his name deserves to be preserved and his work to be remembered, as it will surely live.

JOHN G. PATON, MISSIONARY TO THE NEW HEBRIDES. An Autobiography. Edited by his Brother. SECOND PART. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1890.

The completion of the first part of this autobiography, we must confess, was not satisfactory to us, in that it left the impression that Paton had not done well, perhaps, to leave such a work as he was doing at home to go into the foreign field. That impression is now completely removed. We have now in this life as glorious a testimony to the power of the gospel and of the duty and success of missions as has ever been published. Dr. Pierson well characterizes it as "a most fascinating narrative of missionary adventures and heroism."

THE HAND WITH THE KEYS. By *Kate W. Hamilton*, Author of "*Tangles and Corners*," etc. 16mo., pp. 304; \$1.15.

SARAH JANE: A Girl of One Talent. By *Julia McNair Wright*, Author of "*Almost a Nun*," "*Among the Alaskans*," etc. 16mo., pp. 320; \$1.15.

ELSIE GRAY: A Story of Every Day. By *Belle S. Cragin*, 16mo., pp. 384; \$1.25.

RHODA ARMORER. By *C. J. G.* 16mo., pp. 302; \$1.

A PLAIN WOMAN'S STORY. By *Julia McNair Wright*. 16mo., pp. 320; \$1.15.

AT EDGEWARE. By *E. W. C.* 16mo., pp. 352; \$1.15.

THE RYHOVES OF ANTWERP. An Historical Tale. By *Annette Lucille Noble*, Author of "*The Professor's Girls*," etc. 16mo., pp. 312; \$1.15.

WATER ANIMALS. By *Ella Rodman Church*, Author of "*Birds and Their Ways*," etc. 16mo., illustrated, Pp. 352; \$1.15.

CHILDREN OF THE KALAHARI: A Story of Africa. By *Annie M. Barnes*. 16mo., \$1.15.

MAURIZIO'S BOYHOOD; or All for Christ. A Tale of Modern Martyrdom. By *Margaret E. Winslow*. 16mo; \$1.

PHILIP ST. JOHN. *By Mrs. Mary E. Matheny.* 16mo.; \$1.15.

CHIMES FOR CHURCH CHILDREN. *By Margaret J. Preston.* 16mo.; 50 cents.

Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1890.

Wholesome and interesting reading for the young people in the home, and stimulating and instructive books for the Sabbath-school library are *desiderata*. They are partially provided in the above list of books, any one or all of which, from careful examination and reading, we can heartily recommend to parents, teachers, and library committees. They are all judiciously written, sensible and practical. The printing is beautiful, and the binding as substantial as can be made. The attractive covers are not a little helpful in leading many children to call for these books.

LEAH OF JERUSALEM. A Story of the Time of Paul. *By Edward Payson Berry.* 12mo., pp. 388. \$1.25. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

This is one of the books whose appearance is inevitable after the phenomenal success of such works as Wallace's "Ben Hur." It is fiction based upon Scripture, and introducing Bible characters. Paul and Stephen appear, the former in a character of brutality in which we would not depict him, even before his conversion, and the latter as the instructor of Leah, the child of a rich merchant, in the principles of the Christian religion. A robber chief possessed of noble traits of character, contests in the Roman amphitheatre, the ministering at last of Leah to Paul in Rome, are prominent features in a story, the plot of which is rather full of cross lines and characterized by an uncomfortable end. We are not prepared to commend the attempted mingling of the sacred and secular, and that imaginative connection of sacred historical characters with people of fiction upon which this class of books, patterning after Wallace's, depends for interest.

JOSHUA. A Story of Biblical Times. *By Georg Ebers.* Translated from the German by Mary J. Safford. 16mo., pp. iv., 371. New York: W. S. Gottsberger & Co.

Few writers have such powers of vivid description, realistic picturing, and happy application of the fruits of archæological research as Ebers. One of the greatest of Egyptologists, he is at the same time one of the most fascinating story-writers. This volume will bear out the reputation of the author. It transports us to Egypt, and the night when the exodus began. Joshua, a brave and trusted commander in the Egyptian army, has been summoned home. Shall he remain and be loyal to Pharaoh, or shall he cleave to Israel? In his deposition, his imprisonment, his journey to the prison-mines, his escape, his reunion with his people and leadership of them, his love for Miriam, his separation from her, his part in various battles, and incidents at the Red Sea, in the wilderness, at Sinai, etc., Joshua and the scenes in which he lived are brought before us with great vividness and power. While questioning the propriety of this class of literature and the investiture of Bible characters with the gaudy dress of imagination, we find it hard not to follow with thrilling interest such a tale as this.

**THE MASTER OF THE MAGICIANS.** *By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps and Herbert D. Ward.* 16mo., pp. 324. Cloth, \$1.25. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

Babylon is the scene, Daniel is the central figure of the story. The authors must needs give full play to the imagination in weaving a story about such a place and such a man. They do it most delightfully, and at the same time give us many facts and suggestions concerning the life and religion of the Babylonians, derived from the discoveries of modern times. Assyriology may yet contribute as richly to our fund of information concerning ancient times and peoples as the researches pursued so successfully in Egypt.

**TROPICAL AFRICA.** *By Henry Drummond, LL. D., F. R. S. E., author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World."* 12mo.; pp. 132. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

A cheap reprint, on good paper and well bound, but marred by many typographical errors, of a most valuable work, recently fully noticed. The renewed impulse given to studies on Africa by Stanley's second expedition across the continent will find in Drummond a fruitful field. His chapters are those of a scientist and philosopher, as well as of a traveller.

**HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF PERU,** with a Preliminary View of the Civilization of the Incas. *By William H. Prescott.* Fine Library Edition, in two volumes. Small octavo; cloth, gilt top, illustrated. Price, \$2. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

The expiration of copyright on this well-known and popular work admits of its being published for the first time in cheap form for popular use. Of the work itself it were useless to write, when all our readers are so familiar with the brilliant, thrilling style of the author, and where the work has been so long a standard. The edition before us is well printed (unleaded, however,) in small octavo, neatly bound, and is sold at a price which places it within reach of the most modest income.

**THE SALT-CELLARS.** Being a Collection of Proverbs, with Homely Notes thereon. *By C. H. Spurgeon.* Pp. 267. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

This volume completes this collection, which we have noticed before, carrying it forward from M to Z. Like everything from Spurgeon's hands, whether made by them or merely passing through them, the collection is bright, suggestive, instructive, spiritual. The volumes are for reference or for reading at odd moments.

**THE KING'S SON;** or, A Memoir of Billy Bray. Compiled chiefly from his own memoranda. *By F. W. Bourne.* 12mo., pp. 159. Cloth, 75 cts. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham. 1890.

The twenty-eighth edition of a biography of which it is said that more than six hundred souls were led to Christ through its reading. This enlarged and improved edition will make it more than ever popular and useful.

**THE LIFE WORK OF THE AUTHOR OF UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.** *By Florence T. McCray.*  
Square 12mo.; pp. 440. \$2. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

A sketch of the literary career, rather than a biography, of Harriet Beecher Stowe; an outline of each of her works, including a commentary and criticism on them; a digest of the opinions of eminent reviewers. These are the leading features of this handsomely-printed and bound volume. That the author admired the character and work of Mrs. Stowe goes without saying, yet it is quite evident that her natural bias in favor of her subject did not close her eyes to her defects and eccentricities. However much one may deplore the most notable work of Harriet Beecher Stowe, and the sweeping application it made of certain exaggerated facts, it is not to be denied that she has made a name in history, and is a character which one may, with the aid of this book, well study.

**THE ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY.** With a Uranography. *By Charles A. Young, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Astronomy in the College of New Jersey (Princeton), etc.* Pp. 480, 42. \$1.50. Boston and London: Ginn & Co. 1890.

This book is intended for use in high schools and academies. It is not an abridgement of the author's recent work on "General Astronomy," although it embodies much of its material and uses many of its illustrations. It is adapted to a younger class of students, but without sacrifice of clearness, accuracy and scientific arrangement and statement. By actual use we have found it extremely satisfactory.

**A THEORY OF CONDUCT.** *By Archibald Alexander, formerly Professor of Philosophy in Columbia College.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Very different from Newman Symth's book is this of Prof. Alexander, for while he gives proper credit to the philosophies and principles of ethics, the *a priori* argument of inherent principles existing in the human soul, and the *a posteriori* argument that conviction is based upon experience, he fully sets forth supernaturalism as the power to mould the life, and the Spirit of God as the giver of the highest motive, and the love of Christ as the greatest constraining principle.

**A STUDY IN PEDAGOGY,** for People who are not Professional Teachers. *By Bishop John H. Vincent, D. D., LL. D.* Cloth, 60 cts. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham. 1890.

A dainty little book, oddly but prettily bound, and a most suggestive and eminently helpful production from the pen of one who needs no commendation as a wise and popular educator. It deals with pedagogy as the old Romans and Greeks understood the term, and seeks, most happily and successfully, to point out to those who have the early training of children the most natural and effective methods and agencies for accomplishing true education. It discusses the nature and aims of true education, the conditions which affect education, the special educating agencies, and the selection and control of these conditions and agencies.

**CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO CHRIST.** A Series of Papers. *By J. Munro Gibson, M. A., D. D.* London: James Nisbet & Co. 1890.

Dr. Gibson is well known on both sides of the Atlantic as an earnest evangeli-

cal writer and preacher. The present work will increase the esteem in which he is held. It is not a continuous treatise, but a collection of papers and addresses published on various occasions. There is an effort, however, to give them unity, by a judicious arrangement, and the title gives the leading idea of them all. The author is especially happy in showing that the teaching of the Saviour and of the apostles were in complete harmony, the Master giving special prominence to the ethical element, while the apostles brought out the doctrinal, though the teaching of Christ included, in germ and essence, "all that is distinctive of the apostles' gospel of the grace of God."

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL. The Four Gospels Consolidated in a Continuous Narrative, presenting the Life of Christ in the order of its events. *By J. Glentworth Butler, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 212. Cloth, 75 cents. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1890.

The sub-title fully indicates the nature of the book. It is faithfully performed by one who has had marked and deserved success in this kind of work.

SERMONS BY REV. JOHN MCNEILL. Vol. I. \$1. New York: Fleming H. Revell. 1890.

A volume from which those who desire to know more of the young preacher whose fame is becoming so widespread, can gratify their curiosity to some extent. Judged of by the standards given in our theological schools, they are decidedly out of line; judged of by their raciness, illustrative style, familiarity even sometimes to homeliness, they are altogether striking, and readily account for the hold the preaching has upon the masses.

THE CHIEF THINGS; or, Church Doctrine for the People. *By Rev. A. W. Snyder.* 12mo. Cloth, \$1; paper, 50 cents. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

Twenty-six essays on topics that have but little to do with soul-saving, but a great deal to do with making "churchmen." It is aimed against the "sects," and is designed to equip "churchmen" with materials to meet them. If these be the "chief things," what shall we call faith and repentance and love and obedience and charity?

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With Illustrations. Vol. XXIV.: Memory-Montem; Vol. XXV.: Montenegro-Neutrals. Cloth, 75 cents; half morocco, \$1, each. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

A work full of interesting topics, succinctly explained or described, and to be commended for its low price and general usefulness to those who cannot afford the costlier and more voluminous encyclopedias.

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 16.—APRIL, 1891.

---

## I. BURNEY'S SOTERIOLOGY AND THE CUMBERLAND THEOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

DR. BURNEY'S book is, on several accounts, worthy of the attention of the Christian public:

1. Along with a world of sophistries it occasionally exhibits a real truth in a vivid light.

2. It is a most virulent attack on the penal and substitutionary theory of the atonement, and presents a "new theory" of the atonement, which would suit, with only a slight modification, a Unitarian.

3. Its author's position makes the book worthy of consideration; for he is, perhaps, the most distinguished and honored teacher in a great church; and the doctrines of that church can, because of its numbers and aggressiveness, no longer be looked upon with indifference.

4. The production of such a book in such a quarter presents an excellent example of "the logic of events." Our Cumberland brethren set out, in 1810, with the rejection of the doctrine of predestination, professing to receive remaining Calvinism in its integrity. The reader of this volume will see evidence only too good that the Cumberland Church has already moved far out of Calvinism and into Pelagian Unitarianism, or, if not into it, hard by it, and only kept out by gross and ridiculous inconsistencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Atonement.—Soteriology.* The sacrificial, in contrast with the penal, substitutionary, and merely moral or exemplary theories of propitiation. By *S. G. Burney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University.* Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House. 1888.



I. Our author is aware that the doctrine of the atonement has many vital connections; and that the adoption of his theory involves our modifying our notions of "the divine attributes, the essential characteristics of moral government, the nature of sin, moral retribution, confession, repentance, faith, regeneration, justification," etc., (p. 132). Accordingly, he proceeds to treat of certain of God's attributes, of moral government, and of sin, before advancing to the more immediate discussion of the great subject of the work.

§ 1. The *proton-pseulos* of his whole system is in his conception of justice. On p. 14, in arguing against the Anselmic theory of the atonement, he teaches that if justice is predicable of God in the same sense in which love is, then

"Both attributes are immutable, and reconciliation is impossible; for justice requires satisfaction prior to any act of love; but for God to satisfy justice is itself an act of love. This clearly demonstrates the utter absurdity of founding the necessity of the atonement in the divine attributes." And pp. 133, 134, "God's purposes are to him the rule of his action. . . . Justice, as a divine attribute, is simply God's integrity to his wise and benevolent purposes. Justice and right are coincident."

(1.) He teaches us here that justice, taking that term in its usual orthodox sense, cannot be an attribute of God, because, forsooth, judicial wrath and benevolence are incompatible, "for justice requires satisfaction prior to any act of love." This is not true, and is a *petitio principii*. That justice requires satisfaction prior to any act of love which does not satisfy justice, is a less objectionable statement.

That benevolence and judicial wrath are compatible affections is beyond a doubt. Righteous human anger and benevolence are frequently felt for the same object at the same moment; *e. g.*, Paul had as deep and tender philanthropy as any living man. He would have been willing to have made any righteous sacrifice to secure the repentance of Alexander the coppersmith, but with a holy wrath he prayed (2 Tim. iv. 14), "The Lord reward him according to his works." When, in the court of war, Washington as a judge condemned Major André to death, he did not necessarily cease to feel benevolently towards him. Paul could entertain along with a holy wrath a true feeling of benevolence.

Washington's exercise of judicial wrath was not incompatible with his exercise of benevolence. There is no incompatibility between justice and love, as the experience of many an honest judge can affirm. On the contrary, there can be no such thing as perfect ethical benevolence without perfect justice, whether in God or man.

Dr. Burney seems to think that the text, "God is love," teaches that God cannot be justice in the same essential sense. But what, then, do the words of Isa. vi. 3, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God," mean? What the words of Heb. xii. 29, "For our God is a consuming fire?" Judicial wrath and benevolence are compatible. These texts show it. Justice and love are each essential attributes of God.

(2.) We ask, What about the rectitude of God's purposes? The author identifies justice and right. These terms with him have the same content. Justice as an attribute of God is his fidelity to his purposes; right in God is fidelity to his purposes. But may we not ask whether these purposes are *just* or *right*? It is to the purpose or intention of a man that we go to find out his morality. Apparently, our author will not permit us to ask whether God's purpose is right. Common sense, however, will ask; and if it concludes, as it must, both from philosophy and revelation, that God's purpose is right, it will ask further, "What made it right?" And it will look for the necessary cause of a right purpose in a right nature, of a just purpose in a just nature.

Further, it seems clear that if Dr. Burney is right, then God might have made what we call the moral law—the decalogue—very different, nay, the opposite of what it is; and that the distinction between the "perpetual moral" and the "temporary positive" precept would be reduced to a worthless superficiality. *God is just essentially.*

(3.) According to this teaching God's justice is merely his fidelity to his purposes, faithfulness in making things work out his original purpose.

Now, the author himself says (pp. 157, 158), "The fact that the human mind was created in the image of the divine mind seems to authorize the inference that there is at least some similarity in their moral attributes. Hence, that justice, truth, love,

mercy, etc., in the human are generically the same as they are in the divine." This is the truth. But now the query arises, Is justice in the human nothing else than faithfulness to his purposes? Napoleon was long faithful to his purpose to be emperor of France, and to subjugate all remaining Europe, if possible. Was he just, and *this* his justice? One of the most persistent of all rational beings is the devil. Is he just? And to take a case where the purpose is "wise and benevolent," were Washington's justice and his fidelity to his purpose not to resign his command during the winter of Valley Forge identical? Consciousness says that the trait of persistence along a determined line of action is different from the trait of justice, that justice (if your action affects aught else that has rights) qualifies you in the very formation of the purpose, while persistence, or fidelity to the purpose, qualifies you in relation to the purpose already formed. These are different. God is just as well as faithful.

(4.) The author seems to *out-Socinus* Socinus himself. And it is remarkable that, if our memory serves, he does not refer to Socinus. Their views as to God's justice are very like. Socinus, indeed, seems to have been hardly so hard-mouthed in denying God's justice. He says, "There is no such justice in God as requires absolutely and inexorably that sin be punished. There is, indeed, a perpetual and constant justice in God; but this is nothing but moral equity and rectitude, by virtue of which there is no depravity or iniquity in any of his works";<sup>1</sup> that is, if there is any distributive justice in God, it is a mere effect of divine volition. God is not moved thereto by any necessary attribute. Our author, when he denies justice in any sense of God as an essential attribute, is more consistent than his spiritual progenitor; yet, practically, Socinus and he are at one on the justice of God.

(5.) This colossal slander of God lying at the base of the fabrication of this soteriology necessarily renders the whole scheme unworthy in the highest degree.

§ 2. Our author's notion of God as a moral ruler may be inferred. It is in substance:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Praelectiones Theologicae*, C. 16, quoted in Shedd's *Theology*, Vol. II., p. 365.

“The moral law is a ‘concreation’ in the human mind. Its abrogation would involve the destruction of the mind. Its relaxation would involve fundamental changes in the mind.

“God is just or true to his own purposes as revealed in the constitution of the human mind, and his word, both affirming that the soul that sinneth it shall die.” (P. 134.)

“This is the aspect of divine justice or law that imperatively requires . . . some plan by which the sinner can be changed from a rebel against justice or law to a state of submission to law or God. The restoration of the rebel to obedience is by necessary consequence the removal of penalty, just as the cure of disease is the removal of its painfulness.” (Pp. 135, 136.)

(1.) According to this teaching, the Almighty having endowed us with the “concreated” moral nature, by his arbitrary will, is going to see that we do not walk contrary thereto without suffering. The infinite giant will have his purposes, of which neither moral good nor moral evil may be affirmed, carried out. There is, therefore, a plan to change rebellious creatures.

(2.) We learn here that the moral nature of man is the result of God’s purpose; that purpose our author must hold to be non-moral. Can there be more in the effect than was in the cause? It would seem, then, that our moral natures are non-moral.

(3.) If God’s plan can be best accomplished by abrogating in the case of any individual man the moral law, even if it does cost that man his mind, he may do so and be perfectly just in doing it. Does not his justice consist in his “fidelity to his purposes?”

(4.) We deny that the “restoration of the rebel to obedience is by necessary consequence the removal of penalty.” If sin and disease are analogous in certain respects, they differ in this primary one, viz., that sin is an act, at least, a *nisus*. There is spontaneity in all sin, even in “states” of sin. But disease is a product. It lacks spontaneity. If you destroy the product you destroy its phenomenon, painfulness. But though you cause an agent to stop acting in a sinful way, you do not destroy the bad effects of his previous sin, for which he is still responsible. Or if the doctor object, and say there is a physical *nisus* in disease, then we say that painfulness is not the *only* effect of the disease, and foulness of disposition is not the *only* consequence of sin. Though that be taken away, other consequences are to be answered for. If it be so, that one who sees no righteousness in God, the moral ruler, can-

not *see* it; that is a proof that he should rectify his creed at that point.

(5.) He who denies the essential justice of God can frame no other than an unworthy picture of God's moral government. He beholds the government of an almighty giant, himself uncontrolled by essential righteousness, over non-moral beings. This is worse than the hell of fatalism. Such is the second stone in the foundation of the "new theory." And *it* is from the Socinian quarry.

§ 3. A few quotations will show the doctrine of the moral agency of man set forth in this volume. In speaking of the Anselmic theory of the atonement (p. 43), the author says:

"It was but natural that he should construct his soteriology to meet the requirements of Augustinian anthropology. In brief, his soteriology may be regarded as the natural product of a false anthropology, false views of human freedom, and false conceptions of the nature and possibilities of the moral law." And p. 219: "Substitution requires the doctrine of moral necessity." On p. 63: "Our first parents were created holy, but not innocent and upright." And again, p. 356: "To be born in a state of fitness for heaven is impossible, because it presupposes a concreated righteousness, which is a *contradiction*."

Worthy of attention, as giving an insight into the author's practical psychology, is the statement (p. 64):

"Certainly we should distinguish between an inclination to sin and the act of sinning. The first is a state of sensibility, and the other is an act of the will."

(1.) It is evident that he who makes such statements is to be recognized as the fellow of Socinus, Scotus and Pelagius, and of the first water, in respect to human freedom; that he has never made the distinction, *necessary* in order to any true understanding of the human will, between the passive susceptibilities of feeling and the soul's active appetencies; that, in short, he is ruled by a superficial sensational philosophy. The limits of this review forbid our more than pointing out these facts.

(2.) It is amusing to hear our author speak of the moral nature of man, since he tries to destroy all basis therefor; for though there is a difference between natural and moral good, if one holds to the non-righteousness of God, that he is not essentially righteous, such an one cannot make the distinction. He therefore can allow no moral nature; nor should he speak of moral agency.

(3.) It is a puzzle to understand how God could have "created

our first parents innocent and *upright*—in character, of course—yet, not have created them righteous in character, and so have accomplished that “impossible” thing, that “contradiction,” “a conated righteousness.”

(4.) Such anthropology is a *logical prius* to the view given of the moral government of God, and is so far a fitting third foundation stone of the “new theory.”

§ 4. Sin is not a debt, but a crime” (p. 138).

“To make sin strictly a debt, and nothing but a debt, secures some polemic advantages in favor of substitution.” (P. 139.)

Having made this remarkable statement, our author proceeds, in the course of several pages, to knock down this light-weight straw man, and to pummel him with much self-satisfaction very thoroughly. In the meantime he tells us that “We get the word debt in the Lord’s prayer only by taking a word *literally*, which was evidently intended to be taken *tropically*” (p. 139); and describes sin further as “a crime against objective and subjective law, against God and the sinner himself” (p. 142); and as “a self-degradation and forfeiture of the good which the beneficent law of God is intended to conserve” (p. 145).

(1.) It may be granted that, in the Lord’s prayer, sin is called debt tropically; but would our Lord have used a *trope* unless it were fit by reason of a real similarity in some particular? Hardly. “This use,” says Dr. Broadus, (*Com on Matt., in loco*), “is perfectly natural in itself, since an obligation to God which is not duly met becomes to us a sin.” The sinner is a debtor to God. This is not saying that he is an exact analogue of a pecuniary debtor. He is a *moral* debtor.

(2.) This aspect of the sinner as a moral debtor is studiously hidden. Evidently, like Scotus, Dr. Burney thinks it is hidden even from God. He ignores the relation of the sinner to the penal sanction of the law, or his obligation to punishment.

(3.) The result of sin to the sinner is simply a “self-degradation and forfeiture of the good.” In this he is like Socinus and Scotus, though in his notion of the effect of Adam’s sin on his race he is more like the lower Arminian school—*e. g.*, like Whitby.

(4.) This view of the nature and consequences of sin, though

so evidently false, is the one that coheres with the author's doctrines of God's non-righteousness, of moral government, and of man's freedom.

These four doctrines are the four corner-stones on which the new theory of soteriology is to be erected. They are rotten. They are *sand* already. It cannot stand.

II. After the preliminary consideration of the previously exposed doctrines, our author states the issue, viz.:

"Does Christ save us by suffering the punishment of our sins in our place, or by delivering us from our enmity against God, and restoring us to a loving obedience?"

The form of this statement is objectionable, but we waive the objection. Dr. Burney affirms the latter alternative, and proposes to support his affirmation "by an appeal to known facts of human nature, and facts given in the Bible."

§ 1. He argues, *first*, from "natural or human atonement:"

"The offender, seeing his folly, may repent—that is, turn from his offensive purpose. . . . The act of outward confession has in itself no merit, no virtue, to propitiate. It is only the revelation to the other party of repentance or change of purpose and feeling in regard to him.

"Hence it is sufficiently clear that this repentance, this change of purpose and feeling, this self-reconciliation, is the propitiating, or favor-producing power, which gives to the offended party ample ground for both real and declarative pardon. . . . As disobedience to fraternal law necessarily involves condemnation, so repentance, which is a return to obedience, necessarily insures release from condemnation, or gives sufficient grounds for this release." (P. 154.)

"In cases where a mediator intervenes, what the mediator really does is not to take the place of one or both parties, but to help the offender to return to his duty, and to do just what the law of fraternal peace requires him to do, and to induce the offended party to accept this repentance as the condition of forgiveness. From these common sense truths it is clear that the *propitiation* is simply in the *repentance* or in the *obedience*, and not in any suffering endured by the offender or any impossible substitute." (Pp. 155, 156.)

. . . "Then it fairly follows that the law of human forgiveness, as revealed in nature and in the Bible, is generically the same as the law of divine forgiveness. That God should make confession the absolute condition of forgiveness in reference to man, and punishment the indispensable condition of forgiveness in reference to himself, is a thing in itself inconceivable." (P. 158.)

1. He misstates the nature and conditions of human forgiveness.

(1.) While bringing forth these views Dr. Burney has much to say—good, even if it is old—about the evils which come of failing to forgive upon confession. The nature of confession he also

states truly. But while he has apprehended that there is an important connection between repentance and forgiveness, he has failed to perceive the true nature of that relation, and also to comprehend correctly the nature of human forgiveness.

(2.) He has completely misapprehended the relation between repentance and forgiveness. He makes repentance to be a "favor-producing power," a sort of moral efficient of forgiveness by any well-constituted moral agent. It "necessarily insures release from condemnation, or gives sufficient grounds for this release." His mental condition here is much like that of those philosophers who will have it that our first truths are the products of experience, whereas, they come on *occasion* of experience into the consciousness from the mind's own constitution. They confound occasion and source, or efficient cause. He confounds occasion with the sufficient ground and with efficient cause. The three are severally different. It would be morally unfit to forgive, in the fullest sense in which we can predicate forgiveness of man, our fellow, unless he were repentant; but it does not follow that repentance is the ground of forgiveness, much less that it produces forgiveness. The real ground of forgiveness is the unevadable obligation to love our neighbor as ourselves, together with God's express prohibition of retributive functions to us, and enjoinder of forgiveness upon us. Repentance does not propitiate for the past. It does not repair. It is a cry of guilt. It grounds no right in the offender to the forgiveness of the offended, though it is the occasion necessary thereto.

(3.) But neither does Dr. Burney catch correctly the nature of forgiveness. Let us ask what it is that we can properly say that we forgive in him who trespasses against us. An example will elucidate. We suppose the following: You have a dear friend. He is cruelly murdered, and four results follow, viz., (*a*), natural resentment springs up in your mind against the offender; (*b*), you suffer loss—companionship, succor in distress—at the hands of the malefactor; (*c*), a stain attaches to the character and reputation of the murderer; (*d*), the murderer is under obligation to punishment for his crime. You feel it; he feels it; all upright men who know of his act feel it.



Now, if there be mingled with your resentment unrighteous elements, which is likely to be true,—if you wish to make the murderer suffer for selfish gratification, you should lay aside those elements at once. Indeed, you never should have had them. The personal element in your righteous resentment you should lay aside when you know that the murderous purpose has ceased to be operative in the murderer. As for the loss which you have sustained, so far as remuneration is possible, you know yourself to be entitled to it at the hands of the murderer. And if he is truly repentant, he will do his utmost to repair all possible of reparation. But he may be naturally unable. And whenever the criminal has confessed repentance, and has shown it to be genuine, that his character is as strong and pure as it was before the misdeed, you are bound to forgive him in the fullest sense of which man is capable. You are bound to lay aside resentment, to remit impossible reparation, and to treat him in accordance with this repentant character. The grounds on which you are to do this have been stated already. But you can forgive nothing else. You still feel that he has violated a righteous law, and should suffer therefor. You will find no more personal satisfaction in the thought that he suffers than in the thought that any other guilty man suffers. But you feel that he ought to suffer. He feels it. You never think of releasing him from obligation to punishment; that does not come into your concept of private forgiveness. It is a matter you leave with God or his vicegerents. *Human pardon does not consider the criminal's obligation to punishment.*

(4.) We may remark, in passing, that while the mediator must be equally the friend of both parties, yet he sometimes does take the place of one of the parties; *e. g.*, a son forges a note; he repents; his father intervenes, suffers the necessary financial mulct, and reconciles the parties.

Thus we see that the nature and conditions of *private* human forgiveness are not at all understood by Dr. Burney. This of itself would be sufficient to vitiate his conclusions.

(5.) It is in place here to call *particular* attention to the fact that our author tacitly assumes that the relation of God to the sinner in the divine government is like that of one sinner to

another. He refuses to see any analogy between the relation of a righteous human ruler to his subjects and God's relation to the sinner. He asserts (p. 136), that "to interpret divine law by human law leads to false notions of God and his law, of sin, of retribution, and of the plan of salvation."

This mere assertion he does not support by any argument. It is impossible of proof. Of course, in arguing from human governments, allowances must be made for imperfections of every kind. But if God stands related to the Mosaic law as the Bible claims, there is an imperfect analogy between human and divine government. The light of nature, as Bishop Butler has so powerfully shown, teaches us the same truth. Further, we are justified in claiming that the *analogy is strong*, that human government is, in spite of its imperfections, a part of the divine government; for Paul teaches that a ruler "is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Now, "human governments do *not* regard repentance as the sufficient condition for remitting penalty." No judge does. The so-called pardoning power of government is not a pardoning power. It is a justifying power. He who is said to be pardoned is declared not to have violated the spirit of the law, the letter of which condemned him. Or, in the light of new evidence he is seen and declared not to be guilty. Thus this true analogue teaches the utter insufficiency of repentance in order to remission of penalty.

2. Our author demolishes his own argument from the "nature of human atonement," by his subsequent teaching about the nature and conditions of divine forgiveness. He had said (p. 158), in the chapter on "Human Atonement":

"While the laws of forgiveness are, in relation both to human and divine, generically the same, they are in their *accidents* specifically different."

On page 313 he raises the question:

"Why is not repentance of itself a sufficient ground of forgiveness of sins against God?"

And answers:

"This is one of the most important, and withal one of the most difficult, subjects connected with the whole subject of the atonement." (P. 313.) "I have found it exceedingly difficult to satisfy some students that any propitiation at all is necessary." (P. 314.)

He then proceeds to say :

(1.) "It does not follow that because repentance is a sufficient ground of forgiveness between man and man, that it is therefore a sufficient ground of forgiveness between man and God." . . . (2.) "What is required in order to deliverance from sin against God is not a mere change of an accidental state of the passions, but a change of the heart from an inborn constitutional bias." (P. 314.) (3.) "No repentance is sufficient ground for so radical a change. In fact, repentance is no part of its ground at all, but only its condition. . . . Repentance is the grant of Christ the *quickening Spirit*, without whose influence repentance unto life is impossible." . . . (4.) "But even if repentance . . . was possible, it could not be accepted as a ground of forgiveness, for nothing, absolutely nothing, is acceptable unto God which is not sanctified or separated unto him."

(1.) We may remark, by the way, that after teaching the student that justice, in the common acceptation of the term, is not an attribute of God; that there is no obligation to penalty attending sin; that the absolute condition and sufficient ground of human forgiveness is repentance; that human and divine forgiveness are generically one in character, it does not seem strange that Dr. Burney should find it hard to convince any of his thereto more docile pupils that any propitiation was necessary in order to God's forgiving sin. The student can see no need for the fifth wheel. Out-and-out Unitarianism pleases by greater consistency.

(2.) It is worthy of special notice how different a thing our distinguished author makes divine forgiveness from human forgiveness. "Deliverance from sin against God is . . . a change of the heart from an inborn constitutional bias to evil." By the phrase, "Deliverance from sin," he means "pardon." On page 277 he says :

"To pardon sin in such a sense as to save the soul . . . is to regenerate, new create the soul itself. This done, the penalty ceases, as pain subsides when the disease which caused it is removed."

What folly, then, to argue from the laws and conditions of human forgiveness those of divine forgiveness! Certainly, according to this description of God's pardon, the two kinds of forgiveness are wholly unlike. Why, then, suppose the laws of their performance "generically" alike? When man forgives his fellow, he works no change in him. Our author himself teaches that human forgiveness is a laying aside of indignation by the offended as against the offender. This is a defective view, how-

ever. Remark the following: There is a man named John Hall in New York city. There is one bearing the same name in the mountains of West Virginia. I prove (*a la* Burney) that John Hall of New York gets drunk every Saturday night by showing that the mountaineer does. *They have the same name.* Afterwards I assert that John Hall of New York is a very different sort of man. This last assertion may be true. But what of my reasoning?

(3.) Not only are the acts represented to be absolutely, in respect to essentials, different. *The absolute conditions or grounds of the two acts he represents now to be radically different.* He says that *repentance* is no sufficient ground; that it is not any part of a ground of God's forgiveness. The absolute condition, the sufficient ground of human forgiveness, is, he says, the offender's repentance and confession. But no internal change of any kind is posited as the ground of the divine. The real grounds are thus now declared to be wholly unlike. What force can there be in the author's reasoning from human atonement to himself.

3. It is in place now to consider the grounds alleged by the author to be those on which God pardons:

"If he (man) could by an act of will put himself into a state of thorough consecratedness, then he would be his own sanctifier, atoner and saviour." (P. 316.) "By virtue of this one sacrificial offering (Christ) all humanity is so sanctified that every man may bring his offering before the mercy-seat, or to Christ, his great Highpriest, and find acceptance. This is the new and living way. You should note the important fact that this sanctification of all humanity by this sacrificial offering does not affect the moral or legal condition of men. The atonement made for the altar did not affect the altar itself, but only its relation to God. . . . But as the atonement for the altar rendered it acceptable to God, so every human being is rendered so far acceptable to God that he may consecrate himself to God through Christ." (Pp. 317, 318.)

"I do not use the word sanctification in the sense of moral purity or sinlessness, but in the strict Bible sense, viz., separateness from worldliness and appropriation to God and sacred uses." (Pp. 339, 340.)

(1.) We are taught here that the "sanctification" which Christ effected, (and which, if a man could accomplish, he could be his own "atoner and saviour," *which is*, therefore, the essential ground of pardon,) is simply *a setting apart or appropriating to God*; and that it is just such sanctification generically as that by which holy places, utensils, and the like, were set apart. Christ mediates cer-

tain influences, helps us to certain graces, but if we could only sanctify ourselves, we could obtain pardon.

This sanctification does "not affect our moral condition." It does "not affect our legal condition." Wonderful to say! It affects our "relation to God," nevertheless. What sort of relation? Evidently a non-moral one; evidently, also, a non-legal one. But what sort?

Seeing the ground of divine forgiveness as Dr. Burney sees it, what of his argument from the nature of human forgiveness? It has "gone glimmering."

(2.) The author says (p. 202):

"You wish to know the authority for the assertion, that Christ by his sacrificial death did sanctify, set apart, or appropriate humanity to God in such a sense that each individual can come to God by faith in Christ, and be accepted through faith in him. This authority is clear and explicit. Heb. xiii. 12."

But the authority is not "clearly and explicitly" there. In order to show it to be in the text our author would have to show that the term "sanctify" has only the meaning "to set apart to God," in the Bible, in the Book of Hebrews, and in this chapter. No one of which things has he done, or can he do. It is well known that the term "sanctify" has at least two senses in the Bible (there seem to be four distinguishable uses): (*a*), To consecrate, or set apart to a holy use (Ex. xxviii. 41; Matt. xxiii. 17); (*b*), To purify, or make holy (John xvii. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 11; 1 Thes. v. 23.) In the Epistle to the Hebrews the word seems to be used in a more comprehensive sense, viz., to *expiate guilt* and to *relieve of pollution*.<sup>1</sup> This comprehensive sense is evidently the one here. The denotation of the *τὸν λαόν* being that of God's spiritual Israel, is much less than the position which the text is advanced to sustain requires. Besides, his interpretation gives a revolting caricature of God.

We utterly deny the existence of any such ground of divine forgiveness as Dr. Burney would find in this figment of "sanctification" which differentiates his scheme of soteriology from that of Socinus.

(3.) We cannot but observe, incidentally, that he misstates the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Owen on *Hebrews*; Dabney's *Theology*, p. 661; Sampson on *Hebrews*.

relation of the sinner to Christ's sacrificial work. This his leaning to Pelagianism allows.

So far we have seen that Dr. Burney misunderstands the nature and conditions of human forgiveness, misunderstands the nature and conditions of divine forgiveness, and that *his representations* of the two make them so different that there can be no reasoning from one to the other by analogy. We have also seen that this figment of "sanctification" alone saves him from the Socinian view of Christ's death in its baldest form.

§ 2. In supporting his position from "facts given in the Bible," our author begins with the "Bible usage of the word atonement." He makes the first requisite, in order to arrival at the truth, to be to "lay down all the dictionaries which reflect the vices, as well as the virtues, of the theological authors of the last eight or ten centuries." He then says:

"The word atonement often occurs in the Old Testament, but only in a few instances do the contexts give any distinct idea of what constitutes the atoning power. In these few instances, however, we have clear proof that it does not consist in penal suffering, but in placating or pleasing God by fidelity to him." (P. 164.)

The instances given are Lev. xvi. 11-20; Ex. xxx. 11-16; xxxii.; Deut. ix.; Num. xvi. 41-48; xxvi.

Let us suppose that Dr. Burney is arguing with one who holds that physical death is not the result of sin; that it is not, therefore, awful in God's sight; that the uncleanness of the holy place was not owing to sin in the people; that the holy place was not regarded as contaminated by sin; that, in fine, holds with the Doctor, *apparently*, a sort of gnostic conception of the flesh to be the biblical conception. To such an one only will Dr. Burney's explanation of Lev. xvi. 20 appear in the least plausible.

As for Ex. xxx. 11-16: The reason why the "poll-tax" is called an atonement, **כִּפּוּר**, is easily explained. A perpetual sacrifice was ordained. For this service a legally-imposed tax for the temple revenue was necessary. This explains how this contribution serves for expiation (verse 12). It served this purpose indirectly by serving "for the permanent expiation of the people by means of the offerings."<sup>1</sup> With it offerings were purchased.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schaff's *Lange, in loco*.

Ex. xxxii. : Moses' proffered atonement was not accepted. (See Ex. xxxii. 33-35.)

Num. xvi. 41-48: Here, according to Dr. Burney, the divine anger was turned away by Aaron's heroic obedience to the supreme law of love; and we have atonement without substitution. Rather we have a turning away of the divine anger by an official intercession by Aaron. His intercession, which was typical, was grounded on the sacrifices, also typical, which as high priest he offered. The intercession thus grounded is by an easily understood metonymy called atonement.

Num. xxv.: *Pulpit Commentary*: "The signal example thus made by Phineas of a leading offender was accepted by God as an expiation, and the exterminating wrath which had gone forth against the whole people was arrested." He makes atonement in destroying life. (Cf. *Perowne Com.*, Psalm cvi. 4.) There was more in the act than bare fidelity to God. Nor can the author prove, as he asserts, that Phineas was at this time a regularly consecrated priest, formally set apart to the office of mediator. But we pass the point, and without claiming to have ourselves a perfectly satisfactory notion of this unique atoning act. Were this instance favorable to Dr. Burney, it, standing alone as it does, would be utterly insufficient as a foundation for his theory.

We deny that these cases warrant any one's asserting that atonement consists in placating God by fidelity, and not in satisfying divine justice by penal suffering. The penal explanation is the most worthy of God in every case.

The true conception of atonement is conveyed in Lev. vi. 2-7, and iv. 13-20. From these passages we learn that forgiveness consists at least in the non-infliction of suffering on the trespasser, that the essence of the atonement is in the penal death of the animal, or rather in that of its antitype. It is *shed blood* that expiates. The transgressor's life is saved by the *destruction* of other life, by *substitutionary sufferings*.

Our author, however, having satisfied himself apparently as to the scriptural meaning of the word atonement, proceeds to set forth his conception of the Messianic atonement, or *sanctification*

rather. This figment has already been stated. It only remains to notice how Christ achieved this sanctifying work.

This holy being is represented as plunging under the impulse of unspeakable love into the vortex in which mankind is, and as winning by his heroic and self-denying exertions in behalf of man God's pardon for man. "Such heroic suffering," says he, "commends itself to all that is godlike in humanity, . . . knowing that such suffering does commend itself to all that is divine in men, we may very well believe it to be a sweet smelling savor to God. . . . All the atonements named in the Bible were made by obeying the law, not by bearing its penalties.

"If punishment is pleasant to God, then we must believe that he is equally well pleased with the state of affairs in pandemonium and paradise." (Pp. 211, 212.)

*I. e.*, This God, who has no essential justice, is pleased with the compassionate conduct of the great Rescuer. The Saviour by his magnificently heroic conduct atones or sanctifies.

After the remarks already made on God's justice, it would be puerile to apply ourselves seriously to the refutation of the unworthy twaddle contained in the above quotation.

Nor is it necessary to illustrate at length the arguments by which our author endeavors to rebut the penal theory and to establish the "non-penal." In the main, the objections which he brings against the penal or vicarious theory of the atonement are but those brought by his forebears, the Socinians or Pelagians or semi-Pelagians; *e. g.*, that satisfaction and remission are inconsistent; that the vicarious theory makes out God vindictive; that imputation is immoral and a fiction; that the notion of penal sacrifice is self-contradictory. All these objections have been exploded time and again. They have no force save in the mind of a Pelagian or Unitarian. And in the main, the positive arguments for his position are blocks which have evidently been hewn by a son of the same mothers.

He adds in this work, to unsound anthropology and unsound theology, unsound and unfair exegesis. As an instance of this let us examine his interpretation (?) of Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45:

"The decisive word is *lutron*, a ransom, supplemented by *anti*. . . . The engrossing idea of ransom is deliverance, and the word itself is indifferent to the means by which the deliverance is made. It may be by almost any means whatever except by "penal satisfaction," which, of course, were it possible, would not be ransom or deliverance from evil, but the endurance of evil by a substitute.



Again, the word *for* (*anti*), it is suggested, requires us to believe that there is a commercial value between the so-called penal sufferings of Christ and the souls of many. To this I reply that there is no known standard of valuation between penal sufferings and the souls of men. The penal explanation of the text involves two assumptions which render it worthless: first, that the death was penal and substitutionary; and secondly, that penal suffering actually ransoms or saves. If these gratuitous assumptions are true, then of course Gehenna is, or will become, "a land uninhabited." On the contrary, if we reject the idea of penal ransom, then we readily see how Christ, by giving his life in the interest of humanity, becomes the ransom of all that obey him." (Pp. 298, 299.)

(1.) Suppose God's redeemed do vicariously suffer in the substitute, are they not ransomed from personal suffering by him? and is not this true "ransom, or deliverance from evil?"

(2.) Notice the caricature in what is said about a "commercial value between the so-called penal sufferings of Christ and the souls of many." Caricature is one of the outstanding characteristics of the author's method.

(3.) He says, "The penal explanation of the text involves two assumptions," etc. Dr. Burney calls these "assumptions" "gratuitous," and therein begs the question in dispute.

(4.) His inference from these "gratuitous assumptions" is an "apple of Sodom," that has been touched into dust and ashes a hundred times. The sufficiency of Christ's atonement is one thing, the personal appropriation of it is quite another.

(5.) He teaches that *anti* means *in the interest of*. This is wholly "gratuitous."

Morison, a most reverent, scholarly and honest commentator, worthy of admiration even by those who are displeased with slight Arminian tendencies, says:<sup>1</sup> "He came to present to the divine justice what would afford a sufficient guarantee for the authority and honor of the law, in the event of the liberation of the guilty, and what would be fitted to have a wholesome ethical influence upon the hearts of the liberated. The preposition translated *for* (*anti*) does not mean *for the benefit of*, or in behalf of. It properly means over against, and here represents the ransom as an equivalent for the persons for whom it was paid. Substitution is implied, equivalence is expressed."

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary, on Mark x. 45.*

Says Dr. Broadus (*Com. Matt. xx. 28*): "The preposition rendered 'for' (*anti*), necessarily means 'instead of,' involving substitution, a vicarious death." And calls attention to *antitutron* in "who gave himself a *substitutionary* ransom." (1 Tim. ii. 6.)

"In these two passages the preposition (*anti*) *for* indisputably denotes substitution. Passages like Matt. ii. 22, 'Archelaus reigned in the room (*anti*) of his father Herod'; Matt. v. 38, 'An eye for an eye'; Luke xi. 11, 'Will he for a fish give him a serpent? prove this.'—*Shedd*.

Such are the means by which the "new theory" has been commended to the reading public. Our author has set forth a false notion of God, of moral government, of human freedom, of sin; has started with false views of human forgiveness and of divine; has made grievous errors in arguing from the conditions of the one to those of the other, and has misinterpreted the facts of the Bible to accommodate his own prejudices. And yet the book is of most pernicious importance. It will have an immense influence on a great mass of poorly educated preachers. It will add an increment to the velocity with which Cumberlandism is moving toward Pelagian Socinianism. It is important also as an index to outsiders of the extent of this movement already. We have been informed that Dr. Burney's hand, rather than that of any other, has given shape to those articles of the new Confession of his church which relate to Christ's atoning work. If so, the wording of those articles must be interpreted from his standing point. His view of the atonement is the prevailing view of the church? Those articles may, to him who has not had previous acquaintance with Dr. Burney's theological views, be remarkable only for vagueness; but when read in the light of a knowledge of the author's tenets, we see, not only that Calvinism has been utterly forsaken, but that an atonement more like the Socinian than any other is the church's possession. See § 31 of the *New Confession of Faith*, in the light of Dr. Burney's teaching.

They seem to hold to the divinity of Christ. Dr. Burney himself does, by a happy inconsistency. But their disciples will be less inconsistent. They will soon deny the necessity for the figment "sanctification," which, according to Dr. Burney, God has,

arbitrarily and not from essential justice, decreed in order to pardon.

And there is logic in the movement. The rejection of the "offensive doctrine of predestination," implied unsound psychology and defective views of sin, was an expression of false theology, involved a false soteriology. Start a stone down hill, and the tendency is for it to go on.

We would that our brethren in the Northern Church could see and read their own future in Cumberlandism, if they reject predestination.

THOMAS CARY JOHNSON.

*Louisville, Ky.*

## II. THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

THERE can be no doubt regarding the practical importance of right views as to the nature of the church of God. As a man's views on this subject are, so, if he be possessed of a well-balanced, logical mind, will be his views respecting the way of salvation, and as his views on the question of the way of salvation are, so will be his views as to the nature of the church. There may be exceptional instances to this general rule, but the history of the church furnishes ample proof of its truth. As a matter of fact, the views entertained of the nature of the church have determined the views of those who held them on the all-important question of the way of life; and *vice versa*, the doctrine of the way of life, logically carried out to its necessary consequences, has always given birth to, or been inseparably linked with, a corresponding theory of the nature of the church. This is not to be wondered at. If the essential idea of the church be that it is, as Rome contends, an outward visible organization, organized in a particular way, and constituted the sole repository of the grace of God, and the sole dispenser of it, then it must follow that outside that organization, and independent of its mediatorial ministrations, the grace that bringeth salvation can have no place, and that, in order to obtain it, men must apply to the church and accept her ministrations as divinely ordained, and submit to the terms on which she offers it. As the essayists in *Lux Mundi* put it, the church is the Spirit-bearing body, whose functions, in the impartation of the gifts of the Spirit, are exercised by an organized staff of officials bearing the title and executing the functions of an authoritative priesthood. It is only by absorption into this body that men can be made partakers of the benedictions which this priesthood procures and confers. As to those organizations which have been formed outside this historic corporation, these writers seem to have some hesitation in judging of their status in reference to the obtaining of eternal life. They leave the issue apparently undetermined, and throw the responsibility of a doom which is, to all

appearance, implied upon their wilful rejection of the divinely ordained organ and agent of the Spirit's grace.

On the other hand, if it is held that men become members of the church by faith in Jesus Christ, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to unite sinners to the Saviour by working faith in them, it will follow that, instead of union with Christ being conditioned upon union with the church, union with the church must be conditioned upon union with Christ. In a word, it will follow that membership in the invisible, mystical body of Christ, must be the condition of membership in the external visible organization, and that the former must precede the latter. In other words, the conditions of church membership are simply the conditions of salvation. As the sole conditions of salvation are repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, these alone must be regarded as the sole conditions of membership in the church. Except, therefore, the church is the custodian and administratrix of these graces, or of the grace that produces them, the whole theory which conditions salvation upon union with the outward visible organization must fall to the ground.

The question proposed for discussion, therefore, is of vital interest and of far-reaching consequences. As a man stands in relation to it he is to be judged of as a Protestant or as a Romanist; and if he be a minister, his homiletics will take their cast and character accordingly. An evangelical cannot preach as a ritualist, nor can a ritualist preach as an evangelical. The former will place Christ in the foreground as the way, the truth, and the life, through whom alone men come to the Father; the latter will place the church in the forefront as the only way either to Christ or the Father. In judging of these two antagonistic and mutually exclusive theories, we must take for our guide the word of God alone.

1. The scriptural idea of the church is indicated by the terms by which she is designated. One of these, and that, too, one of the most significant when carefully considered, is the term *ἐκκλησία*. The *Catechismus Romanus* very properly opens the discussion of this subject by referring to the import of this term, and renders

it in Latin by the term *evocatio*. This, however, is not the Latin equivalent of ἐκκλησία. *Evocatio* is simply a calling out, whilst ἐκκλησία is the assembly of those who have been called out, and who have responded to the call by coming out. Singularly enough, the *Catechismus* refers in illustration of the import of this term, to the fact that the gathering in Ephesus who came out in response to the call of Demetrius to assist and defend the claims of the goddess Diana, is called the ἐκκλησία. Surely it is manifest that this assembly was not an *evocatio*, but a body composed of the *evocati*. Such is the import of the term ἐκκλησία, as illustrated by this remarkable incident. It designates a body of men who have been called out, and who have come out in compliance with the terms of the call. The character of the assembly, therefore, will vary as the terms of the call vary. As those called out by Demetrius were summoned in defence of an idol, those who responded to his call and joined in the uproar were simply an assembly of idolaters. Let it therefore be remembered that, in order to know the nature or character of the ἐκκλησία in any case, we must know the character or terms of the call by which it has been evoked. In the case of the ἐκκλησία of Christ this can easily be ascertained, for the call is simply the gospel call—a call to repentance and faith, a call to repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as he is offered to us in the gospel. The ἐκκλησία, whose nature is now in question, therefore, consists of all those who have obeyed this call; that is, who have repented of their sins and turned to God through faith in Christ Jesus.

In the account which Paul gives of the κλήσεις, or calling, of the ἐκκλησία at Corinth, he makes it clear that, in his view, that church consisted of those, and of those only, whose κλήσεις, or calling, was the result of an efficient forth-putting of the power of God through the preaching of Christ crucified, and that this exercise of the divine power was in pursuance of a previous divine purpose and choice. In confirmation of his view the apostle appeals to their own experience. "See (look at, consider,) your κλήσεις (calling), brethren, how that not many wise men according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called, but God hath *chosen* the foolish things of the world in order to put to

shame the wise, and the weak things of the world hath God *chosen* in order to put the mighty to shame." (1 Cor. i. 26, 27.) In a word, their calling (*κλήσεις*), from which the church had sprung, had been a selection, discriminating *κλήσεις*, demonstrating the sovereign grace and almighty power of God, on the one hand, and the utter unworthiness and spiritual helplessness of man. It is true, the outward, visible organization at Corinth is addressed as the church at Corinth, but the terms of the appeal are such as to show that, in the apostle's estimate, none belonged to it in reality save those who had been chosen of God, and who, in consequence of that choice, had been effectually called.

The power put forth in giving this call is likened in Scripture to the power exerted in the resurrection of the dead. "Verily, verily I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." (John v. 25, 26.) In Ephesians i. 19; ii. 6, this power is compared to that wherewith the Father wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places. Such was the power by which the Christians at Ephesus had been quickened into spiritual life and constituted members of that church, and such was the power put forth in the calling of those who constituted the church at Corinth, and such, according to our Saviour's account of it, is the power exerted wherever those dead in sin are made partakers of that life of which he is the fountain and sole administrator, and it is only those who have been made partakers of this life who constitute the true mystical body of Christ.

In confirmation of this view of the *call*, which is the originating, efficient cause of the *ἐκκλησία*, reference may be made to the place assigned to it by the apostle, Romans viii. 28-30: "All things work together for good to those who are the called (*κλητοῖς ὁδοῦ*) according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called (*ἐκάλεσε*); and

whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." According to this passage, the calling holds an essential place in the economy whereby God carries into effect his determinate purpose of grace. It is the first step towards the final determined goal, and without it the divine purpose would remain in abeyance. Those whom God predestinates he also calls. And just as the predestinating purpose does not abide simply as a purpose, but gives birth to the call, so the call does not remain unproductive, but is followed by the justification of those called. And having justified those called, God does not abandon his work; those whom he justifies he also glorifies. The links of this great redemptive chain are inseparable, and it binds indissolubly together the determinate purpose and the final glorification of all the predestinate. It does so, however, through the efficient mediation of the intermediate links of their calling and justification. In a word, if men are to be glorified by an absolute conformity to the image of Christ, they must be justified; and if they are to be justified, they must be called; and if they are to be called, their calling must be according to the divine antecedent purpose.

Now, it must be manifest that this account of the way in which men are delivered from the guilt and bondage of sin, and transformed into the image of Christ, is irreconcilable with the theory that the church, in her essential idea, is an outward visible organization. There is not now, nor has there ever been, an outward visible church organization of whose entire membership it could be affirmed that they were all predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, that they have all been effectually called and justified, and that the entire body has been, or shall be, without fail, glorified. All this, however, is here affirmed of those referred to in this apostolic summary of the steps embraced in the deliverance of men from the power of darkness, and their translation into the kingdom of God's dear Son, and their transformation into his image. Rome herself is compelled to admit that her organization embraces many who are not true members of Christ, and that even some of her chief office-bearers have been lost. It is only of the invisible, mystical body of Christ that the



apostle's statement holds good, and this alone, therefore, is entitled to be regarded as the true church, the body of the effectually called.

2. Again, such is undoubtedly the idea of the church indicated in the introductions of Paul's *Epistles*. Addressing the Christians at Rome, he salutes them as the *κλητῶς*, "the called of Jesus Christ, beloved of God, and called to be saints." His first *Epistle* to the Corinthians opens with these words: "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." In his second *Epistle* to this church he extends his greeting "to all the saints which are in Achaia." Writing to the Ephesians, he addresses them as saints, "to the saints which are at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus."

In Paul's view, therefore, the church at Ephesus was made up of saints, of those who were faithful in Christ Jesus. As the immediately succeeding verses show, those thus addressed had been brought into the estate of saintship in accordance with a choice which antedated the foundation of the world. This choice was a purely sovereign selection, the ground of which was not to be found in the holiness or blamelessness of the subjects of it, but in the good pleasure of God. They were chosen, not because they were holy or free from blame, but in order that they might be made holy and free from blame. And as they were raised to the rank of saintship and freed from condemnation through this antecedent, eternal choice, so had they been raised to the rank of sonship, in pursuance of a divine predestination, which identified them with the Son himself, as the objects of the Father's paternal love.

One would think that such authoritative statements of the origin, attributes and status of the membership of the church should determine the question regarding its essential nature. If it has its origin in a divine purpose, entertained before the foundation of the world, to deliver the objects of it from a state of unholiness and guilt, a purpose which God purposed in himself and carries into execution in the times before appointed, through the infallible mediation of his Son and the omnipotent agency of

the Holy Ghost, it must follow that, from the outset, it stood out before the divine mind as clearly defined as when it shall at last be presented before the throne, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. It is impossible that at any stage in its history it should embrace any save those comprehended in the eternal purpose, or that, when its history is finished, there should be some of those originally embraced in the divine conception found outside its pale. As this cannot be said of the church viewed as an eternal organization, that theory cannot be entertained by any whose idea of the church is regulated by the structure of the economy of grace, or who recognize the omniscience of God, the efficacy of the atonement, or the efficiency of the Holy Ghost in the execution of his office as the applier of the redemption purchased by Christ.

3. In harmony with all this, and confirmatory of it, is the account which Christ gives of his commission. Speaking of this commission (John vi. 37-39), he uses language most decisive on the point now in question: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in nowise cast out; for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Here, then, is our Saviour's commission, what he was authorized and sent to do. It was certainly a very definite commission, and a well defined work. He was appointed of the Father to save a people given him by the Father, and this salvation embraces the resurrection of their bodies at the last day. All those thus given to him, he informs us, shall come to him; and, as his commission embraces all such, he will in nowise cast them out. In receiving them he was simply executing his Father's will, a will with which his own was in the completest and most absolute harmony. In this work he is still engaged, and his commission will not be fully executed until he wakes once more to life the mouldered tenements of his redeemed. When this is done, he will be able to report the result of his sore travail and transcendently glorious achievements under that great commission. He will be able then to say, "Behold I and the children which

thou hast given me; I have not lost one of them, nor ought of any one."

Of like import is his reference to the work assigned him by the Father in that wondrous prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel by John: "Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; even as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. I have glorified them upon the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. . . . I have manifested thy name to the men which thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them to me, and they have kept thy word." It is unnecessary to quote further from this heart-utterance of our great Intercessor. The prayer, in its entirety, proceeds upon federal lines. It assumes a covenant engagement regarding a people given in custody by the Father to the Son. The stipulations of this covenant are mutual. As the Son undertakes to impart to this people, and to every one of them, eternal life, the Father undertakes to give, and has actually given, him power (*ἐξουσία*) over all flesh, that is, over the whole human race, in all its teeming, consecutive generations, to the end of time. This authority is necessary. As those given him for redemptive ends are distributed along the track of the generations, it is necessary that he who is to single out the individuals given him, and impart to them eternal life, must preside over the entire history of mankind. Let it be remembered, that he who breathed this prayer is the same as he who was in the beginning with God, and was God, by whom all things were made, and without whom was not anything made that was made, in whom was life, and whose life was the light of men. In other words, let it be remembered that he who here intercedes is not only the author of spiritual and eternal life, but the author of the natural life of every man. It behoved him, therefore, to have control of the generations in order that he might bring upon the theatre of existence those to whom he was commissioned to impart eternal life. He does not wait till by some fortuitous incidents those made over to him by the Father appear upon the

scene. On the contrary, knowing them as they were entered in the eternal covenant, as the Father's choice, before all worlds, he determines their appearance by the exercise of his creative power.

Whether, then, we consider the design of the Father in giving those referred to in this prayer to the Son, or the redemptive work of the Son, which the Father gave him to do on their behalf, or the efficacy and comprehension of his intercession, we must conclude that failure is out of the question; the end sought by the Father, and wrought for and prayed for by the Son, cannot fail of accomplishment. Those whom the Father hath given him shall, without fail, be with him where he is, and shall behold and share in the glory upon which he has entered. As this cannot be said of any visible church organization as such, it follows that the church in its essential idea is not an external visible organization. It is not true of any such organization, or of all such taken together, however organized, that in their entire membership they were given by the Father to the Son, with full power to impart to them eternal life; and that, having been kept by both Father and Son, they shall in their entirety inherit with Christ the glory ineffable conferred upon him as the reward of his obedience and death.

4. This is the only view of the nature of the church that will harmonize with what Christ says about his sheep: "His sheep hear his voice, and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. When he putteth forth all his own (revised text) he goeth before them; and the sheep follow him because they know his voice. And they will not follow a stranger, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of strangers."

Such is the character of a good shepherd, and Christ claims it for himself: "I am the Good Shepherd; and I know my sheep, and my sheep know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock and one shepherd. . . . I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall pluck them out of my hand. My Father which hath given them unto me is greater than all;

and no one is able to pluck them out of the Father's hand." (John x.)

The ecclesiology of this graphic passage is neither Romish nor Anglo-Romanic. The shepherd is Christ, and the sheep are his church. All that is said of the shepherd is true of Christ, and all that is said of the sheep is true of his church. He knows them and they know him. He leads them and they follow him. They know his voice, and know not the voice of strangers. He dies for them, and gives to them eternal life, and assures us that they shall never perish, giving, as the guarantee of their safety, the relation they sustain to himself and the Father, as held in the hands of both. These things are true of the invisible mystical body of Christ, and are not true of any ecclesiastical organization that ever existed, when viewed in the whole round of its membership. Of no such organization could it be said that its entire membership, without exception, knew Christ, heard his voice, and followed him, eschewing the voice of the leadership of strangers, and that not one of them ever perished, or that they were, individually or collectively, held in the omnipotent grasp of the hands of the Father and the Son.

Did time and space permit, this same view of the nature of the church might be established by reference to other figurative representations of the relation that subsists between her members and Christ. He is the true vine, and they are the branches, drawing their life and fruit-bearing power from him. He is the head and they are the members of his body. Of that body they are constituted members by the agency of his Spirit, who quickens them into spiritual life out of an estate of spiritual death, and thus unites them to their living Head. He is the bridegroom and his church is his bride, which he loved, and for which, out of his love for her, he gave himself to the death, in order that he might present her to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that she might be holy and without blame. Such was the love of this Bridegroom for this bride, and such his purpose regarding her final destiny.

These figurative representations of the relations subsisting between Christ and his church might be greatly multiplied, but those

now given may suffice. They are all in harmony with, and confirmatory of, the doctrine that the church, in her essential nature, is a truly spiritual body, possessing true spiritual life by virtue of the indwelling of the vitalizing Spirit by whom she is united to Christ her Head. It is true that, both in the Scriptures and in common parlance, the term church is applied to outward visible organizations. This is true, but it is a truth that does not necessitate a modification of the doctrine now established by arguments drawn from the current representations of the word of God, and which are the outcome of what the Scriptures teach regarding the way of salvation. Let the question be asked, Why are such and such organizations accounted and treated as part and parcel of the church of Christ? To this question the only answer that can be given is, that they are regarded and treated as portions of the church of Christ because they profess to sustain to him the vital relations already proved to subsist between him and his mystical body. What is true of our recognition of individuals as Christians, is true of our recognition of organized bodies as Christian churches. Our recognition of a man as a Christian arises from our persuasion that he is what he professes to be, a man who has accepted Christ as his Saviour as he is offered in the gospel. If it should turn out that his conduct belies his profession, we instinctively reverse our judgment regarding his claims to such recognition. And just so is it in the recognition of ecclesiastical organizations. The recognition of them as churches is based upon their professed conformity in doctrine and life to the ideal presented in the divine word. In every instance we are moved to recognition through the persuasion that the organization answers, in some measure, to this ideal standard. The act of recognition proceeds upon the assumption that the qualifications for membership in the church are the same as the qualifications for membership in the mystical body of Christ. No church has authority to lay down conditions of admission to church fellowship besides and in addition to those which Christ has laid down as the conditions of salvation. And, on the other hand, no church has authority to modify and attenuate those conditions so as to eliminate from them the essential elements of faith and repentance. In a word, in the

estimate of every intelligent Christian, the church, in any particular place, consists of those who have complied with those conditions, whether that place be Corinth or London, Britain or America.

But some one may say, your ideal church does not embrace infants, as they cannot believe on Christ or repent of sin. To this objection the reply is obvious. When faith and repentance are specified as the conditions of salvation, and, consequently, of admission to church fellowship, the reference is exclusively to adults, to whom the gospel message has been proclaimed. It is of such Christ speaks when he says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned." It is not from such statements that we are to learn the status of infants or Christ's attitude towards them. By his treatment of the little children brought to him for his blessing, and his utterance regarding them, he showed that, in his estimation, little children are fit subjects of redemption, and admissible to the kingdom of God. A church that ignores Christ's action and utterance on that occasion, and excludes infants from membership, cannot justify her action by referring to the terms on which adults are admitted to church fellowship. Carried to its logical ultimate, such a theory would lead to the conclusion that all children dying in infancy are lost.

It is not to be inferred from the foregoing discussion that it is a matter of indifference whether the church be organized or not, or, in other words, whether its members combine in Christian fellowship for mutual edification, by that which every joint supplieth, and organize their forces and resources for the execution of the great commission given her by her divine Head. The doctrine against which protest is entered is, that external organization is essential to the very being of the church, and that where this has not taken place there can be no church, and where it has ceased there the church has ceased also. This is the principle which underlies the ecclesiology of Rome, and by her it has been carried out to its utmost logical consequences. According to her teaching, the church, to be a church at all, must be organized, and must be organized after the pattern set by herself as the mother and mistress and moulder of all churches. As she defines it, the church

is "the assembly of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and communion of the same sacraments, under the government of legitimate pastors, and especially of the Roman pontiff, the sole vicar of Christ upon earth." Such is the doctrine of Rome, and such is the doctrine of the Oxford essayists, as avowed in "*Lux Mundi*," with the single exception of the vicariate and headship of the Roman pontiff. If the view of the essential nature of the church set forth in the previous discussion be true, the theory of Rome and of these essayists needs no formal refutation.

With regard to the form of organization, the writer would simply say, that it must be in keeping with the unity of the church, the parity of her ministry, and the representation of the people in all her courts.

ROBERT WATTS.

*College Park, Belfast.*



### III. THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION CONSIDERED ON ITS DIVINE AND ON ITS HUMAN SIDE.

It was common at one time, without regard to the question as to the mode of inspiration, to distinguish between different *kinds*, if not degrees, of inspiration. Several of these gradations or species used to be pointed out, such as the inspiration of direction and superintendence, the inspiration of suggestion, and the inspiration of elevation or exaltation. To the extent that these schemes admitted, or gave countenance to, the notion of a graduated scale, they were in conflict with the only orthodox doctrine, viz., that of a theopneustia or plenary, and, as Gausson would add, universal inspiration of God's word. Theodore of Mopsuestia, followed by Michaelis, in his Introduction, denied that the inspiration was co extensive with the limits of the Bible, holding that a part was wholly divine and the remainder not inspired at all, and merely human. Archdeacon Hare has been understood to maintain the infallible and even verbal inspiration of the revelations of spiritual truth contained in the Scriptures, but not of the other portions of the word. Twesten in Germany, and Pye Smith, Dick and others in Great Britain, held that all parts of the Bible were divinely but not equally (*nicht gleichmaessig*)<sup>1</sup> inspired. Inspiration, therefore, might be conceded to be universal, but was unequal, and often allowed imperfections and errors to creep in unobserved. Agreeably to this view, the degree of inspiration varied according to the character of the passage and the nature of the subject. Closely connected with this view was the scheme which involved the employment of the distinctions just referred to between different kinds or degrees of inspiration in a heterodox sense. Some of these have been represented as defining the inspiration of superintendence as that divine influence by which the writers "were preserved from serious error in all that relates to

---

<sup>1</sup> See *De Wette, Lehrbuch Anmerk.*, Twesten, *Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik*, tome 1, p. 424, etc.; and Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, all in *Gausson*, p. 27.

faith and life;" the inspiration of elevation as the one which raised the minds and souls of the men of God into the purest and sublimest regions of truth, and thus "indirectly stamped the same characters of holiness and grandeur on their words"; the inspiration of direction as the one under the more powerful influence of which the sacred writers were subject to God's guidance, both as respects what they said and what they abstained from saying; and the inspiration of suggestion, as the one through which all the thoughts, and even the words, were divinely controlled "by means of a still more energetic and direct operation of his Spirit."<sup>1</sup> The Swiss theologian whose name has been once or twice repeated in this article appears to have been ignorant of any other employment of these terms of distinction, and from his view was amply justified in condemning them in wholesale. He was correct in saying that these distinguishing terms were chiefly current in England, from which country, it may be additionally stated, they passed over to America. But they have been widely employed, too, in a strictly orthodox acceptation. Thus the inspiration of superintendence and direction have usually been identified and made to refer to the divine restraint from error; the inspiration of suggestion has been so defined as to limit its reference to truths beyond the range of natural information; and the inspiration of elevation, or exaltation, to the superhuman toning up of the style, especially in the case of the prophets, and to the remarkable exemption of the writers, when writing, from certain human and ordinarily inevitable frailties.

Where the inspiration of direction is distinguished from that of superintendence, the first of these terms, though not identified with the second, would be involved in it, as meaning the divine impulse urging them on to write at all, and enabling them to select from the sum total of their knowledge just what God intended to be conveyed by their lips or by their pens. On this view the inspiration of elevation applies to the manner, not the matter, of the sacred propositions, and differs essentially, but not repugnantly, from the technical inspiration of infallibility, whereas the inspiration of superintendence denotes what we now call

---

<sup>1</sup> *Gaussen*, pp. 27, 28.

“inspiration,” and the inspiration of suggestion what we have somewhat recently learned to denominate “revelation.” This far more vital and stringently indispensable, as well as truly scientific, distinction between *inspiration* and *revelation* has, to a great extent, superseded all the others. There is, it is true, a certain propriety and convenience in the descriptive phrase, “the inspiration of exaltation.” This one phrase, then, may well be retained, even though the other and analogous phrases should have to be abandoned. It serves us in good stead in our attempts to explain the unimpassioned and judicial style of the four accounts of the crucifixion, and has also been made to account for the unutterable grandeur of the language attributed to the three “uninspired” friends of Job, no less than for the ecstatic glow of Jacob and Balaam, and what Burns, in one of his immortal lines, has described as “rapt Isaiah’s sacred fire.” By far the most reasonable view is that the style of Job’s friends is simply that of the “inspired” author of the book, who gives, in a garb of lofty and profound dramatic poetry, yet infallibly, the substance rather than the words of the historic dialogues.

The need for the use of these precarious distinctions we have already intimated is to a great degree avoided by the more exact and far more important distinction between inspiration and revelation. Upon this view, the term *revelation* denotes the supernatural operation of God in imparting truth, otherwise unknowable, to the minds of his human instruments, or to any minds; whilst *inspiration* is the supernatural operation of God fitting the subject of it to be his divinely accredited and infallible spokesman to others.

By revelation in the highest sense of the word is meant, not only divine, but supernatural revelation; by inspiration, not only divine, but supernatural inspiration. There is such a thing as a *revelation*, and even a revelation from God, which is merely natural; as for example, in the divine works of nature and providence. We sometimes employ the term in a still lower acceptance. We say of this or that discovery, no matter how ordinary, that it was “a revelation” to us. So, too, there is such a thing as an *inspiration* which is not supernatural, but natural. Thus we

not only say, and say correctly, that Homer or Shakspeare wrote from the "inspiration" of his own genius, but also that every good thought and wish is "inspired" by God.

We address the Most High in our hymnology as the "inspirer and hearer of prayer." Nay, we use the term in a lower sense still. When Elihu declares that "the inspiration of God" giveth man understanding, his reference would appear to be to the original inbreathing of intelligence into the human soul. When we say that a certain organ, or article, was inspired by Bismarck, we only mean to say that Bismarck dictated its ideas or sentiments. *Inspiration* in the technical sense must, therefore, be distinguished carefully, not only from the rhetorical *afflatus* of the poets, but also from *illumination*, or the enlightening influence of the Spirit in the hearts of all believers, and therefore inseparable from sanctification; and *revelation* in the technical sense must be distinguished carefully from the conveyance of knowledge by ordinary means and in purely natural ways.

There may be, and there is, such a thing as *illumination* without either revelation or inspiration. All believers have as such been illuminated; but all believers have not received "revelations," nor have all believers been inspired. There may be revelation without either inspiration or illumination; for example, the great body of the people of Israel at Sinai, and of the contemporaries and eye-witnesses and auditors of Christ and the apostles. There may be revelation and inspiration without illumination; as is the case of Balaam and Caiaphas. There might be inspiration without either revelation or illumination. On the assumption that Solomon wrote the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, and that he was unregenerate, which many hold to have been the case, the narrative portions of these books would seem to afford an instance in point. There may be revelation without inspiration; as witness Paul's "visions and revelations" from the Lord, when he heard unspeakable words which he was not permitted to utter. There may be inspiration without revelation; as witness the historical statements in Luke's Gospel, and in the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, and all the other purely narrative portions of Holy Scripture.

In regard of the sacred volume it is proper and necessary, not only to affirm that all of it was *inspired*, but also that all of it was *revealed*; and we do affirm this when we declare that the whole Bible is a revelation from God. We do not, however, mean when we so speak to employ the term "revelation" in the narrow and technical sense as distinct from inspiration, but in the broad and popular acceptation of it, which covers the whole supernatural work and product of Almighty God, as evinced or embodied in his word. It is well to bear in mind also that, when we say "the whole Bible is a revelation from God," or "God's revealed will," we then have reference simply to its divine source and authority, not to the method by which its subject-matter was conveyed as truth to the minds of the inspired writers. In point of fact the subject-matter of the knowledge which they were inspired to impart to us came to them, as it would appear, by two very different channels—the one natural, the other supernatural. Much of the truth God instructed them to convey to *us* by infallible inspiration they knew at any rate themselves, and through the exercise of their own natural unaided faculties. Much of it, again, and that the most important part of it, they could never have known except as specially and supernaturally "taught of God."

The absolute necessity of a proper revelation from heaven—a revelation even in the strict exclusive sense—is thus seen to be obvious. Much of the truth contained in the Bible relates to matters beyond the reach of our faculties and organs. The gospel itself is defined as τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, ὡς δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ. The *promulgation*, too, of this, as of all other truth, required that the writers should be inspired.

But much, again, of the truth contained in the Bible was not only within the reach of our unassisted powers, but was actually known; *i. e.*, by a limited circle of witnesses. What was necessary here was simply the divine certification, extension and perpetuation of the knowledge already possessed by the few for that purpose.

We cannot but think that Bannerman and Lee were engaged in what was to a considerable extent a logomachy upon this point.

Bannerman contends that the whole subject-matter of the Bible, even what was already known to the inspired penmen through the mere exercise of their senses and other unaided powers, was supernaturally confirmed to them by divine revelation, and argues ingeniously from the conceded duplication and corroboration of natural by revealed religion. In this particular we opine that this stout defender of the faith in his praiseworthy endeavor to stand upright has leaned backwards. To change the figure, he appears to us to be *plus royaliste que le roi*; that is to say, if he means anything more than is involved in the statement that the whole subject-matter of the Bible is not only alike infallibly true, but is also alike God's infallible *message to us*. This statement covers the whole ground, and obviates the awkward necessity of making the plainest and most familiar history a revelation *in the same sense* with the doctrinal and prophetic portions of the sacred canon. The statement just referred to would have been perfectly acceptable to Dr. Lee, and is indeed carefully embodied in his definition of inspiration. Part of what was embraced by Dr. Bannerman under the term "revelation," and is essential, as he justly held, to a full account of the matter, is fully provided for in Dr. Lee's admirable treatise under the term "inspiration." Viewed in this light the debate is little more than a question about words, and the two stalwart champions occupy positions as regards this point resembling those of the two knights, one of whom swore that the shield was of silver, and the other that it was of gold, when the fact was that it was both gold and silver—silver on one side and gold on the other. Bannerman has notwithstanding been perhaps the first to point out the inadequacy of that definition of plenary inspiration which makes it to be simply the supernatural influence and product which rendered certain men and their sayings and writings "infallible." The definition, to be complete as well as sound, must read, "The infallible *spokesmen of God.*"

The author of the Scottish disquisition is also entitled to the high distinction of having grasped more strongly and tenaciously than any of his predecessors the all-important fact, that the fundamental conception underlying this whole subject is that of the sender of a message, the messenger who conveys it, and the mes-

sage thus sent. The Bible contemplated in this fundamental aspect is, whether merely in a broad or also in a narrower sense, God's infallible message to mankind. Lee would not have shrunk from admitting the substantial truth of this averment. There are in reality only two assertions that are indispensable to a sound doctrine of inspiration. They are these, first, that the whole Bible is, and not merely contains, God's message to man; and second, that that message is throughout infallibly true. If the writers might err in any, even the smallest particular, it is self-evident that they were only fallible.

Now, by a slight change in Bannerman's impressive illustration of the human message-sender and the errand-boy, light may be thrown on the connection between inspiration and revelation.

Let us suppose that a messenger-boy is summoned in one of the New York telegraph offices, and instructed to deliver a given message to a certain gentleman living in a distant street. Let us further suppose that he is allowed to write it down in the way that suits him best, and that all pains are taken to prevent him from making the slightest mistake. That may serve to illustrate the connection between doctrinal or prophetic revelation on the one hand, and an infallible inspiration on the other. But now let us vary the supposition, and try to imagine a different case. The scene is again laid in the New York telegraph office, and the same or similar persons are before us. But suppose the messenger-boy has been waiting for his turn, and has happened to overhear a piece of news, and is then interrogated as to whether he understood, remembers, and can himself report it accurately to another, and upon the exact ascertainment that he can write it down without mistake, is instructed to run on the errand and deliver the message, as in the former case. Here it is manifest the source and authority of the message are in no way affected by the circumstance that the channel through which the messenger-boy received his information is different in the second case from what it was in the first. This may serve to illustrate the connection between an infallible inspiration and that part of the message of the sacred writers which, in so far as it is regarded merely as a part of their acquired knowledge, came into their possession, not in an

extraordinary and supernatural, but in a natural and ordinary way. The signature, it will be observed, of the telegraph operator makes the errand-boy's message the operator's own, no matter whether the boy derived his knowledge of the facts to be reported from the operator himself, or in the uncircumscribed freedom of his own senses and mental faculties from some third party. So the whole message of the Bible is amply authenticated as addressed to us by God, and as being God's infallible truth, by the signature and seal that are everywhere upon it of God's own undeniable authorship and direction.

Says Dr. William Lee, late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, "In the combination of the two elements thus co-operating, viz., the actuation by the Spirit of God, and the distinct, but subordinate agency of man, consists the 'dynamical' theory of inspiration. According to this theory the Holy Ghost employs man's faculties in conformity with their natural laws, at the same time animating, guiding, moulding them so as to accomplish the divine purpose, just as in nature the principle of life when annexed to certain portions of matter exhibits its vital energy in accordance with the conditions which that nature imposes, while it governs and directs at the same time the organism with which it is combined. We must, therefore, look upon inspiration as a divine power, acting not only *on*, but *through* man. We must not regard the sacred penmen, on the one hand, as passive machines, yielding to an external mechanical force; such a view takes in merely the *objective* side of inspiration; on the other hand, if we dwell solely on the *subjective* phase of this influence, we lose sight of the living connection of the writer with God. Were this latter conception correct, the authors of Scripture, following the impulse of their own genius, and in accordance with their own judgment, proceeded in the natural course of things to develop new inferences from the germ of truth implanted within them; and hence, as some have argued, we cannot accept all the conclusions at which they have arrived as either infallible or authoritative. The true theory, as it recoils from any such negation of the divine majesty of the Bible, so it equally ignores the defective estimate of the opposite scheme. The human element instead of being suppressed



becomes an integral part of the agency employed, moulded, it is true, and guided, and brought into action by the coöperation of the Spirit, but not the less really on that account participating in the result produced. Nay, more, the peculiar type of each writer's nature was even essential to the due reception of that particular phase of truth presented by his statements; his share in the great work was apportioned to the order of his intellect and the class of his emotions, while his characteristic form of expression was absolutely requisite for the adequate and complete conveyance of his divine message. Without the moving power man could not have grasped the divine communications; without the living instrument these communications could not have received fitting expression. The Bible, it has been well observed,<sup>1</sup> is authoritative, for it is the voice of God; it is intelligible, for it is in the language of men."<sup>2</sup>

The distinctions already laid down relieve the matter of many difficulties. The German heresy on this subject, as advocated by such men as Schleiermacher, and in England and this country by such men as Morell and Professor Ladd, confound essentially different things. If, as has been shown, inspiration and revelation are not only wholly distinct, but are actually separable in experience, then any theory of inspiration which resolves it into a form of revelation must be false. In like manner, if inspiration and illumination are equally distinct and separable, then any theory of inspiration which resolves it into a form of illumination or sanctification must be false. If, too, the inspiration of literary or any other form of mere genius is distinct from the inspiration of the sacred penmen, it follows, as well as from the preceding statement, that any theory which resolves inspiration into a unique and extraordinary, but merely natural, elevation of the human faculties, *e. g.*, of the intuitional consciousness (Morell's "religious consciousness") must be false. And more comprehensively, if all these distinctions are just, then any theory which resolves inspiration into revelation conjoined with illumination, or revelation conjoined with the glow of poetic afflatus, or revelation conjoined with illumination and genius, or illumination conjoined with an

---

<sup>1</sup> By Bishop Westcott.

<sup>2</sup> Lee on *Inspiration*, pp. 143, 144.

extraordinary degree of natural insight and poetic or eloquent fervor, must be false.

Inspiration cannot be a mere form of revelation, for we have seen that there may be inspiration where there is no revelation. Inspiration cannot be a mere form of illumination, for we have seen that there may be inspiration where there is no illumination. Inspiration cannot be a mere form of natural genius raised to an abnormal pitch, for not only do we have instances of inspiration where there is a total absence of poetic glow or vatic rapture, but we have one instance of undoubted inspiration where the astute dictum of a worldly politician was by his own inspiration turned into a different and spiritual sense—that of Caiaphas—a sense too with which he, of all men in Jerusalem, was wholly out of sympathy, and of which he himself was as ignorant as if it did not exist. Once more, it is manifest that inspiration cannot be due to the combination of revelation, illumination and genius, or of any two of these, for we have seen that there may be inspiration without any one of them.

If these positions have been securely taken, then the whole fabric of false teaching as to the nature of the influence and product denoted by the term inspiration sinks into ruin.

These distinctions help us, moreover, in determining the question of the *extent* of inspiration. The answer we have given to this question is that the inspiration of the Scriptures is *plenary*. Inspiration is said to be *plenary* in opposition to the idea that it may be *partial*. When the distinction between inspiration and revelation is kept in view, the notice of a sliding-scale of degrees of inspiration is at once seen to be untenable and absurd.

When the *plenary* INSPIRATION of the holy men is affirmed, it is not meant to affirm that they had a plenary *revelation*. It is a mistake, however, on the part of Lee, to contend that this would necessarily be to affirm that the human writers were omniscient, and were consequently gods. True, in one sense of the words, this would be the case; but the language admits of another construction; and all that Bannerman means by endorsing the phrase, a “plenary revelation,” is that the whole book was fully inspired.

Still, what is now urged is not any doctrine of plenary revelation, but the familiar doctrine of plenary inspiration.

It is not meant, then, to affirm that Paul had a revelation of the number of persons he had baptized at Corinth, or of the fact that Caiaphas was the high priest before whom he was on a memorable occasion arraigned; or the apostles generally a revelation of the date of the Parousia, or of the ages that should precede it; or the older writers of the heliocentric system of astronomy, or the exact scientific truth as to the yet mooted questions in geology. It is not even meant to affirm that the sacred penmen and inspired spokesmen had, by revelation or otherwise, a full, or even always an accurate, knowledge of the sense of their own infallible words.<sup>1</sup> Caiaphas uttered words of this world's wisdom which, with a purely governmental and humanly selfish intent, were aimed at the very life of the Nazarene, and employed to disconcert his entire scheme. And yet it was this self-same dictum of which the evangelist declares, "And this spake he not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one all the children of God that were scattered abroad." (John xi. 51.) Daniel, after he had seen a vision, tells us he sought for the meaning (Dan. viii. 15); and again, that he fainted upon the occurrence of another unintelligible vision, and was astonished and made sick by it. (Dan. viii. 27.) Of still another vision it is said that "he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision." But the Apostle Peter expressly informs us that the prophets inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace of Christ, "searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," the plain purport of which is that the prophets referred to did not know the exact, much less the complete, meaning of their own words. When Moses, according to Exodus xii. 46, said, "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof," it is altogether doubtful whether he saw the prophetic reference it bore to Christ on the cross. Nor is it by any means ascertained that Malachi was aware

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Butler's Analogy*, Part II., Chap. 7.

that his own prediction of the angel or messenger of the Lord was to be fulfilled in John the Baptist. These are a few instances taken somewhat at random out of a multitude.

All that is contended for under the term *plenary*, as opposed to *partial*, INSPIRATION is, that the divine influence was plenary which enabled and fitted the human instruments to *impart* or *communicate* the divinely accredited truth to others. Nothing is involved here as to the nature or the extent of any real or imaginary influence enabling the human instruments to understand the divine message fully themselves.

The design and result of their inspiration was to make them suitable spokesmen of God to mankind. But if they are God's spokesmen, they must utter truth, for God is not the author of falsehood. Inspiration must, therefore, make them infallible, and infallible in all they utter officially in behalf of God. It is not essential that they shall comprehend their own words, but it is essential that they shall utter words that are infallibly true, and there are no degrees in infallibility. This is in a sentence the whole case for the upholders of the old-fashioned, strait-laced doctrine of the divine plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

It is also important to take notice that when the inspiration of the sacred writers is styled plenary, it is not meant that they uttered the infallible truth of heaven on all occasions, but only when they were speaking for God. Having uttered the divine message they were like Samson when he was shorn of his locks in which resided his miraculous strength. Nathan was not infallible when he assured David that "the Lord was with him" in his purpose of building the ark. This he "spake of himself." Inspired men might even go so far as to write uninspired and wicked epistles. Such was the letter of David to Joab in the matter of Uriah. Much less were the original heralds of the cross infallibly apprized of what was true and false, right and wrong, in matters affecting merely their own private conduct. They were "earthen vessels." They were "men of like passions" with ourselves. Here the distinctions already drawn again stand us in stead. Paul had more discretion, more force of character, more stability of opinion, and it may be more spiritual illumina-

tion than had Peter, and was compelled to withstand him face to face, and confirm, both by word and example, the general judgment which had blamed him; and yet Peter, as an inspired man, is precisely on a par with Paul.

This point may be illustrated from a heretical dogma which was lately agitating papal Europe to its foundations. I refer to the dogma of the infallibility of the pope. Pio Nono claimed to be infallible; but Pio Nono never claimed, nor does his successor, Leo, claim, to be impeccable or omniscient. The Roman pontiff only claims to be infallible as to what he utters *ex cathedrâ*; *i. e.*, from the papal chair, and when dealing with the peculiar class of truths which the ultramontanists affirmed and the defenders of the Gallican liberties denied, that he can and should authoritatively declare.

Just so the inspired spokesmen of God are infallible *when speaking for God*, and the apologetic argument for Christianity, in so far as it guarantees to us the credentials of the holy men, proves, if it proves anything, that the inspired spokesmen *are* speaking for God in the Holy Scriptures. All that we contend for is that the inspired teachers and writers were inspired when acting officially, and in what they officially taught and wrote; not that they were infallible at all times or as men. It was when, and only when, acting as organs of the Holy Ghost that they were supernaturally preserved from error. The popes, on the Romish theory of papal infallibility, may lead vicious lives, and may differ amongst themselves when not speaking from the sacred chair. So Balaam led a vicious life, and yet was inspired;<sup>1</sup> and Paul and Barnabas, at least for a time, held opposite views as to certain matters of Christian practice, and yet were equally the infallible spokesmen of God.

There is another important distinction which has been well drawn by old Francis Turretin, and must be insisted upon just here. It is between what is presented in the Scriptures as mere *fact* or *history*, and what is presented as of the binding nature of

---

<sup>1</sup> See the whole of Turretin's *Locus Secundus, Questiones Tertia, Quarta et cætera*, for admirably exact and thorough discussions of many points belonging to this field of argument.

a *doctrine* or a *rule*. The inspiration is in both cases the same, only in the one case the inspiration vouches for the record; in the other case for the teaching or command. The whole question resolves itself into this two-fold form: Who is it that is inspired, and what does the inspired man commit himself to as true? The author of the book is always inspired, and sometimes, not by any means always, others whom he introduces as speaking, and whose words he reports at variable length.

Because the sacred writer is inspired it does not follow, and it often is not true, that all the men or beings whose words he records are also inspired. The three friends of Job utter opinions that are at variance, not only with those of Job and Elihu, but even with those of God himself; but it is not necessary to hold that Job's three friends were inspired. All we need to maintain is that the author of the book was inspired to give an infallible report of what was said. Job's wife was certainly not inspired when she exclaimed, "Curse God and die!" Satan did not speak by inspiration when he uttered the words, "Ye shall not surely die;" but the sacred narrator was inspired to assure us infallibly that the words were said. We must in every case look to the intention of the writer. Whatever he sets before us as truth is truth, and the very species of truth which he represents it to be; whether intrinsic moral, or spiritual verity, or merely a correct and unerring report of facts or statements, or of continuous discourses, and whether in the case of reported words the accuracy be verbal or only general. It is a great mistake to suppose that the inspired writers always pretend to quote to the letter. Sometimes they only aim to give the *spirit* of what was written or uttered. Marked verbal discrepancies in such cases are obviously no contradictions *ex necessitate rei*. The author's undertaking is to reproduce the *spirit* of the language, and he is invariably and infallibly successful in the endeavor. Thus Matthew tells us the inscription above our Saviour's head as he hung on the cross was, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews;" and yet Mark says it was "The King of the Jews;" and Luke has it, "This is the King of the Jews;" and John, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Had the evangelists claimed to give *ipsissima verba*, there might be con-

tradition here; albeit, as has often been pointed out, the inscription may have been in a different form in each of the three languages; but none of them has made such claim. The accounts are accordingly consistent.

It is a plain inference from the view of the doctrine which we have been unfolding that the sacred writers may have differed indefinitely as to what Lee denominates *their whole subjective state*; and the fact is that they did so differ. The doctrine which has been directed against inspiration from this quarter is consequently baseless.

The obvious fact of the characteristic differences of the sacred penmen does not furnish even a presumptive argument against their inspiration. Says Dr. Thornwell, writing upon this very subject; "The external proofs of inspiration . . . require in most cases a knowledge of the author. And in conducting an inquiry upon this point the internal evidence arising from style, structure and habits of thought materially contributes to a satisfactory result. In the first stage of the investigation we consider the productions simply as human compositions, and God has wisely distributed the gift of inspiration so that, while he is responsible for all that is said, the individual peculiarities of the agent shall designate the person whose instrumentality he employs. He has facilitated our inquiry into the human organ of the Holy Spirit. Having ascertained ourselves as to the human authors or their works, the next question is as to the claims which they themselves put forward in the divine direction. What are these claims, and how are they substantiated? If they pretend to a verbal dictation, and then adduce the credentials sufficient to authenticate it, we have all which in the way of external evidence could be reasonably exacted. The Epistle to the Romans, for example, is put into our hands as a part of the word of God. The first question is, Who wrote it? If it can be traced to Paul, we know that he was an apostle of the Saviour, and enjoyed whatever inspiration was attached to the apostolic office. He possessed, in an eminent degree, the signs of an apostle, and if it were one of the privileges of the office that those who were called to it should, in their public instructions and testimonies for Jesus, speak the language of

the Holy Ghost, as soon as we are convinced that Paul was the writer of the document, its ultimate emanation from God is settled. Now it obviously facilitates this inquiry to have the mind of Paul stamped upon the letter, to have it distinctly impressed with his image, while it contains nothing but the true and faithful sayings of God. It is consequently no presumption against the divine dictation of a book that it should exhibit traces of the hand that was employed."<sup>1</sup>

I will add that there are other less or more obvious reasons why God should have employed as his instrument a MAN, not a machine, an intelligent, moral, individual agent. It is in harmony with all his dealings with the universe, and therefore antecedently probable that he should have done so. He usually, if not always, operates through, and not against, *law*. We agree in terms with the Duke of Argyll in affirming the absolute universality of law in the unlimited sense of that word; for even the volitions of the Supreme Being are in voluntary accordance with the laws of his own nature. No divine act, therefore, can in the highest sense be said to be unnatural or anomalous. We hesitate to go so far as to affirm with that eminent authority the universality of *physical* law. It would appear to be an inevitable deduction from the omnipotence of God—and it is honoring him to say so—that he has the ability to interrupt at pleasure the whole ordinary course of nature, in the *physical* sense, and it may have suited him at times to do so. This is the simplest, and, as it seems to us, the most probable account to give of the *miracles* of the Old and New Testaments. It is not necessary to hold that the ordinary physical force is for the time being no longer exerted in the case of a miracle. It is only necessary to recognize the interposition of a new and higher force than the ordinary physical one—a force, too, exerted from the outside, not the inside, of the system of ordinary causation—and the inadequacy of the ordinary, and the adequacy of the extra-ordinary force to produce the miraculous effect. It by no means follows from this that there should be any physical contrivance or machinery, or any system of physical laws, higher than the familiar system commonly spoken of as the ordi-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Collected Writings*, Vol. III., pp. 55, 56.



nary course of nature, or the ordinary system of second causes, in the physical sense, that is employed by the Almighty in the production of the effect. There is not a tittle of proof that anything whatever of a causative kind intervened between the sovereign fiat of God and the occurrence of the miraculous event. If any energy was put forth other than the divine volition, it would most likely be a direct characteristic (shall we say spiritual?) energy proceeding from the source of all wisdom and of all power. But whatever view may be taken of God's miraculous agency, such agency is confessedly and *ex vi termini* exceptional.

Are inspiration and revelation to be classed as miracles? So Bannerman opines and maintains. In the technical sense, clearly they are not. They are not to be so much regarded as themselves evidential, as matters to be supported by evidence *ab extra*; and are not, as John Locke declares the technical miracles to be, "*sensible* events." Miracles they may be in a wider acceptance of the term. They are supernatural, not natural, phenomena and products. They are in a manner singular and extraordinary events. But—and this is the point we would emphasize—it is, as we have seen, antecedently more likely, as more agreeable to God's usual mode of procedure, and more in harmony with the acknowledged facts of the case, that the allwise and omnipotent Jehovah should have made use of, rather than that he should have superseded, the faculties and even the personal idiosyncrasies of the human instruments. Inspiration and revelation do, however, bear a relation to the ordinary course of Christian experience analogous to that borne by a miracle to the ordinary course of nature.

Again, there were eminent and controlling reasons for it of a practical kind. All sorts of persons and tribes were to be reached and benefited by the revelations. Dr. William Lee, as we saw, believes that the peculiar type of each writer's individual nature was essential to the due conveyance and reception of that particular phase of truth which he presents. It may be added that every one of these particular phases of truth was exactly adapted to corresponding phases of the human soul, whether in the case of one and the same person or of different persons. Some tempera-

ments are mercurial, now up, now down, and require corresponding variety of intellectual and spiritual stimulus and aliment. The same man, whether mercurial or not, is apt to be in different moods at different times. Such moods commonly vary according to events and circumstances. Other temperaments are sanguine, or phlegmatic, or atrabilious and melancholic. There are also different degrees and orders of intelligence. There are seasons when a man craves logic, and seasons when the same man craves poetry or homely exhortation. One man loves, or needs, to be instructed in doctrine, another man to be guided in practice. Certain persons are more impressed by Moses, others by David, or by Isaiah, or by Luke, or by Paul, or by James, or by John. The whole range of knowledge and genius is compassed, and the entire gamut of emotion and affection is run, in these sacred oracles. There is something in the word of God for those who are elated, and still more for those who are depressed and dejected. There is matter here for both sexes, and for all races, ages, and climates. As Matthew Henry says, here are shallows where a lamb may wade, and deeps where an elephant would have to swim.

Because of the striking elevation in the subjective condition of Isaiah, Paul and John, in comparison with that of most or all of the other biblical writers, it has been confidently urged by some that their words have a *higher authority* than those of the other writers. If this were so of any we should plead for the inclusion of Moses and David in this list. The difference, however, to the advantage of some, as compared with others of the biblical writers, is due to their superior natural powers, to their superior *illumination*, and to the peculiar exaltation of soul which usually accompanied their superior degrees of *revelation*. It is a difference which does not affect one whit the equal *inspiration*; that is to say, the divinely-secured *infallibility* of the otherwise inferior writers. We have been led to conclude that inspiration may be found apart from revelation, and even from illumination. It is probable, notwithstanding, that a majority, if not all, of the inspired writers—that is, the men whose books compose the sacred canon—had received revelations, and that all had probably received

spiritual illumination. Let it be borne in mind, however, that it was neither their revelations nor their illuminations that made them inspired; but it was common for these three things to be united in one person. Now Isaiah, John and Paul, if you please, were endowed with singular measures or degrees of revelation and illumination; but mark you, there are *no* measures or degrees in INSPIRATION.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

## IV. THE DELUGE.

### I. TESTIMONY OF TRADITION.

“THE one tradition which is really universal among those bearing on the history of primitive man is that of the deluge. It goes back to the earliest ages of the world, and can be nothing but an account of a real and well authenticated fact.”<sup>1</sup> Of similar import with this testimony of Lenormant is that of Canon Rawlinson. “The evidence shows a consentient belief among members of *all* the great races into which ethnologists have divided mankind. Among the *Semites*, the Babylonians and Hebrews; among the *Hamites*, the Egyptians; among the *Aryans*, the Indians, Armenians, Phrygians, Lythunians, Goths, Celts and Greeks; among the *Turanians*, the Chinese, Mexicans, Red Indians and Polyneesian Islanders, held the belief which has thus the character of a universal tradition, a tradition of which but one rational account can be given, namely, that it embodies the recollection of a fact in which all mankind was concerned.”<sup>2</sup>

“Of all the true traditions relative to the great deluge,” writes Lenormant, “by far the most curious is that of the Chaldeans, made known to the Greeks by the historian Berosus,” which is as follows:

“In the time of Xisuthrus happened a great deluge, the history of which is thus described. The deity Chronus (the Greeks thus translate the Chaldæo-Assyrian name Ilu) appeared to him in a vision, and warned him that upon the fifteenth day of the month Dœsius (Sivan) there would be a flood by which mankind would be destroyed. He therefore enjoined him to write a history of the beginning, procedure, and conclusion of all things, and to bury it in the City of the Sun at Sippara; and to build a vessel, and take with him into it his friends and relations, and to convey on board everything necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and to trust himself fearlessly to the deep. Having asked the deity whither he was to sail, he was answered, ‘To the gods,’ upon which he offered up a prayer for the good of mankind. He then obeyed the divine admonition, and built a vessel five stadia in length and two in breadth; into this he put everything which he had prepared, and last of all conveyed into it his wife, his children and his friends. After the flood had been upon

<sup>1</sup> *Ancient History of the East*, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Butler's Bible Work*, Old Testament, Vol. I., p. 246.

the earth, and was in time abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel, which, not finding any food, nor any place whereupon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval of some days he sent them forth a second time, and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made trial a third time with these birds, but they returned no more, from whence he judged that the surface of the earth had appeared above the waters. He therefore made an opening in the vessel, and upon looking out found that it was stranded upon the side of some mountain, upon which he immediately quitted it, with his wife, his daughter and the pilot. Xisuthrus then paid his adoration to the earth; and having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the gods; and with those who had come out of the vessel with him disappeared. They who remained within finding that their companions did not return, quitted the vessel with many lamentations, and called continually on the name of Xisuthrus. Him they saw no more, but they could distinguish his voice in the air, and could hear him admonish them to pay due regard to religion, and likewise informed them that it was on account of this that he was translated to live with the gods; and that his wife and daughter and the pilot had obtained the same honor. To this he added that they should return to Babylonia, and, as it was ordained, search for the writings at Sippara, which they were to make known to all mankind; moreover, that the place where they then were was the land of Armenia. The rest having heard these words offered sacrifices to the gods, and taking a circuit journeyed towards Babylonia. The vessel being thus stranded, some part of it yet remains in the Gordyæan mountain of Armenia; and the people scrape off the bitumen with which it had been coated, and make use of it by way of an alexipharmic and amulet. And when they returned to Babylon, and had found the writings at Sippara, they built cities and erected temples; and Babylon was thus inhabited again."<sup>1</sup>

If the reader will now carefully compare with this the account of the deluge given us by Moses in Gen. vi.—viii., considering it for the present simply as the Hebrew form of the universal tradition, he cannot but notice that, while they agree in many particulars, they differ in others, and some of these matters of prime importance; *e. g.*, (1), The dimensions of the ark, as given by Moses, are three hundred cubits in length by fifty cubits in breadth. If we understand the cubit here mentioned to be the sacred cubit, and take the length of that cubit, as determined by Sir Isaac Newton, to be about twenty-five inches, the dimensions of the ark will not differ greatly from those of the *Great Eastern*; whilst Berosus' dimensions of five stadia in length by two in breadth, *i. e.*, more than half a mile long by nearly a quarter of a mile broad, are simply incredible. A vessel of such size would break by its own weight. (2), The Chaldean tradition embodies no moral les-

<sup>1</sup> *Ancient History of the East*, Vol. I., pp. 503-4.

son, while that of Moses does. In the Chaldean tradition this most terrible catastrophe which has ever befallen the human race appears simply as a "happening," a sort of fatal accident, whilst in Moses' account it stands forth distinctly as inflicted of God on mankind as a punishment for their sins; and it is not until "the earth becomes corrupt before God, and filled with violence," that it occurs. (3), Both versions of the tradition are pervaded by a religious spirit, that of the Chaldean being distinctly poly-theistic, whilst that of Moses is as distinctly mono-theistic. M. Renouf, speaking of the religion of Egypt, writes: "The sublimest portions are demonstrably ancient; the last stage of the Egyptian religion was by far the grossest and most corrupt." And this which is true of the Egyptian religion, is, I believe, true of all religions. For these reasons the inference seems to be a fair one, that in the Mosaic account we have the tradition of the deluge in its oldest and purest form.

## II. THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF THE DELUGE.

The Mosaic account of the deluge, contained in Gen. vi.-viii., claims to be something more than the mere Hebrew form of a universal tradition. As a part of Scripture "given by inspiration of God," it must be considered veritable history, and as such our Lord and his apostles treat it. Our Lord, addressing his disciples shortly before his death, says: "For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so also the coming of the Son of man shall be." (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39.) And the apostle Paul writes: "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." (Heb. xi. 7.) And Peter: "God spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." (2 Pet. ii. 5.) The Mosaic narrative itself has the characteristics of veritable history, especially in this, that the deluge does not appear as an un-

accountable accident, a strange catastrophe, as in the traditional accounts of the event, but as a solemn, deliberate judgment of God upon a world given over to wickedness. "And God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh has come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them. And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven, and every thing that is in the earth shall die; but with thee will I establish my covenant; and thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee." (Gen. vi. 12-18.) Such a narrative is worthy a place in a history of the world written to teach man the true religion, and to secure the truthfulness of the narrative is worthy "the inspiration of God."

In order to a correct understanding of the Mosaic narrative of the deluge, there are several questions which must be answered, and to an examination of these I will now ask the reader's attention.

1. *When did the deluge occur?* The Mosaic account of the deluge is part of a continuous history, which fixes the date at about 3155 B. C., according to Hale's chronology, or 2348 B. C., according to that of Ussher. The Masoretic Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, differ in the numbers they give in their genealogical tables, and hence the difference in the estimates made by modern scholars, such as that between the estimates of Hale and Ussher, quoted above. It would be altogether aside from my present purpose to discuss this question of chronology. Either of the dates given above is sufficiently near the truth to answer all the demands I shall make upon it in the present article. The Chaldean tradition tells us that the friends of Xisuthrus (the Chaldean Noah), who had been preserved in the ark, "journeyed to Babylonia, . . . built cities, erected temples, and Babylon was inhabited again,"—thus identifying the date of the deluge with the commencement of the Babylonian empire, known to us through history and the monuments.

Can we determine with any degree of certainty the date of the commencement of the Babylonian empire? On this subject

Canon Rawlinson, Professor of Ancient History at Oxford, writes: "Exaggerated chronologies are common to a large number of nations, but critical examination has (at any rate, in all cases but one), demonstrated their fallacy, and the many millions of years postulated for their past civilization and history by the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Hindoos and Chinese, and others, have been shown to be pure fiction, utterly unworthy of belief, and not even requiring any very elaborate refutation. Cuneiform scholars confidently place the beginning of Babylon about 2300 B. C., of Assyria about 1500 B. C. Aryan scholars place the dawn of Iranic civilization about 1500 B. C., of India about 1200 B. C. Chinese investigators can find nothing solid or substantial in the past of "the Celestials" earlier than 781 B. C., or, at the furthest, 1154 B. C.<sup>1</sup> Thus it will be seen that the date assigned the deluge by the Chaldean tradition is in substantial harmony with that assigned by the Mosaic history. The deluge occurred some four thousand or five thousand years ago.

2. *Was the flood universal; did it cover literally the whole earth?* The older commentators understood Moses to assert its universality; yet not without exception, for Matthew Pool, who lived and wrote during the latter half of the seventeenth century, in his notes on Gen. vii. 9, writes: "Peradventure this flood might not be simply universal, over the whole earth, but only over the habitable world, where either men or beasts lived, which was as much as the meritorious cause of the flood, men's sins, or the end of it, the destruction of men and beasts, required."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, most modern commentators understand him to assert that the flood extended so far, and only so far, as the human race extended; this being all, in their judgment, that his language, fairly interpreted, requires.

The universality of the tradition is satisfactorily accounted for by the fact, admitted on all hands, that in the flood the whole human race was destroyed, with the exception of the one family saved in the ark, and that all the peoples of the earth to-day are descended from that one family. On the Mosaic narrative itself,

<sup>1</sup> *Origin of Nations*, page 148.

<sup>2</sup> *Pool's Annotations*.



Sir J. W. Dawson remarks: "I have long thought that the narrative in Gen. vi.-viii. can be understood only on the supposition that it is a contemporary journal, or log, of an eye-witness, incorporated by the author of Genesis into his work. The dates of the rising and falling of the waters, the note of soundings over the hill-tops when the maximum was attained, and many other details, as well as the whole tone of the narrative, seem to require this supposition."<sup>1</sup>

In Scripture, as in other writings, expressions general in form are often to be understood as limited in meaning, their true signification being determined by the context, or by a consideration of the style in which they are written. When Moses, giving an account of the famine which occurred in Joseph's day, writes: "And the famine was over all the face of the earth," (Gen. xli. 56,) and again, speaking of the dread of Israel which God caused the Canaanites to feel, writes: "This day will I (God) begin to put the dread of thee upon the nations that are under the whole heaven," (Deut. ii. 25,) no one understands the expressions "over all the face of the earth," and "under the whole heaven," as expressing literal universality; and yet they are the very expressions in Moses' account of the flood which the older commentators quote in support of the opinion which they maintained. The literal truth of the narrative requires us to believe that the flood was universal in so far as the then inhabited earth was concerned; that the whole human race, with the exception of Noah and his family, perished in its waters; but the language of Moses does not, I think, fairly require more than this.

In the Scripture narrative the deluge is presented as a terrible judgment of God, brought upon the earth by the exceeding sinfulness of man. "And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold I will destroy them with the earth." (Gen. vi. 13.) In this particular it belongs to the same category with the subsequent destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in the days of Abraham; and these two events are cited together by our Lord as illustrations of the suddenness with which God's judgments shall

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Earth and Man*, p. 290.

come upon the wicked at the end of the world. (Luke xvii. 26-30.) As in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah, what Pool calls "the meritorious cause," undoubtedly limited the extent of the judgment; so would we naturally suppose it to have been in the case of the deluge, and there is nothing in the language of Moses, as we have seen, at variance with such a supposition.

How far had the human race extended itself at the time the deluge occurred? This is a question difficult to answer, and it is not surprising that extreme opinions have been advocated by different writers. The fact stated by Moses, that man lived to a far greater age in antediluvial times than now, would point to a far more rapid multiplication and consequent spread of the race than now. But, on the other hand, Moses tells us that the corruption and violence, which ultimately brought on the judgment of the deluge, began to prevail at an early date among the descendants of Cain, and, as all experience testifies, this would prove a serious check upon the rapid multiplication of the race. Because of the corruption and violence which have long prevailed in the rich valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, their population to-day is less than it was eighteen hundred years ago. As probable a supposition as any other is that which assumes the rate of increase during the years which preceded the deluge to have been about the same with that of the years since the commencement of the Christian era; and if so, the human race when the deluge came would have peopled a large part of Asia, most of Europe, and possibly the Nile Valley in Africa.

3. *Where did the ark rest when the deluge was past?* What was the starting point of migration for the post-diluvial nations of the east? To this question the Chaldean tradition and Moses give us one and the same answer. According to Chaldean tradition, the companions of Xisuthrus "heard his voice in the air," informing them "that the place where they then were was the land of Armenia." Moses writes: "And the ark rested, in the seventh month and seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat." (Gen. viii. 4.) "Ararat occurs in the Bible only as the name of a country which, in the Assyrian inscriptions, is called

Urarti, in classic literature Armenia, and by the native inhabitants Haik."<sup>1</sup>

Armenia, the high table-land on the southern slope of the Caucasus, stretching down towards Mesopotamia, by the universal consent of modern historians, is regarded as the post-diluvial cradle of the human race. This conclusion is based upon such facts as these, viz. : (1), The most ancient traditions all point to this as the starting point of the peoples of the earth ; (2), It is the native country of most of the cereals which have furnished food for man the world over, and of many of the domesticated animals which have accompanied him in his migrations ; and (3), It is here, and clustering around this as a centre, we find the oldest nations—the only ones that have a history reaching back into the long past—*e. g.*, the Chinese, the Indians, the Persians, the Assyrians, the Jews, the Phenicians, and the Egyptians.

4. *In what condition, as to religion and civilization, was the human race at the time the deluge occurred ?* Noah and his immediate family still retained a knowledge of the one true God, and of the religion he had made known to man. Moses writes : " And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark ; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." (Gen. vii. 1.) And in the New Testament Scriptures Noah's name is enrolled in the list of ancient worthies who illustrated in their lives the nature of saving faith. (See Heb. xi. 7.) As to civilization, Noah, and the people among whom he lived, probably the descendants of Seth, must have possessed a knowledge of ship-building, at least, such as implies a knowledge of the mechanic arts in general, far in advance of that possessed by savages. Both Moses' history and the Chaldean tradition, in what they tell us of the building of cities shortly after the flood, clearly imply a state of advanced civilization as existing among the people of Armenia and the regions adjacent thereto at the time the deluge occurred.

If we suppose the upper part of the Tigro-Euphrates Valley to have been the original cradle of the human race, and that mankind had spread thence over a large part of Asia, all of Europe, and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopædia.*

the Nile Valley in Africa at the time the deluge occurred; and further, that the emigration implied in this had taken place in a natural way, after violence had begun to fill the earth, the condition of those then living at a distance from the centre of emigration was probably very different from that of Noah, and those who still occupied the original mother-country. The law which governs natural emigration is well stated by the Duke of Argyll, as follows: "It is in consequence of the law of increase that population is always pressing upon the limits of subsistence. Hence the necessity of migrations, and the force which has propelled successive generations of men farther and farther, in ever-widening circles round the original centre or centres of their birth. Then, as it would always be the weaker tribes who would be driven from the ground which had become overstocked, and as the lands to which they went forth were less and less hospitable in climate and productions, the struggle for life would be always harder. And so it always happens in the natural and necessary course of things, that the races which were driven farthest would be the rudest, the most engrossed in the pursuits of mere animal existence. And now, does not this key of principle fit into and explain all the facts? Is it not true that the lowest and rudest tribes in the population of the globe have been found in the farthest extremities of the great continents, and in the distant islands, which would be the last refuge of the victims of violence and misfortune?"<sup>1</sup> Whilst, then, Noah and the people who lived in the old centre of population were in a condition of advanced civilization, it is probably true that the tribes driven into Western Europe and Great Britain had sunk into the lowest savagery when the flood came.

5. *In what way was the deluge brought about?* On this point the Chaldean tradition gives us no information. Moses' account is very remarkable, and worthy our careful study. "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the seventh month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows (*marginal*, flood-gates) of heaven were opened, and the rain was upon the earth forty

<sup>1</sup> *Primeval Man*, pp. 161-'3.

days and forty nights." (Gen. vii. 11, 12.) In these words Moses traces the flood, not to the down-pour of rain alone, but to great seismic convulsions as well.

Hugh Miller gives us what, I think, is little more than a translation of the Mosaic record into the language of modern science when he writes: "Let us suppose that the human family, amounting to several millions, were congregated in that tract of country which, eastward from the modern Ararat to far beyond the sea of Aral, includes the original Caucasian centre of the race. Let us suppose that, the hour of judgment having arrived, the land began gradually to sink—as the tract in the Run of Cutch sank in 1819—equally, for forty days at the rate of four hundred feet per day—a rate not twice greater than that at which the tide rises in the Straits of Magellan—and which would have rendered itself apparent as but a persistent inward flowing of the sea. The depression, which, by extending to the Euxine Sea and the Persian Gulf, on the one hand, and the Gulf of Finland on the other, would open up, by three separate channels, 'the fountains of the great deep,' and which includes an area two thousand miles each way, would at the end of the fortieth day be sunk at its centre to the depth of sixteen thousand feet, sufficient to bury the loftiest mountains of the district, and yet have a gradient of declination of but sixteen feet per mile, the contour of its hills and plains would remain apparently what they had been before, and the doomed inhabitants would see but the water rising along the mountain side, and one refuge after another swept away."<sup>1</sup>

Fifty years ago no geologist would have found any difficulty in admitting the occurrence of such a seismic convulsion as Moses, interpreted by Hugh Miller, describes in his account of the origin of the flood. Now, however, I will be told "catastrophic geology" is out of date, and the uniformitarianism of Lyell and his disciples has taken its place. To this I reply, if the older geologists made too great use of catastrophe in accounting for the present condition of our earth, Lyell and his school have erred just as far in the other direction, as is evident from the ridiculous conclusions to which uniformitarianism has in some instances led them; *e. g.*, es-

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Butler's Bible Work*, Old Testament, Vol. I., p. 240.

timating the age of the Mississippi delta at one hundred thousand years. Beyond all question, in our day seismic convulsions are as much a reality as frost, and river-currents, and glaciers, and as really agents in effecting changes in the earth surface. In the earthquake at Cutch, referred to by Hugh Miller, the movement was felt over an area having a radius of one thousand miles from its centre. The fort and village of Sindree, on the eastern arm of the Indus, were submerged, the sea flowing in by the eastern mouth of the Indus, and in a few hours a tract of land two thousand square miles in area was converted into an inland sea or lagoon. Besides this, if our earth was once a molten mass, such as the sun is to-day—and such is the universal belief of geologists—gradually cooling through the radiation of its heat into space, seismic convulsions must have occurred from time to time, and must have occurred more frequently in early geological ages than now, and the terrible rendings and upheavings of which the older rock-strata give evidence strongly confirm this conclusion.

### III. TESTIMONY OF MODERN SCIENCE.

So great a catastrophe as the deluge is represented to have been, it is reasonable to suppose, would leave behind it traces of its occurrence other than the universality of its tradition, some traces upon the surface of the earth itself, such as modern science would take cognizance of. Are there any such traces discoverable in our day? I think there are; and to an examination of these I will now ask the reader's attention.

1. *The present condition of the region over which the deluge extended*, especially of the central portion of that region, seems to indicate its subjection to some such cataclysm as the flood, and that within what geologists would call recent times. "There is a remarkable portion of the globe," writes Hugh Miller, "chiefly on the Asiatic continent, though extending into Europe, and which is nearly equal to all Europe in extent, whose rivers, some of them, the Volga, Oural, Sihon, Kour, and the Amoo, of great size, do not fall into the ocean, but on the contrary, are all turned inward, losing themselves in the eastern part of the tract, in the lakes of a rainless district; in the western part, into such seas as the Caspian

and the Aral. In this region there are extensive districts still under the level of the ocean. Vast plains, white with salt, and charged with sea-shells, show that the Caspian Sea was, at no distant period, greatly more extensive than now."<sup>1</sup>

2. *A remarkable break interrupts the early history of the human race as read in the light of anthropological research.* "Accurate examination of the stone implements and other relics of the 'stone men,' together with careful exploration of the deposits in which they are discovered, has led to a division of them into two well-defined classes, not contemporaneous in origin, but divided by a clearly-marked interval of time, which must have been of considerable duration. The discrimination of the implements carries with it a like discrimination of the races which fashioned and used them. The later, or neolithic, race of the stone men are proved by their remains to have differed greatly in habits, tastes, degree of cultivation, and manner of life in general from the palæolithic race; differed, in fact, so radically as to render it highly improbable that the difference was merely due to development. The facts lead to the conclusion that the older race disappeared or became extinct without leaving posterity, and that after a while, long in actual years, although short in geological time, another race, less savage, if less artistic in perception, came in and occupied the vacant lands. There is perhaps no better authority on this point than Mr. J. Geikie, and he writes as follows: 'Between palæolithic and neolithic man there is thus a wide gulf of separation. From a state of utter savagery we pass into one of comparative civilization. Was the neolithic phase of European archaeological history merely developed out of that which characterized palæolithic times? Was the European neolithic man the lineal descendant of his palæolithic predecessor? There is no proof, either direct or indirect, that this was the case. On the contrary, all the evidence points in quite an opposite direction. When neolithic man entered Europe, he came as an agriculturist and a herdsman, and his relics and remains occur again and again immediately above pleistocene deposits, in which we meet with no trace of any higher or better state of human existence than that which is repre-

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from *Butler's Bible Work*, Old Testament, Vol. I., p. 239.

sented by the savages who contended with the extinct mammalia.<sup>7</sup>  
—*Prehistoric Europe*, p. 379.”<sup>1</sup>

In the appendix to the last edition of his *Earth and Man*, Sir J. W. Dawson writes: “A point on which Dawkins insists, and which he has admirably illustrated, is the marked distinction between the old paleocosmic men of the gravels and caves and the smaller race, with somewhat differently formed skulls, which succeeded them, after the great subsidence which terminated the second continental period and inaugurated the modern epoch. . . . This race, scattered and overthrown before the dawn of authentic history in Europe by the Celts and other intrusive peoples, was unquestionably that which succeeded the now extinct paleocosmic race, and constituted the men of the so-called neolithic period, which thus connects itself with the modern history of Europe, from which it is not separated by any physical catastrophe like that which divides the older men of the mammoth age, and the widely spread continents of the post-glacial period from our modern days.”

“A most important speculation, arising from the facts recently developed as to prehistoric men, is the possible equivalency with the historic deluge of the great subsidence which closed the residence of paleocosmic men in Europe, as well as that of several of the large mammalia. Lenormant and others have shown that the wide and ancient acceptance of the tradition of the deluge among all the great branches of the human family necessitates the belief that, independently of the Bible history, this great event must be accepted as a historical fact, which very deeply impressed itself upon the minds of all the early nations. Now, if the deluge is to be accepted as historical, and if a similar break interrupts the geological history, separating extinct races from those which still survive, why may we not correlate the two? The misuse of the deluge in the early history of geology, in employing it to account for changes that took place long before the advent of man, certainly should not cause us to neglect its legitimate uses when these arise in the progress of investigation. It is evident, if this correlation be accepted as probable, it must modify many views now held

<sup>1</sup> *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1888.



as to the antiquity of man. In that case, the modern gravel and loess on plateaus and in river valleys, far above the reach of the present floods, may be accounted for, not by the ordinary action of the existing streams, but by the abnormal action of currents of water, diluvial in their character. Further, since the historical deluge cannot have been of very long duration, the physical changes separating the deposits containing the remains of paleocosmic men from those of later date, would be in like manner accounted for, not by the slow process of subsidence, elevation and erosion, but by causes of a more abrupt and cataclysmic character. This subject the writer has referred to in previous publications, and he is glad to see that prominence has recently been given it by so good a geologist as the Duke of Argyll in a late number of the *Contemporary Review*.”<sup>1</sup>

In his *Fossil Men*, Sir J. W. Dawson writes: “Huxley adds, ‘The comparatively large cranial capacity of the Neanderthal skull, overlaid though it may be by pithecoïd bony walls, and the completely human proportions of the accompanying limb-bones, together with the very fair development of the Engis skull, clearly indicate that the first traces of the primordial stock, whence man has been derived, need no longer be sought by those who entertain any form of the doctrine of development in the newest tertiaries, but that they may be looked for in an epoch more distant from that of the *Elephas primogenius* than that is from us.’ Another point which strikes us in reading the descriptions, and which deserves the attention of those who have access to the skeletons, is the indication which they present of an extreme longevity. The massive proportions of the body, the great development of the muscular processes, the extreme wearing of the teeth, among a people who predominantly lived on flesh, and not grain, the obliteration of the sutures of the skull, along with indications of the slow ossification of the ends of the long bones, point in this direction, and seem to indicate a slow maturity and great length of life in this most primitive race.”<sup>2</sup>

3. *The occurrence of a great flood, extending over a large part of Asia and Europe, and this at a comparatively recent date, is*

<sup>1</sup> *The Earth and Man*, pp. 144-’6.

<sup>2</sup> *Fossil Men*, pp. 194-’8.

*now contended for by some of our ablest geologists, in order to account for the destruction of the mammoth and his cotemporaries, and the condition in which his remains are found.*

These remains, though most abundant in Siberia, are met with throughout a large part of Europe, as well as on this western continent of ours. "If from Europe, the northwestern corner, including North Britain and Wales, be cut off, and also a southern and central portion of which the Alpine chains are the focus, it may be broadly said that, throughout all the rest of the continent, the remains of the mammoth are more or less plentiful. In some parts the frequency of them is astonishing. Beneath the shallow sea, for instance, between Norfolk and the opposite coast, they are so abundant that, in sailors' talk, the locality goes by the name of the 'burial-ground.' In Lower Suabia, we are told, scarcely a railway cutting, a cellar or a well can be dug without some bone or tooth being unearthed. Belgium is particularly rich in this fossil wealth, and almost equally so are the broad plains of Russia from the White Sea to the Black. Passing eastward from northern Europe we meet the remains of the mammoth profusely scattered over the vast range of Asiatic Siberia. From this region its tusks have long been, and still continue to be, exported in large quantities as fossil ivory; and of some spots, which happen to have been better explored than others, we are told that the soil seems to be almost entirely composed of the bones of the great mammals. What is still more curious, is the fact that, from time to time, as the frozen cliffs, which in many places hem in the rivers, are undermined and break away, there starts out from its icy grave the gigantic beast itself, still clothed in its hairy hide as it roamed the wilds untold millenniums ago, and with its flesh so well preserved in nature's own refrigerator as to furnish a succulent banquet to the prowling carnivora of this degenerate age."

"In so far as Asiatic Siberia is concerned, it is indubitable that, broadly speaking, where the bones and carcasses lie, there the animal died. No theory of subsequent water-carriage can adequately account for the presence of the relics where they are found. Their site, their condition, their enormous quantity, alike repudiate such a solution of the problem. The bones and tusks bear no marks of

detrition, such as would necessarily have been produced had they been swept and rolled along by rivers or floods from more southern lands. They abound in localities to which no streams could have floated them, and are even more plentiful in the elevated clays than along the coast, or in the plains bordering on the rivers. Besides, in not a few cases both the skeletons and carcasses have been found standing upright in their clayey or gravelly sepulchres, showing that the animals had either sunk in the soft sediment, or been engulfed as they stood by the turbid waters, and been frozen in before they could fall over. Some of the remains even exhibit marks of death by suffocation; and what is perhaps still more remarkable, the upright carcasses have been observed to face in a particular direction, as if the animals were overtaken while fleeing from the pursuing flood.”<sup>1</sup>

“In New Siberia lie hills two hundred and fifty or three hundred feet high, formed of drift wood. . . Other hills on the same island, and on Kotilnoi, which lies further to the west, are heaped up to an equal height with skeletons of pachyderms, bisons, etc., which are cemented together by frozen sand as well as by strata of ice. . . On the summit of these hills the trunks of trees lie flung upon one another in the wildest confusion, forced upright in spite of gravitation, and with their tops broken off or crushed, as if they had been thrown with great violence from the south on a bank, and then heaped up. . . . It is clear that at the time when these elephants and trunks of trees were heaped up together, one flood extended from the centre of the continent to the farthest barriers existing in the sea as it now is.”<sup>2</sup>

In view of such facts as these, Mr. Henry H. Howorth, one of the leading scientists of Great Britain at the present day, in his work on *The Mammoth and the Flood*, published in London in 1887, writes: “I believe that the same potent cause which swept away the mammoth and the rhinoceros, the cave-bear and the hyæna from Europe, also swept away palæolithic man, and that this cause was as sudden as it was widespread. . . I submit with every confidence that I have proved the position that the extinction of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1888, pp. 117, 118.

<sup>2</sup> *Recent Origin of Man*, p. 514.

mammoth in the old world was sudden, and operated over a wide continental area, involving a widespread hecatomb, in which man, as well as other creatures, perished; that this destruction was caused by a flood of waters which passed over the land, drowning the animals, and then burying their remains; and that this catastrophe forms a great break in human continuity, no less than in the biological records of animal life, and is the great divide when history really begins.”<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the time of man’s advent upon the earth, a great change has taken place in the opinion of scientists in the last ten or fifteen years. Instead of the hundreds of thousands of years demanded by Lyell and scientists of his school, it is now very generally conceded that a very few thousand will cover the whole period of man’s inhabitation of the earth, in so far as science can throw any light on the subject. Prof. A. Winchell, in his *Walks and Talks in the Geological Field*, published in 1887, writes: “Man’s advent is geologically recent. No report of a human relic has been made by any geologist from any formation below the miocene. No report of miocene or pliocene man has been corroborated by such evidence as to command the sanction of conservative geologists. European man is first a quaternary phenomenon; he dates from the epoch of flooded streams and glacial decline.” (P. 304.) And “the epoch of glacial decline he fixes at from five thousand to eight thousand years ago.” (See pp. 292, 293.) Sir J. W. Dawson, in the last edition of his *Earth and Man*, published in 1887, tells us: “The more recent discoveries, both in Europe and America, tend more and more to limit the absolute antiquity of man, and to place his appearance in the post-glacial age. The recent measurements of the topographical survey of New York have shown that the recession of the Falls of Niagara is so much more rapid than has hitherto been supposed, that the time since the glacial submergence at that place cannot exceed ten thousand years, and was probably much less.” (P. 297.) Some centuries must have elapsed after man’s advent before the deluge, of which science now finds abundant proof, occurred; as is evident from the fact that the remains of antediluvial man are spread over

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Mammoth and the Flood*, pp. 252-256.

all Europe and a large part of Asia; and thus the date of the 'Flood of the Loess,' or 'the Great Siberian Deluge,' as the flood demanded by modern science has been called, does not differ very materially from that we have seen occasion to assign to the flood of tradition, and that of which Moses gives us the history in the Pentateuch."

#### CONCLUSION.

In the *Central Presbyterian* of March 7, 1888, Dr. Southall writes: "We suppose there is nothing recorded in the Pentateuch that has given occasion to so much genuine incredulity among students of science as the narrative of the flood; and fifteen years ago in England, in the day of Lyell, and the uniformitarian school of geology which he built up around him, there was a stolid non-recognition on their part of that great geological cataclysm which some American and French geologists already detected in connection with the loess and gravel deposits of the glacial epoch." The correctness of this statement no one acquainted with the scientific literature of the last quarter of a century will call in question. In concluding this article, let us see how the matter stands to-day.

1. *The Flood of the Pentateuch.* The Pentateuch contains the history of a flood, of which it tells us, (1), That it occurred after man had been an inhabitant of the earth for many centuries—1656 A. M., according to Ussher; 2256 A. M., according to Hale; (2), That this flood extended as far as the human race had then extended itself, over a large part of Asia, and probably all of Europe, and so was universal in so far as the then inhabited world was concerned; (3), That at the time of its occurrence man in Central Asia was in a condition of advanced civilization, whilst in Western Europe, to which the "violence which filled the earth" had driven some tribes, he was probably in a savage condition; (4), That this flood occurred some four or five thousand years ago—4226 according to Ussher, 5043 according to Hale—and that at its close God gave assurance that "the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh;" (5), That the immediate physical cause of the flood was "the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep, and the opening the flood-gates of heaven," *i. e.*, great seismic convulsions, accompanied by tremendous rains; (6),

That "the meritorious cause" of the flood was the universal corruption of the human race, Noah and his family alone retaining their integrity; and further, that because of this his character, Noah was forewarned of the approaching flood, and prepared an ark for the saving of himself and family, thus becoming the second head of the race; (7), That at the close of the flood the ark landed Noah in Armenia, which thus became the post-diluvial centre of emigration for mankind; and (8), That after the flood the duration of human life was greatly shortened.

2. *The Flood according to Tradition.* A universal tradition, found among all the different races of men, in all parts of the world, tells us of a great flood which once overspread the then inhabited portion of the earth. Taking this tradition in its most complete form, the form in which it has been handed down by the Chaldeans, it tells us, (1), That this flood occurred long after the creation of man; (2), That it was universal in so far as the world inhabited by man was concerned; (3), That at the time it occurred the inhabitants of Central Asia were a civilized people; (4), That this flood occurred some four or five thousand years ago; (5), That one man, his family and a few friends, alone escaped destruction, and that by means of an ark which they had been forewarned by the gods to build; (6), That at the close of the flood, the ark landed in Armenia, which thus became the post-diluvial centre of emigration for mankind. Of the immediate physical cause of the flood, and of its meritorious cause, tradition says nothing distinctly, and of the promise that this should be the last universal flood it says nothing whatever. This difference in the two accounts is just that which ordinarily distinguishes tradition from authentic history.

3. "*The Flood of the Loess,*" or "*the Great Siberian Deluge.*" Geology tells us of many cataclysms which have occurred in the past, some of them continental in extent, as proved by the sedimentary rock-strata they have deposited. Lyell and his school of geologists taught, that either all these cataclysms occurred before man's advent on earth, or that his advent occurred hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of years ago. This conclusion recent investigation compels us to give up. One flood, at least, has oc-

curred since man was created, as proved by the fact that human remains are found in its sediment; and this flood must have occurred in comparatively recent times, as proved in many ways, especially by the condition in which the remains of animals destroyed are found. This flood is known to geologists as "the Flood of the Loess," or "the Great Siberian Deluge," not meaning by the latter name to limit its extent to Siberia, but because it is in Siberia many of the characteristic evidences of its occurrence are met with.

Respecting this flood it is now ascertained, (1), That, as stated above, it occurred long after man had become an inhabitant of the earth; (2), That it extended over a large part of Asia, and almost all of Europe, as the remains of palæolithic man and the great mammalia which were his cotemporaries prove; (3), That at the time of its occurrence man in Western Europe was in a savage condition, whilst in Central Asia, as indicated by certain bronzes recently found in Southern Siberia, there is some reason to believe that his condition was far in advance of that of the cave-man of France and Great Britain; (4). That this flood occurred some five or six thousand years ago; (5), That the immediate physical cause of the flood was a great seismic convulsion, not a gradual sinking and rising again of a part of the earth's crust, requiring ages for its accomplishment, but a great convulsion, seismic in character; (6), Of the "meritorious cause" of the flood it gives no intimation, unless the debased, savage condition of the cave-men destroyed by it throws some light upon this point; (7), Of the prophecy that "the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh," science tells us nothing as a prophecy; it simply records its fulfilment; for since the flood of the loess, no other general flood has swept the earth. Of the ark and its history it tells us absolutely nothing; but (8), Science does furnish evidence that the life of the antediluvians was much longer than that of man at the present day.

Such are the more important facts in this case, as the matter stands to-day. In this, as in other instances which might be cited, science, after having antagonized the Mosaic history for a time, has quietly drifted around into an almost perfect harmony with it.

## V. BLEDSOE'S THEORY OF MORAL FREEDOM.

THE fundamental difference between the Calvinistic and Arminian systems of theology lies in their divergent theories of moral freedom. Both systems agree in teaching that man is a free moral agent, and therefore responsible for his conduct. The Scripture statements of this fact are urged upon the consciences of men with equal fidelity and zeal by the preachers of both schools. It is only when the attributes of humanity are exhibited in contrast with the attributes of God, that the vast gulf which separates the two schemes of doctrine is made plain.

The Calvinist invariably views the fact of man's freedom and accountability as a smaller circle, included in the vastly greater circle of the divine purposes. God foreordains all things, "yet so as that neither is any violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty and contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." How this is so, the disciple of Calvin does not pretend to understand or explain. That it is so, nevertheless, he accepts as being the plain teaching of the word of God. He finds in that word many affirmations of the absolute sovereignty of God in all the dispensations of grace, and the entire course of providence. Along with these he finds numerous other passages declaring the sufficiency of the gospel provision for all the needs of a ruined race, the willingness of God to save all men, and the reprobate sinner's responsibility for his own unbelief and damnation. He therefore proclaims both sides of the gospel. He could not do otherwise without being recreant to duty and false to his own reason. In respect to our moral responsibility, the statements of the divine word are in full accord with the revelation given within the soul. Human consciousness, bearing witness to the freedom of the will, must needs be considered trustworthy, since we cannot believe that "the root of our nature is a lie." But we cannot "by searching" within ourselves "find out the Almighty." Touching the nature and extent of God's sover-



eighty over his intelligent creatures, the Bible is our only source of information. That book declares that always and everywhere God "doeth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth, and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou?" But who can show the harmony subsisting between man's freedom and God's sovereignty?

The Calvinist assumes, indeed, that every fact in the universe fits every other fact; but he does not assume that he will be able in every case to see the fit. God only can; and in the day when we shall see face to face and know even as we are known, much that is now mysterious may be made plain to our minds. Meanwhile it were vain to take our logical files, and endeavor to trim the facets of our facts so as to make them fit each other to our satisfaction. Such an effort would not change the facts. The only result would be to subject ourselves to an optical illusion, under the influence of which we would imagine we see things which are still, and destined ever to remain, invisible. Facts refuse to be minished, even by the diamond lathe of logical demonstration. God's sovereignty and man's free-agency are facts; but lying as they do, at opposite poles of the moral universe, they are separated by an infinite diameter. We feel sure that the axis of the divine government turns on both; but our feeble vision cannot see through the mighty opaque sphere, and trace the nexus between them.

The Arminian, however, demands a gospel scheme in which there shall be the least possible mystery. He will admit no fact to be a fact, unless he can see how it fits every other fact. If he finds in the Bible two propositions which he cannot reconcile, he will pare down one or both, or augment one or the other, in order to make them appear reconcilable. Or, again, in an emergency, he may pare down one and augment the other, and then fancy that he has made the two fit each to each. This last is precisely what Arminian theology has done in its effort to reconcile human freedom with the divine sovereignty. It adds to the concept of free-agency ideas which are not given, either by consciousness or revelation, and at the same time subtracts from the scriptural doctrine of divine sovereignty so much that what is left is not a

doctrine of divine sovereignty at all, but rather a doctrine of divine impotence.

The late Dr. Bledsoe did more than any other man to reconstruct and popularize the Arminianism of this generation. Perceiving, as he did plainly, that Jonathan Edwards had exploded, utterly and forever, the old Arminian notion of "the self-determining power of the will,"—a notion which had served as the very keystone of the Arminian arch,—he realized that a new metaphysic of the will must be given to the world in order to avert the ruin of the Wesleyan system. This want he essayed to supply. His theory of moral freedom is, in brief, as follows:

The mind of the creature is *in itself* an original cause, so far as its own volitions are concerned, and by reason of its freedom cannot be swayed by any influence whatever. "The efficient cause of" human "volition is nowhere." A free agent is "one who, in view of circumstances both external and internal, can act *without being efficiently caused to do so.*" This view, in Dr. Bledsoe's opinion, "is the only safe retreat from self-contradiction, absurdity and atheism." One of the absurdities from which he retreats is the "grand illusion that the Spirit of God cannot act upon the mind at all, unless it acts to produce a volition." By this he means that, while the Holy Spirit may do much in the way of influencing the human mind—as for instance in convincing the judgment—he cannot in any case influence the mind so as to produce a volition. Such an influence would, according to this theory, be an efficient cause, and would *ipso facto* destroy the creature's free agency! Hence it follows that when we speak of the divine government, we must not use the term as implying that God controls the human race. There are multitudes of men so wicked and perverse that *God could not, if he would, convert them.* "Omnipotence itself cannot convert and save the soul without its own voluntary consent and active coöperation." That the conversion of a soul is in the power of God is only a "seeming truism." The denial of this "seeming truism" involves a paradox which, as our author admits, appears at first view "not only to be incredible but impious."

It is thus seen that Dr. Bledsoe's theory is a form of theo-

logical optimism. Christ said, "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him;" and again, "With God all things are possible." Nowhere in holy writ are we informed that the present state of things is the best that could possibly exist under a system of free-agency. But Dr. Bledsoe, striving to be wise above that which is written, has sought to convince the world that God saves every soul whom he can save, and prevents all the sin that can possibly be prevented. Witness the following passages from *The Christian Cosmos*.<sup>1</sup>

"If we would vindicate the divine goodness, then, we must restore holiness to its true position as an end [*i. e.*, in the divine government]; we must never lose sight of the grand fact that the universal design of God's providence is to root out and destroy all sin and to secure all possible moral good. We must not only bear in mind that God does not produce sin, but also that he does not *permit* sin; that instead of beholding its rise and progress in the moral universe as an idle spectator, the infinite, inexhaustible resources of his whole mind are, at all times and in all places, employed to exterminate and crush the odious thing."

And once more, lest anybody should be so fatuous as to think that possibly God might permit the sin of free moral agents, and use it as a means to some ulterior end in the economy of grace, our author adds, in the same paragraph from which we have just quoted: "We should not dream that its provision is a means in the order of God's wisdom, but that it is in itself an end to be aimed at, and aimed at only to be destroyed."

Dr. Bledsoe's theory differed radically from the Arminianism of John Wesley. Wesley and his coadjutors believed in "omnipotent grace." Their faith was voiced in the hymn which rose heavenward amid revival shouts, from many an altar crowded with weeping penitents,—

"Come, O thou all-victorious Lord,  
Thy saving power make known."

They preached with unfaltering confidence in the gospel as the power of God unto salvation, and relied implicitly upon the "Almighty Spirit" to make their word effective. John Wesley

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vide Southern Review*, October, 1878, p. 273.

believed with childlike simplicity that God could out of the stones raise up children unto Abraham. But as has been seen, "omnipotent grace" was not a thing in which Bledsoe believed. He could not, without abandoning his theory of moral freedom, teach that God could infallibly and certainly convert any soul. He might turn a stone into a human being, but as to making that human soul a child of Abraham, God could not be sure of success in the effort. He could *try* to convert a sinner, but he might be balked in the attempt. The creature must choose first to be saved, or God is powerless to save him; not the slightest volition Godward can ever be produced by the Holy Spirit. Regenerating grace must wait for native depravity to invoke its power to save. So, likewise, is God impotent in the matter of restraining sin. He may render it difficult by interposing providential hindrances; he may use moral suasion through the Spirit, the living ministry and the word; but he can exert no power such as will change the sinner's purpose. No sin has ever occurred that God was able to prevent. All the good that was possible to man in this fallen world has been evolved in the past, and thus it will be to the end of time. Hell is a region peopled by souls whom a gracious God would have saved if he could.

This theory is the latest of many attempts to "justify the ways of God to man." Plausible as it may seem, viewed as a vindication of the goodness of God, it involves consequences which no sane man can consider without shuddering.

If Dr. Bledsoe's doctrine is true, the conflict between Christ and Satan has so far been waged without superior advantage on either side, unless it be the side of Satan. If heaven saves and hell destroys all it can, thus far, most assuredly, the victory may be justly claimed by the infernal host. The fall and its manifold awful consequences occurred, not by the sovereign permission of an all-wise and omnipotent God, who was purposed to over-rule all things for the good of his children and the glory of his own holy name, but in spite of all the means which a God who was *not* "almighty to control" had been able to use in seeking to avert the terrible catastrophe. Indeed, looking at the scenes in Eden, when the tempter was exerting himself to compass the ruin of our

race, we behold in the light of this theory the incidents of a sublime, though terrible, game of chance. God and the devil were the players. The temporal and eternal interests of humanity were at stake. Both players put forth their utmost skill and wariness, God in dissuading from sin and the devil in tempting; and lo! the Creator was outwitted! Having used in vain all the limited and exhaustible, yet nevertheless "infinite and inexhaustible resources of his whole mind" to prevent the fall, the Divine Being has been ever since doing all he can to retrieve the disaster. To this end the gospel scheme has been projected as a divine experiment—itself God's greatest effort to undo evils which he had first tried to prevent.

Here is optimism, indeed, but how sad! The aspiring hope of a storm-tossed world, flying far with wearied wing, scanning eagerly and long the vast expanse of evil's flood, must be content to bring back to the ark, not an olive-branch from the hills of promise already risen above the subsiding deluge, but this precious bit of theological drift-wood, *God is doing the best he can*.

In thus ascribing the sin of man to the impotence of God, Dr. Bledsoe has sought to snatch the crown of moral empire from the brow of the Universal King. Adam Clarke, in laboring to escape the conviction that divine foreknowledge and predestination are necessarily inseparable, suggested that omniscience might be after all but a mere potential attribute of Deity; that God might, if he chose, be ignorant of future moral contingencies. Evangelical Arminianism has long ago laughed to scorn this absurd notion of a God whose eye, though capable of infinite vision, viewed blinkingly the wild ways of ruined humanity. Common sense the world over has scouted a theory which involves the blasphemous thought that God, not in poetic imagery alone, but in sober truth, does at times go to sleep, or turn away his eyes from sundry quarters of his creation; and that, as a consequence, he is sometimes vexed and surprised, on looking again, to see the tares which the enemy of souls has been sowing! But Dr. Bledsoe, equally determined not to admit the doctrine of predestination, and yet unwilling to surrender the doctrine of God's infinite foreknowledge, cuts the Gordian knot of difficulty by affirming that while God

*can* and must foreknow, he *cannot* predestinate. His logic has given the exact boundaries of omnipotence. It presents a God whose arm is "stretched out still," but so far is that arm from being able to wield power sufficient for the fulfilling of humanity's most ardent hopes, that it might as well be like Jeroboam's—paralyzed!

Bledsoism leads into the nethermost abyss of doubt. It reduces that gospel which is declared to be the power of God unto salvation, to the level of a mere palaver, since its cardinal doctrine is that the Holy Spirit cannot efficiently *cause* any volition or change of purpose in any soul, renewed or unrenewed. It leaves no room for certainty in the future history of the moral universe. It multiplies a thousand-fold the mystery of prophecy by affirming in terms that facts beyond the circle of the divine predestination are nevertheless foreknown and foretold; and at the same time it leaves a thousand facts of sacred history, and a thousand statements of the inspired word, not only unexplained but inexplicable. Our God "declares the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure: calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country; yea, I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." Yet, notwithstanding such declarations of the holy oracle, we are told that God cannot produce a volition without destroying the moral freedom of the creature!

No horror of great darkness can so utterly overwhelm a saintly soul as the suggestions of Satanic doubt in regard to the efficacy of prayer. It is one among many glories of our Calvinistic system that it regards the prayer of a believer as an ordained means to an ordained end. The Spirit does not create within us holy desires and elicit strong crying unto God, only that we may be mocked by disappointment. "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save."

The Psalmist prayed, "Hold thou me up, and I shall be safe." That soul is indeed leaning upon an arm of flesh, who trusts in his own faith and in his own perseverance rather than in

the covenanted grace and keeping power of the Almighty. Yet this is the extremity to which Bledsoism would lead us. Since it is impossible, according to this theory, for God either to produce or prevent a volition in the soul, it is impossible for him to confirm a soul in holiness and keep it from falling. Here, also, as in the matter of conversion, he may do his best and be defeated. Final salvation is conditioned, not upon God's faithfulness, but solely and absolutely upon perseverance in faith and holiness. In the creation of moral agency God has limited his power to save, and the very danger against which every saint devoutly prays to be guarded, is the one danger against which all the guards of grace are unavailing! The saintliest soul may view the promised land from the Delectable Mountains of Christian experience, and yet, like poor Ignorance in Bunyan's allegory, find a way to hell from the very gate of heaven. "Lord most holy; O God most mighty; O holy and merciful Saviour, thou most worthy Judge eternal, suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from thee!" So reads the sad prayer of the Methodist burial service; and yet the small crumb of comfort it would give the fainting spirit is snatched away by this awful doctrine. If God can neither produce a volition, nor yet prevent one, then it follows necessarily that the "pains of death" may yet prove omnipotent alike for the destruction of body and soul; and God must needs suffer his own gracious workmanship to be marred and struggle in utter impotence, while the soul of his redeemed is being plucked from his helpless hand!

The apostle who has furnished the church with the most perfect summary of the doctrine of grace could say in the boldness of faith, "I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him." He could rejoice that every believer was being "kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation." But here is a doctrine well adapted to damp the ardor of his joy: human perversity may balk any purpose of God, and undo all the work of the sanctifying Spirit at any stage of the process of salvation. So, too, must the triumphant note of praise with which Jude closes his epistle lose all its jubilation, when read in the murky light of this terrific dogma. There is no soul to whom God's

ministers may say, "He is *able* to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy."

Holy men in reading the diary of Edward Payson, find abundant reminiscence of their own heart struggles in the account which that sainted man of God has left of his dire conflicts with doubt: how, for example, he thought himself at one time able to bring forward objections to Christianity that would shake the faith of the Christian world, and found himself wondering why the devil had never brought about their publication; how he felt his own condition worse than that of Bunyan's Town of Mansoul when Diabolus and his legions broke into it: "They could not," he says, "get into the castle, the heart, but my castle is full of them." John Knox had great conflicts with Satan down to his last hours; Cowper was driven to the verge of suicide, surviving to write the sweetest hymn on providence that was ever penned; and Jonathan Edwards, it has been said, died in a delirium of despair; but no Calvinist was ever brought to the torturing extremity of believing himself dependent for salvation upon a God already defeated in myriad conflicts, and only able now to give, as the highest possible assurance of safety to the agonizing soul, this hypothetical promise, "*I will save you if I can.*"

Again, prayer for the conversion of sinners, in the Bledsonian scheme, is at best a pious wish. Considered as an appeal to God, it is a meaningless absurdity, since "conversion is not in the power of God!" All evangelists ought to change their tactics, and quit insisting on the efficacy of prayer for the unconverted. If it be true that, independently of all human coöperation, and in anticipation of all saintly prayers, a well-meaning God is doing all that can possibly be done to save the world, common sense must, as a matter of course, suggest the propriety of turning away from the throne of grace, and addressing our prayers, if we pray at all, *solely to the sinner*. True, we have as little encouragement to do this, according to Dr. Bledsoe, as to do the other; but then, considering the alleged facts presented for our credence, there would be more excuse for such a procedure. The sinner, as we can see very plainly, is not doing his best to secure his salvation. A prayer



addressed to him could not be in any sense a means to its own answer; at utmost we could only indulge the hope that there might be some inscrutable coincidence—not to say accidental—between our prayer and the sinner's *uncaused* repentance; but, then, it might be a comfort to us to know that such a coincidence had actually taken place! But why ask God to do more than he is doing, when he is already doing *his best*? Why ask him to continue doing that which, we are assured, he will continue to do to the end of time, with or without our prayers? If, to use the Bledsonian phrase of Rev. Sam. P. Jones, "God has done his best for forty years to save" the sinner "and failed," why ask him to experiment further? Why not rather sympathize with him in view of the sad results of his gracious toil, and, like Job's three friends, be silent seven days and seven nights? Indeed, why pray for anything more than temporal blessings? These, assuredly, God might grant without destroying our free-agency!

When a man's theology involves consequences so horrible, it has not only in large part melted away, but, like the surplus manna that was left till morning, it has bred worms, and become offensive. He who tries to feed his soul on such pabulum will inevitably find himself nauseated. He will learn that in fleeing from "self-contradiction, absurdity and atheism," he has indulged speculations in comparison with which atheism is equally as comforting and almost as respectable. Such a crazy notion of the divine government is well adapted to produce a feeling of contempt alike for the Bible and its Author, and leads inevitably towards atheism. Indeed, it justifies the position of an atheist with whom this writer had a talk some years ago. He did not believe that God *could* create a free moral agent! He was a Bledsonian without faith in God.

But no matter how a Christian believer may exaggerate the doctrine of moral freedom by importing into it ideas that are not presented either in consciousness or revelation, he cannot for long suffer the thought of his own liberty to eclipse that of the divine sovereignty. A true believer's prayers will overleap the barriers of a narrow metaphysical creed, and genuine faith will not fail to bring sincere, though it may be unconscious, tribute to the com-

forting royal truth so firmly enthroned in our Calvinistic system. Belief in the gospel, and in the Saviour of whom it tells, implies belief in the final glorious triumph of redeeming love. That certainty cannot exist without an exact, infallible adaptation of means to the end designed. It can only be predicated in the faith of an all-wise and omnipotent Spirit, who is ever engaged in effectuating the purposes of God in redemption. If it be said that human reason cannot conceive how God could save his elect by the power of the Holy Spirit without destroying their moral freedom and accountability, the learned author of *The Christian Cosmos* has given a very satisfactory Calvinistic answer to the objection. "We should recollect that our ability to conceive is no measure of God's ability to execute." Having thus abandoned the fundamental fallacy upon which his whole scheme is erected, Dr. Bledsoe was forced at last, as we shall now see, to surrender his own theory explicitly and in unmistakable terms.

He concludes *The Christian Cosmos* with this remarkable passage: "If God could indeed, by the word of his power, save us from sin and the horrors of eternal death, by bestowing upon us the gift of holiness, how gladly would we resign the freedom to follow our own depraved hearts. If such freedom to do evil be the only obstacle to the salvation of the whole race, then, O mighty Lord! O blessed Father! *restrain this liberty of ours*, interfere with this miserable freedom, and keep us from the deluge of our sins! Oh! give us holiness, that we may be like thee, and we shall be satisfied! . . . Oh! take this useless bauble, freedom, from us, and give us that holiness by which we may forever see God and live in him!"

This prayer is doubtless intended, like Wesley's famous apostrophe to the devil, to serve as a piece of argumentative rhetoric. But the more it is examined in the light of its author's own theory the more will it be seen to *smack of doubt as to the truth of that theory!* Bear in mind, first, that in respect of the reprobate world Bledsoe taught precisely what Calvinism affirms: that they are left free to follow their own depraved hearts. Remember also, that our author had been setting forth the doctrine that conversion was not in the power of God, because, as all admit, con-

version consists in an entire change of purpose and principle. He held that any influence of the Spirit, such as would cause a change of purpose in the soul would destroy the soul's liberty. Remember further, that Calvinism never yet taught that God ever placed any obstacle in the sinner's way to prevent his salvation. To Dr. Bledsoe alone, of all theologians dead or living, belongs this unique honor. If he has demonstrated anything at all to the satisfaction of himself or anybody else, it is this: *There is but one obstacle to any man's salvation; that obstacle is moral freedom; and GOD PLACED IT IN THE WAY!* Need we wonder, then, as we contemplate this miracle of Arminian logic, that Bledsoe's great mind staggered under the weight of his own awful thought, and that, amid the qualms of his doubt, he should call the crown of humanity's glory a "miserable freedom" and a "useless bauble?" Considering the possibility that God *might* convert the world by the word of his power, he prays that, if it be possible, the glorious result may be accomplished! He is willing to allow his liberty to be restrained, if thereby he may be saved!

That liberty of will which forms a sufficient basis for moral accountability, and in the exercise of which the impenitent sinner merits condemnation by the commission of evitable and voluntary sin, while the true penitent freely chooses the way of life, ought surely to satisfy any theologian. But if the human will be regarded as so absolutely independent of all divine influence that it may nullify the decree of a sovereign God, and infallibly prevent the sinner's salvation, even when all heaven joins in the attempt to compass his deliverance, that were a "useless bauble" indeed—a "miserable," and what is worse, an infinitely dangerous freedom. Awful beyond the power of language to describe is the sad plight of a soul so lost that Omnipotence itself cannot save it.

Other and plainer evidences of Dr. Bledsoe's unconscious dissatisfaction with his own conclusions are not wanting. That he held true and proper conceptions of the power of evil is clear from the following:

"Who shall estimate the consequences of a single evil deed? As this acts, not upon passive matter, but upon mind, who shall foretell when it may cease to work? A single impulse in the

moral world may there propagate others greater than itself, and these others still, and so on without end.<sup>1</sup> There the sin of to-day may light on generations yet unborn, and blast the loveliest buds of innocence, and darken the brightest scenes of joy."

The man who thought thus of the mere *force of example* could not possibly, save when confused by his own vague speculations, think otherwise than that the agencies of redemption are stronger than the powers of darkness. We are not surprised, therefore, to find him using these words: Sin "forms no part of God's design. It is the work of man, and of man alone. It is at war with God's design, and fain would run against the current of all the means by him employed. But in that torrent how weak a thing it will be found at last; how impotent and crazy to contend with God!" Again: "By the blood of the cross, by the glory of the everlasting covenant" angels and glorified spirits "are kept in society with God, and their allegiance is secured." Bad as things are, God has ordained that they shall never grow any worse! "The creatures of God," proceeds our author, "are *secured* against any further defection from him by the display of his character and the stupendous system of agencies and means which have been called forth in the work of redemption." Among the agencies employed in the work of redemption our author includes, of course, the personal agency of the Holy Spirit. Turning back a few pages we find the following: "In addition to the Divine example, the blessed God vouchsafes his Spirit, that the want and emptiness of the creature may receive constant supplies from the inexhaustible fullness of the Creator. It is indeed by the secret influences of this Almighty Spirit that the universe is, like a lamp, kept ever brightly burning; and were they once withdrawn its every ray of light and beauty would soon fade and die away amid the thickening mists of night and darkness. . . . By this Spirit it is that the heart of this great world, so wonderfully framed, is *touched through all its chords of life*; and the immortal mind, this many-stringed instrument, is tuned to the mighty diapason and majestic swell of all its

---

<sup>1</sup>I take the liberty of changing the order of a part of the sentence so as to give the author's evident meaning. The original has the cart before the horse—a genuine Arminian blunder!

melodies." That is, the Spirit regenerates and sanctifies the soul, and did he withdraw his influences every ray of moral light and beauty would vanish, and all the moral harmony of the universe would die away in hideous discord. Moral beauty and moral harmony are other names for holiness, which is, as our author justly observes, "a conformity of mind, heart and *will* to that which constitutes the good and glory of the Divine Being himself."

Thus we see that, after having affirmed that the efficient cause of right volition, which is the conformity of our will to the Divine will, is *nowhere* and *nothing*, Dr. Bledsoe commits logical suicide by ascribing this and all other praiseworthy moral characteristics to the "secret influences of the ALMIGHTY SPIRIT."

WM. P. McCORKLE.

*Lexington, N. C.*

## VI. THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT.<sup>1</sup>

The origin of the young people's societies of Christian Endeavor, as given in the words of the founder, Rev. F. E. Clark, is as follows:

"In the winter of 1880-81, a precious revival spirit visited the Williston Church of Portland, Me., and many, especially among the young people, gave their hearts to God. The pastor and older church-members were naturally anxious concerning these young disciples, and felt that great wisdom and care were necessary to keep them true to the Saviour during the first critical years of their discipleship. The problem weighed heavily upon their minds, for they felt that neither the Sunday School nor the church prayer-meeting, nor the young people's prayer-meeting, though all well sustained and admirable in their way, were sufficient to hold and mold the Christian character of these young converts. There was a gap between conversion and church-membership to be filled, and all these young souls were to be *trained and set at work*. How should these things be done? These were pressing problems. After much prayer and thought the pastor of the church invited the recent converts, as well as the young church-members, to his house on the evening of February 2, 1881, and after an hour of social intercourse, presented a constitution which he had previously drawn up of the Williston Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. The constitution is essentially the same as that adopted by the great majority of Societies of Christian Endeavor at the present day."

Thus, in the midst of a revival, in the attempt to deal with a real problem, and one by no means peculiar to that church, was born a movement which has grown to be one of the religious forces of our modern life. At this time, however, the movement was without any general system or coöperation. It advanced by the duplication of the society in other and contiguous churches. Out of this grew annual conventions for conference and coöperation, and then a national organization and the adoption of the *Golden Rule* as the newspaper organ and "only national representative of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor," of which the founder of the movement is editor, and whose paid circulation, June 12, 1890, was 51,424. The organization is knitted together by city and State unions, all looking to the national con-

---

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Cincinnati Ministerial Association, with a reply to criticisms. Published by request.

ventions as their head. It also extends to foreign and heathen countries.

In July 1890, it numbered 11,013 societies, with a membership of 660,000. The society has its representative badges and banners. Many pastors in different denominations have spoken favorably of the societies in their own churches, lists of which testimonies are published by the United Society of Christian Endeavor.

The platform upon which the local society stands is as follows, viz:

“Its object shall be to promote an earnest Christian life among its members, to increase their mutual acquaintance, and to make them more useful in the service of God.”

Its membership consists of three classes—active, associate, honorary.

*Active* members are composed of “young persons who believe themselves to be Christians.” “Voting powers” are “vested only in the active members.”

*Associate* members consist of “young persons of worthy character, who are not at present willing to be considered decided Christians.”

*Honorary* members consist of “persons who, though no longer young, are still interested in the society, and wish to have some connection with it”

All such members must be “elected by the society, after carefully examining the Constitution, and upon signing their names to it, thereby pledging themselves to live up to its requirements.”

The *officers* of the society are the ordinary ones required in any organization. The *committees* are four:

1. *Lookout Committee*: “to bring new members into the society, to introduce them to the work and to other members, and to affectionately look after and reclaim any that seem indifferent to their duties;” to “satisfy itself of the fitness” of members and to propose them.

2. *Prayer-meeting Committee*: to assign topics and appoint leaders, and “to secure faithfulness to the prayer-meeting pledge.”

3. *Social Committee*: “to promote social interests of society,” and to that end “any appropriate entertainment of which the church approves may be provided.”

4. *Executive Committee*: consisting “of the pastor of the church, the officers of the society and the chairmen of the various committees. All matters of business requiring debate shall be brought first before this committee, and by it reported either favorably or adversely to the society.”

The Constitution further provides with reference to attendance on the prayer-meetings:

“All the active members shall be present at every meeting, unless detained by some absolute necessity, and each active member shall take some part, however slight, in every meeting. To

the above, all the active members shall pledge themselves, understanding by 'absolute necessity' some reason for absence which can be conscientiously given to their Master, Jesus Christ."

"Once each month a consecration or experience meeting shall be held, at which each active member shall speak concerning his progress in the Christian life, or renew his vows of consecration. If any one chooses, he can express his feelings by an appropriate verse of Scripture, or other quotation." Absentees from this meeting are to "send a request to be excused, by some one who attends."

Again, "If any active member of the society is absent and unexcused from three consecutive monthly meetings, such a one ceases to be a member of the society, and his name shall be stricken from the list of members." Additional committees may be added in the by-laws. Its relation to the church is defined thus:

"This society being a part of the church, the pastor, deacons, elders or stewards and Sunday-school superintendent shall be *ex-officiis* honorary members."

Fidelity to the duties which the organization imposes is sought to be secured by the pledge presented "to all candidates for active membership," which is as follows:

"Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise him I will strive to do whatever he would like to have me do; that I will pray to him and read the Bible every day, and that, just so far as I know how, throughout my whole life I will endeavor to lead a Christian life. As an active member I promise to be true to all my duties, to be present at, and to take part, aside from singing, in every meeting, unless hindered by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. If obliged to be absent from the monthly consecration meeting, I will, if possible, send an excuse for absence to the society." This pledge was modified at the convention at St. Louis, 1890, by the insertion after the words "read the Bible every day," the further promise "to support my own church in every way, especially by attending all her regular Sunday and mid-week services, unless prevented by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Saviour."

At the time of this action 11,013 societies had been organized,



presumably upon the old pledge, with whom the adoption of this modification is an optional matter. The publishing department of the United Society of Christian Endeavor continues to issue cards containing the original pledge quoted above. It is proper to state, however, that the amended form is "recommended by the trustees" of the United Society, and it is "hoped that all the societies will make the change as soon as possible." The Junior Society pledge, however, for boys and girls under thirteen or fourteen years of age, seems still to be unchanged in this regard.

Among the by-laws (Art. xi.) suggested as hints to societies is one providing letters of introduction. "Letters of introduction to other Christian Endeavor Societies shall be given to members *in good standing*, who apply to be released from their obligations to the Society; this release to take effect when they shall become members of another society." Suitable printed blanks are furnished by the publishing society.

The transfer of members when no longer young, from the active list, is provided for by an amendment to the model constitution—proposed by Rev. F. E. Clark, and recommended to the societies by vote of the National Conference, held in Chicago, July 5–8, 1888—"it is expected that the older members, when it shall become impossible for them to attend two weekly prayer-meetings, shall be transferred to the honorary membership of the society, if previously faithful to their vows as active members."

The interdenominational basis of the Societies is set forth as follows:

"The basis of the union of the societies is one of common loyalty to Christ, common methods of service for him, and mutual Christian affection rather than a doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis. In such a union all evangelical Christians can unite without repudiating or being disloyal to any denominational custom or tenet."

The essence of a Society of Christian Endeavor is thus defined by Rev. F. E. Clark: "There can be no true Society of Christian Endeavor that omits these prayer-meeting rules. Societies may differ in almost every other respect; they may have more or less committees, more or less duties assigned to each committee; the

by-laws may vary widely, but these clauses which define the obligations of individuals to the work must remain substantially the same if the organization is to be a Society of Christian Endeavor." These quotations are taken from two publications by Rev. F. E. Clark, dated 1889, viz: "A Short History of the Christian Endeavor Movement," and "Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor—What it is and How it works."

In discussing this movement, which has thus been outlined, I shall speak first of its strength, then of its weaknesses or dangers, and lastly how to utilize the one and counteract the other. Its strength is due, among other causes, to the following:

First, it addresses itself with some success to the solution of a real problem, and one which is pressing upon Christians of every denomination, namely, How to interest and retain and train the young people in the services and activities of the church. The conditions of life under which we live have given to young people between twelve and twenty years all the characteristics of a distinct class, requiring idiosyncratic treatment both in the education of the home and the church. Statistics show, and the experience of almost every pastor will sadly corroborate them, that many of our young people between sixteen and twenty years of age disappear from our Sabbath-schools, but do not reappear in our churches. They complain of a want of congeniality in the regular service, and in their own services exhibit impatience at the presence or restraint of older persons. Now, while this is undoubtedly due in part to the individualistic tendencies of the age, the decline in respect for rightful authority, and to the fact that improved educational methods have put many young people in real advance of their parents in many matters, yet on the other hand we think it is still more largely due to the fact that the church has not modified its services and methods in the direction of making them as congenial to the youthful mind, with its peculiar vivacity of feeling and energy of effort as it might have done. The peculiar claims of the young have given rise in its later phases to the whole Sunday-school movement, and have determined its successive enlargements. They have produced our young people's meetings and bands and associations. Many of these things have, however,

in part superseded attendance upon regular church services, and have been in partial rivalry with them. The problem now is, how to make them really coöperative with them, so that the training in the young people's gatherings of all kinds shall be preparative to participation in the duties of adult church-membership. The solution of this problem is the object of the Christian Endeavor Society movement, and it is made one of the grounds upon which its friends allege its superiority to many other agencies of un denominational origin.

Another element of its strength is the extent to which it recognizes and utilizes the social affinities of the young in reaching the young, and keeping them when reached, in the activities of the Christian life.

It is an organization of young Christians, not only for mutual helpfulness and united effort, but to reach the unsaved young. Its whole equipment is determined by the tastes and feelings of youth. It recognizes that the social principle among the young is a most potent, and often destructive, one, and it seeks to create a fellowship in which that principle shall work in behalf of, and not in opposition to, Christian sentiments and activities. It has taken with young people because it was constructed with reference to that end.

Its greatest element of strength, in my judgment, is that it has provided a kind of religious life and activity exceedingly helpful within proper safeguards, which the church in its organic form has not itself properly provided. The movement is an outgrowth of a real demand. It calls for modifications and adaptations in church machinery. It represents a genuine and necessary element of a church's complete activity. But the church has been rather afraid of the new force arising within her, the power of the aggregated activity of its youth, and has yielded only under pressure to it. Hence that force has found expression, and is shaping itself in channels outside of and beyond the church.

If the different Christian bodies had organized their young people upon some such principles around the local church and its superior judicatories, this movement would never have taken its present form and gained its present dimensions.

Young people's meetings are no new thing, but young people's meetings organized upon a basis as broad as the church's activities, binding the young of one church with those of another, rising in successive organizations until the whole church is represented in them, is new. What its power for good may be can be seen in the rise of the Christian Endeavor movement, and in the development of the organic work of women in the church.

The weaknesses or dangers of the movement may be divided into those which pertain to it as a local church organization, and as an interchurch or interdenominational one.

As a local church organization, it *fails to recognize sufficiently the rightful authority of the church.*

The voting power is only in the active members. The pastor, deacons, elders or stewards are honorary members—*ex officio*. They may advise, but not determine. As the governing board of the church, superior to all its organizations, they are not recognized at all. Even as honorary members, they are only such as individuals. The session or other local authority should be heartily accorded in the constitution, at the very least, a veto power upon any and every action of the society.

*The basis of active membership*, in view of all its duties and privileges, seems *too broad*, namely, "all young persons who believe themselves Christians." Thus, without a public profession of faith and an acceptance of the vows imposed by church-membership, they are deemed fitted to discharge all spiritual duties of the society, and to take its solemn pledge of obedience to Christ. Conjoining all this with non-membership in the church is calculated to underrate the importance of that relation.

In another direction the *basis of active membership seems to be too narrow*. It excludes all who do not subscribe to a pledge which is not prescribed by the church, nor imposed upon its members when entering its communion. Says Mr. Clark: "Numbers are of little consequence. Think more of quality than quantity. Half a score of those who are earnest and consecrated are worth in this work ten score of half-hearted. A *very few* young people of the right sort can make a strong Society of Christian Endeavor."

When the terms of the pledge required are noted, it is possible that a very large portion of young people in any church might be outside of its young people's society, and yet not be guilty of any unfaithfulness as Christians. For the pledge is open to the objection that it requires all the young men and women to speak or take part in all public meetings irrespective of the views of their parents or the feeling of the local church, a matter the wisdom of which, with reference to adults, is by no means a settled question in the evangelical churches, much less with reference to its young people.

Again, it requires all its members once a month to speak concerning their "progress in the Christian life, or renew their vows of consecration," a requirement which many of us feel to be of more than doubtful value.

If any one suggests that these things could be modified to suit the views of parents or of each individual church, let me read to him the admonitory words of the founder of the society.

"There can be no true Society of Christian Endeavor that omits these prayer-meeting rules;" "these clauses which define the obligations of individuals to the work must remain substantially the same if the organization is to be a Society of Christian Endeavor."

Again, the stringent requirements which the society imposes upon its members in connection with its own immediate meetings and work has *a tendency to give to such meetings and such work a superiority in importance to the regular meetings of the church.* When time is limited and calls are pressing, the services less stringently laid upon them will be the ones which are given up. This objection has been recognized by the convention of 1890, but not entirely removed by the insertion in the pledge of the additional obligation "to support my own church in every way, especially by attending all her regular Sunday and mid-week services, unless prevented by some reason I can conscientiously give to my Saviour." Such reason might be the impossibility of attending the meetings of both the society and the church.

These are some weaknesses or dangers which in any particular church might be modified so as to render it unobjectionable; but

much more serious ones pertain to it as an interchurch or interdenominational organization.

It has a tendency to direct our young people to an authority *outside* of their own church for inspiration and guidance in their work *within it*, and thus to foster an allegiance which may, in case of a collision, be fatal to the peace and authority of the church. While these State and national conferences may disclaim any legislative power, their moral or suasive power as the chosen representatives of the societies may be practically little less than controlling. Is it wise to build up an alliance within our churches which may some day prove stronger than the church itself? Is it wise to expose the young and untried disciples to such a possible conflict?

Again, looking to a foreign authority has a tendency to disqualify the young for entrance, *when adults*, loyally and lovingly into the duties of their own church. Those who mould the young in our churches, in a few years will have moulded our adults.

Again, the practical direction assumed by these State and national conventions over the work of our young people, *implies either the incompetency or the unwillingness of the organized Christian bodies to do this work for their children*. If there is such incompetency, why should it be so? If there is unwillingness, is not this movement God's call to them to take it up?

While agencies outside of church organizations have sprung up and flourished, to do as the joint agent of the churches what they could not do individually, and have justly had the church's support, as, for instance, the Y. M. C. A., this organization, which is outside of ecclesiastical lines, has for its purpose the running of a most important part of the work within ecclesiastical lines, and which, by every principle of social and religious order, ought to be done by the churches themselves. Is it not true of the parent church as well as the natural parent, that "if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel"?

The only sufficient ground of assent to such a system of things is to be found in some special power in the Christian Endeavor movement, which is not in the churches. Why, I ask,

should the great Christian bodies of this country ask conventions, made up of individuals united upon a specific pledge, to practically determine the training of their young people, instead of training them themselves? Again I ask, what is there in the Christian Endeavor Society, which is good, which cannot be assimilated into any evangelical Christian church's system, and be used in harmony with its own methods and traditions?

If it be said that this leaves no room for interdenominational conferences, we reply that it gives the only safe and durable basis for such conferences. Let each church organize its young people around its local church and the superior ecclesiastical tribunals, rising step by step until the young people of every church shall be bound together; then let the interdenominational gatherings, whether city, State or national, be composed of representatives from these different bodies, and the movement would have the strength of both the denominational and undenominational inspiration.

Again, it is a fair question as to whether its *interdenominational basis sufficiently guards evangelical truth*. (See above). This basis is ambiguous, and would not exclude Annihilationists, Universalists or Second Probationists, and some who hold an exalted view of Christ as a creature, but deny his essential deity. The disclaimer of a "doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis" would seem to regard any distinct utterance of the common faith of the society as a thing not to be desired. With so excellent a basis of union as the Evangelical Alliance, representing the evangelical churches of Christendom already in existence, it seems strange that a doctrinal basis is disclaimed. The history of the King's Daughters shows how dangerous ambiguity in the basis of any religious organization may become.

Again, this movement tends, and has tended, to assume the character of an *imperium in imperio*, an *ecclesia in ecclesia*. It does not fix the conditions of church membership, but that of a high standard young Christian. Letters of introduction are given by one society to another, which to all intents and purposes are similar to church members' certificates of dismissal. And as church-membership is not a condition of active membership in

these societies, by such letters any local society might receive members of no church, or any church, without the spiritual authorities of the local church being permitted in any way to pass upon their fitness. Nay, by such an arrangement any society might have members who were actually hostile to the type of doctrine and order of the church to which it belonged.

Over and above this whole movement is the United Society of Christian Endeavor, an incorporated body, whose members are, I believe, a self-perpetuating body. Of it Rev. F. E. Clark says: "It is simply the missionary agent of all the societies." "So far as is possible, the United Society should become self-supporting by printing its own literature, furnishing the society badge when decided on, etc." "The United Society, as the incorporated body, is the proper organization for the raising of money, and the publication of literature, and for the general management of the work at large. For the sake of unity, and of securing suitable supervision of the literature and the workers for whom the society is responsible, it is expedient that the literature and the paid representatives emanate from the United Society." So, finally, this movement, while placing the young people in our churches under the presiding genius of an alien jurisdiction, places the entire direction of the movement itself under the brethren who constitute the members or trustees of the United Society and the owners of the *Golden Rule* Newspaper and Publishing Company. If this is a young people's movement, from whose coöperative control and guidance our older people are excluded, why not exclude the older people who constitute the United Society and shape its policy and issue its literature? Are not these brethren quite as incompetent by reason of age, as elders, deacons or stewards? Or if they are not incompetent for this cause, should boards of elders, deacons or stewards be?

"Would it not be better," etc., it is objected, "to ask what has been the result of these principles in practical working now for ten years?"

When it is suggested that evil results have flowed, and are flowing, from some of these principles, we are challenged in the language of another, to show a "single society" "not a help to its



church" "that has not left the *principles* which distinguish the movement."

When the principles are criticized we are told to look at the results, and when the results are criticized, we are told to look at the principles from which a departure has been made. Now, it is the judgment of the writer that the evil in the results is due to the evil in the principles; that one is the cause of which the other is the effect, and that the connection is not recondite, but obvious. But is it fair, when a society claims to stand for certain principles, and to ask adherence upon the ground of said principles, and whose founder publishes a tract of sixteen pages "for the benefit of those who desire, in succinct form, the *principles* and the practice of the society," to refuse in its defence to allow it to be judged by them?

The principles of a man or an organization will sooner or later rule them, however good surroundings and other counteracting influences may check their development. If the principles are defective, it is folly to wait until they have borne their hurtful fruitage before we correct them. Indeed, when the results have come in their fullness, it is often too late to apply an adequate remedy. An organization unwilling to stand or fall by its principles is hardly one to whose inspiration and counsel we can safely trust our young people.

But great cause for comfort is found in the fact that these criticisms have been born of fear. Now, in a certain sense, this is undoubtedly correct. They are born of fear, but the fear is born of the defective principles of the Society. It is well sometimes to be moved with fear before the results, and thus avoid them. Noah was "moved with fear"; the antediluvians were not; they waited for the results, and they got them. By a timely moving with fear, we hope our beloved church will have Noah's reward, who "prepared an ark to *the saving of his house.*" To be moved with fear of principles which either contravene the Scriptures or are at variance with the wisdom which the church has purchased at great cost, is to be moved by the highest of motives, nay, by the fear of God.

When attention was called to the absence of a proper recogni-

tion of church authority in the model constitution—in the article which *defines* the “relation to the church” of the Society—the criticism is met by quoting utterances of its founder, and of the United Society and others affirming the principle of church supremacy. But it is not explained why this article *remains still unchanged*, nay, is “copyrighted” against “mutilated editions.” A church session which accepts that constitution as it is, consents to the relation which it defines, and surrenders powers vested in it by its members’ ordination vows.

When it is noted that those who are not members of the church of Christ are permitted to take the Society’s solemn pledge of allegiance to him, and exercise all the delicate duties which the constitution imposes upon active members—and that thus the duty and importance of church-membership is lowered—the “all-sufficient answer” is declared to be “the seventy thousand *such* members” “who joined the church last year.” The seventy thousand were not from “such members,” but from the “ranks of associate members” who do not take the pledge and do not assume the duties or enjoy the privileges of active members. The criticism therefore stand unanswered. But surely it will not be claimed that these additions, occurring in churches where Sabbath-schools, missionary societies, a regular pastor and regular services were doing their work the year round, were all due to the adoption of the distinctive principles of the Christian Endeavor Society. The dishonor done to the church of Christ and the ordinances of God’s house, by such an assertion, would be great indeed.

When it is pointed out that some of the peculiar features of the pledge and its adjuncts would exclude many of our young people who would not, and who, some of us think, ought not to take it in all its features, from any young people’s society at all, unless it was a separate one, we are solemnly warned against driving “a sectarian wedge into that fellowship,” when, alas! we are trying to prevent “that fellowship” from driving “a wedge” into us.

When attention is called to the superiority in importance given to the Society’s meetings over the regular services of the church by the pledge, the reply is given that the National Con-

vention at St. Louis amended the pledge so as to include the regular services. But we are not told why the Publishing Society goes on still publishing at least two forms of active membership pledges *which omit this amendment*. To make the amendment is to admit its necessity; but, after amending it, to issue pledges without it, is to virtually declare it optional. The founder of the movement admits that the adoption of the new pledge by a society "is practically reorganizing," and notes that "some societies had adopted" it "for those who shall *hereafter* join the Society," at the same time getting as many as possible of the old members to sign it. It is strange that a pledge which from the beginning laid such a stress upon loyalty to the local church should have been taken by those who will decline to take it in its amended form. Here are results sustaining the criticism I made, furnished by Mr. Clark himself.

When I urge that the interdenominational organization "has a tendency to direct our young to an authority outside of our church for inspiration and guidance" which is hurtful, I am told that this is "a new and strange doctrine," "the full force and final result" of which I do not see. This is followed by a series of climactic interrogatories, based upon the imputation to me of the "new and strange doctrine," indeed, that Presbyterians should never go out of the Presbyterian Church for "instruction or reading on any specific subject, like that of Christian Endeavor."

Why is it that the doctrine imputed to me is so "new and strange" when applied to the Presbyterian Church, with its magnificent equipment of piety and learning, but quite the reverse when applied to the Endeavor Society? Says Mr. Clark: "The United Society should print the literature," should have "supervision" of it; it "should emanate from the United Society." What that literature includes may be seen in the price list of the Publishing Company, entitled "Literature of the United Society of Christian Endeavor." We notice Hymns of Christian Endeavor, cards, forms, badges, banners, prayer-meeting topics, leaflets, books, covering every detail of organization of activity, and the *Golden Rule*, "the only national representative" of the movement, with the exposition of the Sunday-school lesson, and the supply of al-

most everything that constitutes a regular religious newspaper. Why does a claim, such as the above discloses, seem so venial when made by the Endeavor Society, and so censurable if made by the Presbyterian Church? He may be sure that, as the Presbyterian Church does not claim the exclusive right to print the literature of its own young people's societies, it will never concede that right to any other organization.

In response to the charge that the society tends to an *imperium in imperio*, an *ecclesia in ecclesia*, we are again met with the before-noted deliverances affirming loyalty to the church's authority. But it is not explained how this consists with the following facts, viz: that membership in the church is not essential to active membership, and that there is the consequent introduction into a society, with voting power, of a constituency not within the jurisdiction of the church at all.

That letters of introduction to (or from) other Christian Endeavor Societies "are given and received to members in good standing," "to take effect when they shall become members of another society," when many of these societies are in other denominations, and the spiritual authorities in none of them consulted.

That the power is lodged in the Lookout Committee "by personal investigation to satisfy itself of the fitness of young persons to become members of this society." Our sons and daughters who have satisfied the session of their fitness to unite with the church of Jesus Christ and take its solemn vows, must have their fitness for this higher degree investigated and established by an irresponsible committee of young people.

That members "may be *allowed* to withdraw," if their "reasons seem sufficient" to the Lookout Committee and the pastor. Here the pastor is taken in and the elders left out, and the committee must be satisfied as well as he.

That a member can be suspended, "if thought best by the pastor and the rest of the Executive Committee." (Mr. Clark's answer to a question).

That provision is also made for dropping members who, after due appeal and warning concerning their duties, prove obdurate.

Now, here is a society in the church whose distinctive literature is to come to them from without the church; fixing religious vows of communion, which it alone has the power to release; investigating the fitness of church-members to unite with it; giving and receiving letters of dismission to and from societies outside of the church's jurisdiction; admonishing and disciplining members—in some acts taking the pastor in and shutting the elders out, and in others shutting out both—and when we think we see a good deal of *ecclesia in ecclesia* in all this, we are told that we are mistaken; that the representatives of the society affirm in unmistakable terms “the obligation of each society” “always and absolutely to the church of which it is a part.” I prefer to diagnose the disease by its symptoms rather than by the feelings of the patient on the subject.

When it is suggested that it is a fair question whether the interdenominational basis “sufficiently guards evangelical truth,” we are referred, not to the formulated basis, but again to deliverances, one by the convention of 1890, the other by the United Society in the same year. I quote these deliverances as given by an advocate of the movement; first, that of the convention: “We declare our platform evangelical;” secondly, that of the United Society: “Voted, that we reaffirm our principle, that we stand together on an evangelical basis; that societies connected with evangelical churches alone be enrolled by the United Society. While we disclaim any authority over local unions, State and other organizations, yet we recommend to them that this principle be recognized.”

Do these utterances disprove my words? Let us see. Note, first, that neither of these bodies has any authority to make the basis exclusively evangelical, if, as formulated, it is not so. We are told that the convention is “for fellowship, not legislation.” The United Society “disclaims any authority over local unions, State and other organizations.”

Note, again, that when the United Society declares “that societies connected with evangelical churches alone be enrolled,” it implies that societies might exist in churches not evangelical; that the pledge might be taken and the basis accepted by said societies,

and that therefore the pledge and basis are not incapable of a sense less than evangelical. Does not this action concede that the interdenominational basis does not *sufficiently* guard evangelical truth ?<sup>1</sup>

Note, again, that the recognition of a principle so fundamental as this, the Society can only "recommend" to the local unions. How weak the power of these central organizations seems in the settling of this issue. But stop: the convention and the United Society are not so weak as might appear. Just touch the prayer-meeting pledge, or the consecration meeting, and see what the convention of 1890 says: "We declare the pledge essential to a Society of Christian Endeavor, and that those who in any way weaken or tamper with the principle of obligation as embodied in the covenant idea of the pledge are *destroying the very foundations* on which the society rests, and cannot be recognized as true Societies of Christian Endeavor. We declare the consecration-meeting to be essential."

I would be glad to have seen rung out by the United Society and the convention, with similar emphasis: "We declare the acceptance of the body of Christian truth known as evangelical essential to a Christian Endeavor Society, and that those who in any way weaken or tamper with the principle of obligation to Christ, as set forth in that body of truth, are destroying the primary foundation upon which the society rests, and without which it cannot exist."

I would be glad to have seen a little more "recommending" in the matter of the external form in which Christian devotion

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written, I find in the Year Book (1888) of the United Society that Unitarian and Universalist societies are enrolled. The *New York Union* reported last year twelve Universalist societies. Recently a society in a Maine Congregational church protested against action of the State Union "looking to the exclusion of non-evangelical societies from our fellowship." It is further declared that "they did this with much enthusiasm—a unanimous rising vote." March 2, the *Rochester* (N. Y.) *Union* :

"Resolved, That it is the sentiment of the local union of Y. P. S. C. E., of Rochester, N. Y., that it is opposed to all legislation with the object or result of excluding any societies now members of the local union on the ground of denominational differences." As the United Society disclaims "any authority over local unions," etc., the Universalist societies in this Union seem to be there to stay.

should shape itself, and a little more peremptoriness concerning the basic truths of evangelical Christianity.

Now, here is an organization originating in a region where the advocates of a second probation have swept away many influential churches and leading ministers, have captured a theological seminary, and shaken the authority and historic position of the American Board; a region in which, in compact, organized and influential form, are many whose denial of the deity of Christ ranges from regarding him as little less than God to seeing in him a fallible man; a region in which Universalism stands for a rejection of evangelical teaching, from the single article of future retribution to the rejection of almost every other article. Now I ask, under such circumstances have not the evangelical churches a right to demand that when this society enters our churches its adherence to evangelical teaching shall be so clearly, sharply, doctrinally defined that no ambiguity shall remain? Perhaps a most instructive illustration of how little indefinite phrases can guarantee a steady adherence to the great truths they were designed to guard, is seen in the history of that glorious motto of the society: "For Christ and the Church." Is it not true that this was the motto of the oldest university of America, whose foundations were laid by those who held the faith of the Puritan Fathers, and designed it to be a nursery of a ministry that should defend, with learning as well as with piety, the faith the founders cherished? But, alas! that Christ has been shorn of his deity within its walls, and that church has been shorn of her great Head, whose right to rule her and invoke her confidence lay in the diadem of his eternal godhead.

This leads me to the last question, viz.: "How shall we utilize the strength of this movement and counteract its weaknesses? My answer is simple:

1. Let it alone. It has done good, and is doing good. As a bond of union between churches whose ecclesiastical organization is not very compact or highly developed it may have a very fruitful future.

2. Let us organize our young people, as far as is possible and wise, upon similiar principles, having local church organizations,

presbyterial and synodical ones, and one representative of the whole church, each subject to the ecclesiastical authority within whose jurisdiction it is organized. Let us on that basis neither *include nor exclude* the peculiar features of a Christian Endeavor Society, leaving local features to the session of the local church. Add a department to one of our executive agencies with a competent officer at its head, whose duty it shall be to foster in all wise ways such organizations, and to suggest such modifications in church methods as shall start our young people at the baptismal font, and never let them get out of the church until they get into heaven. Let us do for the young people's work what we have done for the woman's work. And when interdenominational conventions are held, let there stand with the representatives of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew's, and of the Epworth League, and of other denominational young people's organizations, the representatives of a Presbyterian Young People's Association beneath their banner of blue.

3. Let us recognize in the Christian Endeavor movement a call of God to this work, and be grateful for its lessons and its encouragements, while we claim the right to decline anything in it which in our judgment is incompatible with the true interests of our young people.

WILLIAM MCKIBBIN.

*Cincinnati.*



## VII. NOTES.

---

### THE EVANGELISTIC REVIVAL IN THE SYNODS.

NOT quite a decade has passed since the inauguration in Kentucky of a systematic movement to carry the gospel to the outlying masses by means of a body of men chosen by the Synod and set apart to strictly evangelistic work. The immediate aim of this movement was to enter the much-neglected but rapidly developing mountainous sections of Eastern Kentucky, and push forward the standards of Presbyterianism in strictly aggressive work. It was freely predicted at the time that the movement would be short-lived, that the ardor of its originators would soon cool, and the enthusiasm of its supporters become chilled, and the endeavor fail for want of pecuniary support. On the contrary, every year has but added to the interest manifested and the confidence felt in the work. During the last year more money was contributed, more laborers were employed, more communities were reached, and more visible results secured than in any previous year, whilst the current year promises to be the most prolific and fruitful of all. Meanwhile Synod after Synod has awakened to the importance of a similar work within its own bounds. It is wonderful to see the enkindling within a few months past of the evangelistic zeal in nearly every Synod of our Southern church. Virginia, with her great resources in men and means, seems likely to equal or even outstrip Kentucky. North Carolina is thoroughly aroused and grandly at work. Georgia, Nashville, Memphis, Mississippi, Missouri, are either organizing or pressing the work through organizations similar to that in Kentucky. In other Synods, as for instance South Carolina, the evangelistic work is being pressed with redoubled zeal and energy along strictly presbyterial lines. Everywhere unparalleled amounts of money are being contributed or pledged for evangelistic work. Our best and most successful pastors are being taken from devoted flocks and comfortable homes to carry evangelistic standards into the "regions beyond." A few years ago there was but "an handful of corn upon the top of the mountains," and to-day "the fruit thereof shakes like Lebanon."

We believe that this movement is, in the highest sense, a revival. In other words, we believe it to be the result of a special gracious operation upon the minds and hearts of our people, inspiring us with profounder interest in the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom amongst us, and guiding us into the use of those primitive and apostolic methods which, under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, we may expect to issue in rich spiritual results. Amongst the beneficial results that are already apparent, may be mentioned the following: First, The attention of the church has been prayerfully drawn to the scriptural office of the evangelist, as a most potent factor not only in carrying the gospel to the heathen on foreign shores, but to the heathen at our own doors. Second, The name of evangelist has been lifted up to something of its proper dignity and respect. That a man is announced as an evangelist is no longer regarded as *prima facie* evidence that he is, if nothing worse, some brother of restless spirit, who has tired of the monotony and of the patient methods of pastoral work, or who has been unsuccessful in a settled charge, and has felt called upon without any higher sanction than that of his own private conscience to give himself to some species of rambling and desultory work. The word evangelist, for our Presbyterian people at least, carries with it an authority and awakens a reverence that it did not ten years ago. There were at that time a number of beloved and honored brethren of our church laboring as evangelists. They were highly esteemed in love for their personal qualities and for their work's sake, but the office itself, from the large number of irresponsible men in the land bearing the name of evangelist, was without the honor that properly belongs to it. A third of these already visible results is, that to which we have already alluded, in the greatly stimulated liberality of our Christian people. It will doubtless be found in all the Synods, as it has proven in Kentucky, that, instead of diminishing the amount of contribution to other schemes of church beneficence, the work of Synodical evangelization has stimulated to greater interest in them and to increased contributions for their support. The happy influence of this scheme upon all the others has been one of the best evidences that it is of the Holy Spirit. As to the results that are to accrue in the future, we may hope for, first, a great enlargement of Presbyterianism. These evangelists will carry it into many communities where it is now known, if known at all, only through the caricatures of those who delight in setting forth the virtues of their "free salvation" by painting it upon the dark background of the fatalism which they label

Presbyterianism. Second, We may hope for great ingatherings of souls into the kingdom of Christ, such ingatherings as shall make "the wilderness and the solitary place to be glad, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose." In the third place, may we not hope that this thoroughly organized and efficient work throughout our whole Southern territory will take away the last semblance of excuse for the policy of our Northern brethren, as outlined by Dr. E. D. Morris in a recent number of *The Church at Home and Abroad?* With their Home Mission treasury depleted, and the vast number of calls from the great and growing Northwest, which they say they are not able to meet, surely they may now spare the tears they are weeping over the "destitutions in the older Synods of the South," and save themselves the increase of their Home Mission debt, that would be incurred in costly efforts to plant Northern churches and Presbyteries in the heart of our Southern Synods. The veil that covers such a zeal is too thin to conceal its real nature. Whatever plausibility it may have had in years gone by, in the face of the present systematic and determined effort to carry our standards wherever there is room, every dictate of Christian charity and every principle of Christian economics demand that the covenant of coöperation, so recently entered into between the two Assemblies, shall be strictly regarded, and no such wholesale organization of Northern churches on Southern soil indulged in as Dr. Morris' article manifestly contemplates.

Like every other genuine revival, this evangelistic revival has perils against which it is very important to guard. First, there is the danger of the evangelist being drawn off into the work of what is now known as the revivalist. That is, he is in danger of trying to reap where other men have patiently sown, instead of doing his own appropriate work in new and uncultivated fields. It is very delightful to go into a field where some consecrated pastor has been quietly and patiently toiling for years, where everything is ripe for a harvest of souls, and be the instrument of gathering great numbers into the church. It is delightful, but it is not "doing the work of an evangelist." A second danger is that of the glorification of numbers. A man who estimates his success by the number of churches he organizes, or the number of church members he enrolls, or the number of confessions he receives, must be more than human if he does not sometimes "daub with untempered mortar." He is in danger of receiving members without due examination, and of organizing churches that have no reasonable prospect of survival after he is gone.

These "notes" would be extended beyond all reasonable space if we should do more than merely to touch upon these points without enlarging. Let us consider in conclusion some suggestions that those engaged in evangelistic work may find of more or less practical value. First, care in the organization of churches. It does not follow because an evangelist has gone into a community where there is no Presbyterian church, and has had a good meeting, and has found a number of people who would like to be organized into a Presbyterian church, that he ought to go on and make the organization, or recommend Presbytery to do so. Many questions are to be considered, as to the extent to which other denominations are meeting the spiritual wants of the community; whether there is need for a Presbyterian church; whether there is room for it; whether it can be expected to become self-sustaining, or can be conveniently grouped with other churches, etc. You have no right to bring a church into existence that has no means of support, visible either to reason or to enlightened faith. Second, economy in the grouping of churches. The Presbyteries should see that, as soon as a church is organized, it is so grouped with other churches that it can have the stated ministry of the word and pastoral oversight and care. Third, judicious pecuniary aid. It is one of the most difficult problems that the church has to encounter, how to administer pecuniary aid to weak churches, and at the same time cultivate in them that proper spirit of Christian manhood which makes them strain every nerve towards self-support. The old five-year rule was too inflexible to adjust itself to all cases, and the admission of any cases as extraordinary, opened the way for the claimance of each particular case to be extraordinary, so that the rule was very difficult of administration. In the fourth and last place, we would suggest that the most serious of all problems is to find ministers for the new and interesting fields that our evangelists are opening up. For many years we have been pursuing the course to a very large extent of "robbing Peter to pay Paul." If all our vacant churches were properly grouped into pastorates we should find the supply of ministers sadly inadequate to our present wants. If our evangelistic movements shall result, as we trust they will, in the organization of many additional churches, whither shall we look for the men to supply them? Surely the church has need to look well to her education interests, and also to pray earnestly that the Lord of the harvest will "send forth laborers into the harvest."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

OUR INDEBTEDNESS TO THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY  
IN FOREIGN WORK.

In the work of evangelizing the world, to which the church is appointed under her great commission, the importance of the circulation of the printed Scriptures among the people can hardly be too highly estimated. When Jesus, with exquisite beauty and aptness, portrayed this work under the agricultural imagery of a sower going out to sow, he said, "The seed is the word of God." And when Paul pictured it under military emblems as a soldier going forth to do battle for his king, clad from head to foot in "the whole armor of God," he said, "The sword of the Spirit is the word of God." And now that this word, which is at once the living, fruit-bearing germ in spiritual husbandry, and the mighty, conquering weapon in Christian warfare, may, in its completeness—in its "*all* Scripture, given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness"—be brought to bear upon the minds and hearts of men, it must, as a printed volume, be placed in their hands. This is necessary too in order that the oral preaching of the word may be attended with proper effectiveness. The herald of salvation, restricted under his divine commission to "preach the word," must always base his appeal ultimately upon the Scripture, the one divine and infallible standard; and it is only as the hearers, like the Bereans of Paul's day, with the Bible in their hands search the Scriptures, along with his preaching, that it can produce its due effect in their hearts and lives. Experience also proves that the circulation of the Bible among the people is requisite to the permanency of the work of evangelization. The utter failure of the once promising missions of the Roman Catholics in Congo and Japan has been cited to show how quickly and entirely Christianity may disappear when the Bible is not given to the people; while in striking contrast stands the Protestant mission in Madagascar, where, though the missionaries were driven out after a few years' labor and the church was allowed no visible organization or public worship, the truth remained and Christianity grew, amid the fiercest persecutions of twenty-five years' continuance—the Christians actually multiplying five-fold during that period, with nothing to maintain and promote the faith but the printed Bible, which was read in secret. If, however, this be not a valid argument because of the errors and corruptions of Romanism, what is to be said of the transitory character of the work of the Apostles themselves, since many

of the nations among whom they propagated Christianity and planted the church sank back very quickly into practical heathenism? But, on the other hand, who can show us a people that have been evangelized and had the Bible circulated among them in their own tongue, that have ever again relapsed into heathenism? And how many instances are constantly adduced where the Bible itself in the hands of the heathen, even without a human teacher, has led souls to Christ who stood ready and waiting to be organized into a church of believers upon the first arrival of the missionary? The words of Scripture, which are *spirit* and which are *life* (John vi. 63), carry in themselves convincing, converting and sanctifying power to the human soul. The Bible itself is its own best witness of the truth it contains; and in the hands of the blessed Spirit, who dwells in it and works through it, it is able to make men wise unto salvation.

So, when we confine our view to foreign evangelization, the circulation of the Scriptures in the common language of the benighted people whom we would evangelize, rises to an importance that is simply incalculable. Foreign missionaries fully realize this, and bear their loud and earnest testimony to the fact that Bible distribution is altogether indispensable to the success of their work.

Now the missionaries of our church in all the various foreign fields which it has been our privilege to cultivate for Christ, have had in their labors the full advantages of this most needful and helpful Bible work. In China, in Japan, in Greece, in Italy, in Brazil and in Mexico, the Bible has been translated into the common tongues of the people, printed in quantities to supply all our demands, and circulated as freely as circumstances would permit. But who has been doing this grand work and rendering this inestimable service to us and to our missionaries in the foreign fields? Chiefly the American Bible Society. As the great agent and representative of American Christianity in the work of distributing the Scriptures, it accompanies our missionaries in all the fields of labor whither we send them, and *without expense to our Foreign Missions treasury*, attends thoroughly to this Bible work. If new translations of the Scriptures be needed, it has them made; it prints the book yearly in quantities sufficient to meet all reasonable demands of the work; and through its own agents and colporteurs in the field it distributes the word as our missionaries teach and preach it.

In China, where we have our largest missionary force, the American Bible Society entered the land as soon as it was opened to Christianity, and commenced its operations there along with the first Protes-

tant missionaries. At its own expense it speedily translated the whole Bible, and printed and distributed many million copies of this version. It has since borne a large share in the labor and expense of other translations that were needed, and is to assume one-half the expense of the now proposed union, uniform versions of the Scriptures in high classic style, and the simple *Wenle*. "The annual sales of the American Bible Society in China," Dr. Du Bose writes, "now amount to 270,000, Bibles and portions. It is an increasing figure, and so may be put down at 300,000 per annum, and in a few years much greater than this. In the provinces of Kiangsu and Chinkiang, the American Bible Society has sold and distributed from the beginning 5,000,000 Bibles and portions of the Word."

In Japan, where we have at present four mission stations and nineteen missionaries, the people for the first time received the whole Bible in their own familiar tongue about the beginning of the year 1888. This translation was the product of fifteen years' combined labors of the American Bible Society and other Bible and missionary societies. And the expense of the translation alone to the American Bible Society, as its proportionate share, amounted to \$17,000. Of course the version was promptly printed and circulated, the demand being very great; and in the years 1888 and 1889—up to the last report received—about 100,000 volumes of Scripture have been printed and circulated by the American Bible Society through its agency in Japan.

As to Greece, where we have done mission work for many years, and now have four missionaries employed, many who were present at the last General Assembly, in Asheville, N. C., will doubtless remember the ardent and emphatic testimony to the valuable help of the American Bible Society in that country, borne by the Rev. T. R. Sampson, who remarked that, unlike Roman Catholic countries, in Greece the circulation of the Bible was not prohibited, and the American Bible Society did a generous and noble work in disseminating the word among that people.

In Mexico, despite Roman Catholic opposition, the American Bible Society in 1889 circulated 8,543 volumes of the Scriptures among that benighted and priest-ridden people. And for several years past the Rev. H. B. Pratt, a minister of our own church, has been in the City of Mexico in the employ of the society, preparing a better version of the Scriptures in the Spanish language, for the use of our missionaries and the people there. At the present time Mr. Pratt is in New York, aiding in the printing of the translation that he has made.

In Brazil, where we have expended so much labor and time and money, sacrificing some of our noblest young men in the work of evangelizing that people, ground down and wasted under papal bondage, the American Bible Society has always fully coöperated with us. It distributed, through its agency there in 1889, about 7,800 volumes of Scripture; and now that religious liberty and the free circulation of the Bible seem to be assured through the establishment of the republic in that land, the work of distribution will no doubt be vigorously and extensively prosecuted.

Nor has the power of the Pope in Italy been sufficient to shut off our two faithful lady missionaries at Milan from the direct aid of the American Bible Society. Its last report mentions "a grant of \$750, which was made to promote the circulation of the Scriptures through the Committee of Evangelization of the Waldensian Church," in cooperation with which our missionaries are acting. And in Cuba also, where the Lord seems now to be opening up such "a wide and effectual door" to us to participate in planting a pure Christianity on that island, the American Bible Society has gone ahead of us, and through its established agency there has for years been diligently spreading the Scriptures. Its agent, laboring single-handed, sold personally 2,300 volumes of the Scriptures in 1889.

These facts, gathered from the latest official sources, indicate somewhat the character and the extent of the work which the American Bible Society is doing from year to year in the foreign field, upon which it expends annually about one-half its net income, and employs twelve general agents and several hundred colporteurs. And from this brief survey of its work in the fields where our church is doing missionary labor, one can gain some idea of the invaluable aid that it has rendered to us in our foreign missions. When, therefore, we consider all the benefits accruing from its work to which we have fallen heir in entering these mission fields, and all the help which we have constantly realized from its most important, abundant and efficient labors continued in them, how shall we estimate the debt which we owe to the American Bible Society in our foreign work? How could we get along without this invaluable agency? One of our own noblest and most efficient missionaries, who has had a large experience of missionary labor in China, thus records his own appreciation of this Society in his work: "Suppose there were no Bible Society! How shall I express it? Well, you know I have one of the best of wives; a faithful, self-denying mother, who looks so watchfully to the family, teaches



the children, superintends the native schools, and received social visits from 1,500 women last year, to all of whom the way of salvation was explained. Well, what my home would be without this guardian angel, my work would be without the Bible Society."

But how are we, as a church, meeting this weighty obligation? Do we recognize it; do we appreciate it? Are we acting in accordance with it? The annual receipts show that a very small portion of the funds which the Society uses in its benevolent and missionary work comes from the South, probably not one-fourth enough to meet the expense of circulating the Scriptures in the home field, not to count the foreign field at all. Is it not high time then to recognize our obligations, understand our duty, and come up to the help of the Lord in this most essential department of Christian evangelization? Our last General Assembly took its position clearly, positively and prominently in regard to this matter. It reaffirmed its relations with the American Bible Society, recommended annual collections in all our churches for the cause, provided a column in its statistical tables to report these contributions, and ordered that hereafter a standing committee of the Assembly be appointed every year to consider and report upon this important work. Our chief judicatory has thus marked out the line of duty for us and called us to it; will the Lord's host whom it commands march promptly and faithfully up to the standard it has planted?

THOMAS H. LAW.

---

### THE INAUGURATION OF DR. C. A. BRIGGS AT UNION SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

THE Presbyterian Church in this country is making history rapidly. In aggressive work at home and in extensive efforts abroad, the different members of the Presbyterian family are purchasing for themselves a good report at the present day. Our brethren of the great Northern branch of Presbyterianism, however, are just now engaged in what will doubtless make some important history in the near future. They have entered, in a carefully guarded way, upon the revision of the historic doctrinal symbols of Presbyterianism, and a large and representative committee is now preparing a report for the next General Assembly, which meets in Detroit in May.

The echoes of the revision discussion of a year ago had scarcely died away when an event occurred which can hardly fail to have great signifi-

cance. That event is the inauguration of Dr. Charles A. Briggs as professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, and the delivery of an address by him on that occasion. Mr. Charles Butler, president of the Seminary Board, gave \$100,000 to found and endow this chair; and in connection therewith he nominated Dr. Briggs as its first incumbent. The Board confirmed the nomination, Dr. Briggs accepted the post, and was transferred from the Hebrew chair to that of Biblical Theology. He entered upon his duties at once, and on the 20th of January, 1891, was solemnly and formally installed, in the presence of a large and distinguished assembly gathered in the Seminary Chapel. After the opening exercises Dr. Briggs accepted the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church, in the following terms:

“I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and I do now, in the presence of God and the Directors of this Seminary, solemnly and sincerely receive and adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. I do also, in like manner, approve of the Presbyterian Form of Government, and I do solemnly promise that I will not teach or inculcate anything *which shall appear to me to be subversive* of the said system of doctrine, or of the principles of said Form of Government, so long as I shall continue to be a professor in the Seminary.” (Italics mine.)

The newly inducted professor was then addressed by Rev. Dr. Frazer of Newark, N. J., who was a classmate of Dr. Briggs, in the class of 1864, in Union Seminary.

Then followed the inaugural address, which, we are told, occupied more than an hour and a half, and was delivered with great freedom, fervor, eloquence and power. An authorized syllabus of the address has been published in several papers, and it may be taken for granted that most of our readers have already seen it. It is not necessary, therefore, to copy it *in extenso* in this note, which can only be a mere sketch at best.

The publication of an *authorized* syllabus of the address renders it a reliable and legitimate subject of discussion. The religious and other journals of the North have been discussing its merits very freely, and the Southern branch of the Presbyterian Church has naturally a deep interest in the great movements which affect the church at the North. That interest, moreover, will assuredly be of the kindest and most fraternal nature. Whilst we must differ most decidedly with the posi-

tions taken by Dr. Briggs, and cannot but deplore the signs of radical drifting from the historic moorings of Presbyterianism which his address indicates, we would still cherish the hope that in due time it will be made evident that the following which Dr. Briggs has in his own church is very small.

The subject of the address is, "The Authority of the Scriptures," but the discussion leads over a wide field, and the friendly and unfriendly critics seem to differ greatly as to the aim and scope of the address. Before we let the address in a measure speak for itself, some gleanings from Northern exchanges may be of interest to our readers, as showing the trend of opinion regarding it near the scene of its delivery. The New York *Evangelist*, which has always been a strong advocate of revision and a warm supporter of Dr. Briggs, has an article which seems to combine the laudatory and apologetic elements in about equal proportions. It says: "No abstract can do any justice to its learning, comprehensiveness, eloquence, and spirituality," and then it goes on to explain and interpret the utterances of Dr. Briggs in such statements as these: "The main purpose of the address was to show that Biblical theology proves the authority of Scripture." . . . "The point was emphasized that the authority of Scripture is the authority of God, not of man; that barriers which prevent men from feeling this divine authority are of human rearing and need to be removed." . . . "The way was prepared for this main discussion by a consideration of the different avenues by which divine authority has actually, in human history, come to men, the church and reason having as a matter of fact shared this service with the Bible." Then the apologetic tone comes out more clearly, thus: "If any one should suppose that Dr. Briggs meant to imply that the Church and Reason were of equal rank with the Bible as channels of divine authority, the entire address, with its unreserved exaltation of the Scriptures, would be the only needed answer." After several similar statements are made the comforting assurance is given, that "Some minds will probably be relieved by the distinct statement—needless to those who know Dr. Briggs best—that he does not find a second probation in the Bible, and may be led to consider without prejudice whether in his (Dr. Briggs') belief in a progressive sanctification after death there is not a helpful truth."

The New York *Observer* at the date of this writing has simply given an account of the inauguration ceremony and a careful outline of the address. This vigorous journal will no doubt have said something clear and strong before this falls under the reader's eye. *The*

*Herald and Presbyter* in its article does not take very strong ground for or against the address. Such statements as the following arrest the reader's eye: "The inaugural address brings out in bold relief the peculiar views of the author." . . . "He announces no new views." . . . "Public opinion will now be more definite and accurate. We may expect that those who are dissatisfied will be more demonstrative than ever." . . . "Dr. Briggs is a leader in our church of a movement that is wide-spread in the religious world." At the close of the article the bearing of all this on the revision movement is alluded to in the following terms: "We are as much afraid of too much revision as of too little. We want nothing that impairs the system of doctrine. Those who sympathize with Dr. Briggs' peculiar views we feel sure will find no comfort in the report of the Revision Committee, and none in the action of the General Assembly upon it." *The Christian Intelligencer*, of New York, under the caption of DR. BRIGGS' VAGARIES, notes eleven points, makes some pertinent comments, and concludes its short article thus: "His address will gladden errorists of all sorts, and give a painful pang to many devout hearts. It will put upon the Theological Seminary which has honored him a very heavy burden." The New York *Independent*, in an able and temperate article, makes the following severe statement concerning the address in general, after alluding to various important particulars: "The general type and drift of this address, taken as a whole, seems to us as calculated to shed more darkness than light, and to raise more difficulties than it removes, and is better adapted to suggest doubts than it is to establish and confirm faith; and, hence, to deepen rather than to clear up the fog on the subject of religion." As might be expected, *The Presbyterian* has a strong article, in which the views set forth in the address are vigorously assailed. This article also points out the inconsistency of accepting, as Dr. Briggs does, the Confession of Faith, and then announcing such views as are set forth in the address. At the conclusion of the paragraph on this point it is stated that "it is not given to many men, as we believe, to plunge into inconsistencies with such a fatal facility." The tone of the whole article may be gathered very well from this statement: "What a sorrowful thing it is to see a man of so much learning, of so much real attractiveness, so finely qualified for opening up to young men the great historical revelations of God, made through the ages by inspired men, advance to his new position in the church with such words of contempt for his companions in ministerial and church life, and of exulting applause for their foes on his lips! It is simply

a matter for unfeigned lamentation." Other expressions of opinion from the East might be given, but space forbids, and at this date (February 10th) we have not been able to get our hands on an expression of opinion from the breezy West, or from the genial Pacific coast. What has been gleaned, however, will present a general view of the opinions formed of the address soon after it was given to the public in its authorized syllabus.

But it is high time that we had passed on to deal with the address for ourselves. No elaborate review of it can be made in the limits of this note, much as we feel inclined to enlarge.

As already stated, the subject of the address is "The authority of the Scriptures." This theme is discussed in a broad way under four heads: I. The sources of authority in religion. II. Barriers to the Bible. III. The Theology of the Bible. IV. The harmony of the sources of authority. The first is discussed under three particulars, the second under six, the third under eight, and the fourth in a general way. Before saying a few things regarding some of the views announced in the address, two obvious remarks may be made concerning its general spirit and tone.

In the first place, there are certain criticisms made at the expense of the reverent regard which many people have for the Scriptures that seem to us to border on the profane. We are assured by our report that the address throughout "breathed a spirit not merely of theological earnestness, but also of high religious fervor." Then another report tells us that Dr. Briggs gave utterance to the following: "*The Bible is no better than a mass-book for stopping a bullet: and is not as good as holy water for putting out a fire.*" This may have been intended as a bit of pleasantry by Dr. Briggs to relieve the fatigue of a long address, in which it must have often been difficult for the hearer to be sure of the meaning of the speaker; still our deep rooted conviction is that such pleasantry must outrage the feelings of reverence for the word of God, which have a place in the earnest Christian heart. If a man has not fertility enough to make a joke to rest an audience without alluding in this way to the Scriptures, it is surely better to have no jokes at all. Wit is proper enough in its place, and there may be no sin in a hearty laugh, but only harm can come from levity or irreverence concerning sacred things of any kind.

The other general remark relates to the depreciatory tone in which the Scriptures and our reverent regard for them are repeatedly spoken of. This produced a painful impression on our mind the first time

the syllabus was perused, and repeated perusal of the statements made has not removed in the least degree that impression. We are told that "the Bible has been treated as if it were a baby, to be wrapped in swaddling clothes, nursed and carefully guarded, lest it should be injured by heretics and infidels." The insinuation is made that Protestant theologians, even, are guilty of this abuse of the Bible. What must be the effect of such an expression on a man who already has little regard for the Scriptures? Then the high regard in which the Bible is held in the Christian church is called "Bibliolatry like unto Roman Catholic Mariolatry and Hagiolatry." How far will such a remark go to increase reverence for the Bible among Protestants? It is boldly stated that "there are errors in the Bible which no one has been able to explain away." How much will this fortify the average man in his confidence in the Bible as the word of God? Again, we are informed that "the ethical conduct of the holy men of the Bible was such that we would not receive them into our families, if they lived among us and did such things now as they did then." This sounds very like some utterances with which the perusal of infidel literature has made us familiar.

It may be that we are worshipping in great ignorance at the shrine which Protestant bibliolatry has set up, seeing that we have not yet imbibed the results of advanced critical scholarship, although we have stood by the stream and watched it flow past carrying a great deal of rubbish in its current, but we will continue to worship at the shrine of God's holy word all our days, and hope to die still a reverent bibliolater. It may also be that we are lacking that faith which enables us to believe even where there are errors which cannot be explained away, but we may still be allowed to believe that there were no errors in the autographs of the Bible since there is only hypothesis against it. We are also quite willing to admit that we have by no means attained to that degree of ethical culture which enables us to criticize the ethical precepts set forth in any part of the Scriptures, and yet we must confess that the tone of the address upon this point produced a painful impression. We would not be surprised to learn that some complimentary words have come to the ears of Dr. Briggs from quarters that are not at all well disposed towards the ethics of the Bible.

A few salient points in the address are now selected for brief consideration:

The first that meets us is the question of *authority* in matters of religion. Dr. Briggs tells us very truly that divine authority is the

only authority to which man can yield implicit obedience; then he goes on to say (and it sounds strange to Protestant ears) that there are three fountains of divine authority: 1. The Bible. 2. The Church. 3. The Reason. He says that "the great majority of Christians since the Apostles' days have found God through the church or institutional Christianity." He also states that "God makes himself known by the forms of reason, the metaphysical categories, the conscience, and the religious feelings," and that "he cannot deny the rationalists a place in the company of the faithful." He then sums up by adding that "men are influenced by their temperaments and their environments which of the three ways of access to God they may pursue."

In all this, and much more of a like nature in the syllabus, there is so much ambiguity of expression and confusion of thought, that it is by no means easy to tell what Dr. Briggs means, and so be in a position to offer satisfactory criticism.

In the first place, Dr. Briggs by no means makes it clear whether he regards the Bible, the church and the reason as of coördinate authority in religion. The syllabus does not inform us on this point, for it seems almost studiously to avoid saying what a single sentence would have made plain. *The Evangelist*, which seems to know the secrets of Dr. Briggs, interprets his position to be that "he gives the Bible the first place." But it does seem strange that such a master of expression as Dr. Briggs has shown himself to be in other writings should leave his meaning so obscure upon a cardinal point like this. Why is the reader so puzzled to get at the real opinion of Dr. Briggs in this case? His minimizing of the Bible and his exaltation of reason look suspicious, and what is said towards the close of the address does not remove the uncertainty. He there speaks of the church and reason as "the *other* seats of divine authority." "The Bible needs the church and the reason ere it can exert its full power upon the life of men." And growing eloquent, he adds: "I rejoice at the age of rationalism, with all its wonderful achievements in philosophy. I look upon it as preparing men to use reason in the last great age of the world." Such statements as these, taken together, force us to the conclusion that Dr. Briggs coördinates the authority of the church and reason with that of the Bible, if he does not regard them as equal sources of authority in matters of faith and life. If this be so, then there is departure from the historic faith of Protestantism, and from the Confessional doctrine in regard to the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and life having divine authority.

In the second place, the views of Dr. Briggs on this question lead to endless confusion and are not without real danger. If the church be a source of authority, we at once ask what church, what branch of the church, are we to look to? Is it to the Protestant, or the Romish? Then, if to the Protestant Church, which one of its many branches are we to hear and obey? How can an earnest honest seeker after God find assured certainty by this means? Must we all wait till "the church of the future," of which Dr. Briggs writes so finely in *Whither*, has been formed? In like manner, if reason be made a source of authority the same perplexity arises. Whose reason, or what reason, is to be taken as the authority? Is it the natural reason and conscience, or is it the reason of a man under the renewing grace of God? How on this theory can an earnest seeker find certainty, unless he goes to the Scriptures, and rests not on reason as final? Dr. Briggs is historian and theologian enough to know that we have here the essential principles of Romanism and Rationalism respectively brought before us, if not accepted, in the views he presents. And, further, it is evident that if these three sources of authority should not agree, and they might often differ, there is no final source of appeal, and the confusion is complete. Unless the Scriptures, as the word of God, are taken to be the one source of absolute authority, we have no escape from the Romish doctrine on the one hand, or the Rationalistic on the other. So far as we can see, the address of Dr. Briggs seems to build a broad-gauge, down-grade road which logically leads to one or the other of these destinations. Is Presbyterianism prepared to leave the safe and narrow way which gives both the church and reason their proper places in matters of religion, but sets the Bible in the seat of undivided authority?

In the third place, Dr. Briggs confounds the question of the source or seat of authority with two other questions. Sometimes it is confounded with the question of the grounds or evidences that the Bible unfolds a divine revelation, and at other times with the question of the channels by which God makes himself known to men. Nearly all that the syllabus contains under the section on "Barriers to the Bible," pertains to the question of the evidences or proofs that the Bible is a supernatural revelation, and does not really touch the question of *authority* at all. A simple perusal of the address will confirm this remark. But worse still, nearly everything said in the section on the "sources of authority" relates to the way in which God makes himself known, and not to the question of authority in the proper sense. He speaks



again and again of men "finding God," "devout seekers after God," "avenues to God," etc., when the topic under discussion is that of *authority* in religion, not that of the way or avenue to God. The church and reason have their office in making God known to men, and of leading men to God, but they can only rightly discharge this office when they set forth the contents of Scripture, which is the seat of authority in matters of religious faith and life. The testimony of the church and the resources of reason have value in presenting the grounds or evidences that the Scriptures are of God and from God; but when this has been done, the voice of God speaking in these Scriptures is the only source of authority which is binding upon men. Any authority which the church or reason may have is derivative and subordinate. If the question be asked what is the source of the *authority* of the Scripture itself? we may very properly quote from the Confession what Dr. Briggs quotes in connection with the question of *authenticity*, where the enquiry is as to what books constitute Holy Scripture. This is a claim which Dr. Briggs has made in several of his writings, and it is worth while pointing out that it is the former of these questions to which the statement in the Confession relates, while Dr. Briggs quotes it in support of his views on the latter. Let the quotation speak for itself. "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, (who is truth itself,) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God. (*Conf.* Chap. I., Sec. IV.).

In the fourth place, the views set forth in the syllabus are impracticable, and in the end must leave men without any assured authoritative rule. If in actual application the church, the reason and the Bible are in conflict upon any point, which must yield, and where is the arbiter among the disputants? If each is admitted to be authoritative, on what ground can any one of the three be compelled to submit to another? From this dilemma there is no escape. But again, even reason and the church are fallible and may err in their deliverances, and in this case they at least are not always unfailing and reliable guides. On what ground can they rightly claim to be trustworthy sources of authority? But worse than all, so far as Dr. Briggs' views are concerned, an unconscious but merciless consistency finds the Scriptures in the same condition, for he tells us that "there are errors in the Bible which cannot be explained away." With a fallible church, an imperfect reason, and a Bible with remediless errors in it, we are

assuredly in a sad plight, so far as the source of authority in religion is concerned.

But we must pass on to make a few remarks on the views contained in the syllabus regarding some of the "Barriers to the Bible." He names six of these, as follows: 1. Superstition. 2. Verbal Inspiration. 3. Authenticity. 4. Inerrancy. 5. Violation of the Laws of Nature. 6. Minute Prediction. After reading what the syllabus sets forth concerning these so-called "barriers," our conviction is that, should Dr. Briggs succeed in removing these imaginary barriers from the Bible, the effect will be not to let the earnest seekers after God find him more easily or speedily, but to allow the enemies of our faith to pour in over the broken down barriers, and turn fruitful fields into a wilderness.

What we have to say will be confined to one of these "barriers," and that is the important one of "Verbal Inspiration," and along with it, of course, that of "Inerrancy."

The syllabus takes strong ground against verbal inspiration, but not any stronger than may be found in some of Dr. Briggs' other writings. He does not tell us what particular phase of the verbal inerrant inspiration is before his mind; but whatever it is, it is rejected without any ceremony. It is evident that he intends to go further than to reject the purely mechanical dictation theory of verbal inspiration, for if he only did this, few, perhaps, would find fault with him. That he intends to set aside every phase of the verbal theory is made very plain from his one-sided and ineffective criticism of the Princeton divines in *Whither*, and the repetition of similar views in the syllabus before us.

The following passages from the syllabus and other reports of the address show clearly that he rejects every form of the verbal theory. He says, "There is nothing divine in the text, in its letters, words or clauses. The divine authority is not in the style or in the words, but in the concept, and so the divine power of the Bible may be transferred into any language." A more extended report of the address in a measure interprets this statement in the syllabus by adding, that "We force our way through the language and the letters, the grammar and the style, to the inner substance of the thought, for there, if at all, we shall find God." Upon these views of Dr. Briggs thus expressed we offer a few critical remarks, with no attempt to expand them.

In the first place, we might ask how it is possible to transfer the divine power into any language, if that authority has not in the first in-

stance belonged to the language? If the divine *authority* is not in the text, the words or the style, how can Dr. Briggs consistently speak of transferring the divine *power* into any language? The denial, in this way, of the inspiration verbally of the original text, renders it impossible to introduce divine authority into any subsequent set of words employed to set forth the concept or thought. But we merely note this in passing.

In the second place, it is difficult to understand clearly what Dr. Briggs means by the "concept" in which the divine authority resides, and whether he means the same thing by divine authority as is usually denoted by inspiration. The second passage quoted above indirectly defines the "concept" to be "the inner substance of the thought." Speaking in plain terms, we may suppose that Dr. Briggs simply means that the thoughts, not the words, are inspired. But even here we cannot help asking again: Whose concept or thought is meant? Is it God's or man's? If it be God's, how can we be sure that we have that concept correctly before us, unless the words used to convey it be also divine? If it be merely man's concept, gathered from language devoid of divine authority, then it can have no authority at all. It is likely the former that Dr. Briggs means, and if so he must show how it comes to pass that we can be sure of grasping that concept in which alone the divine element is to be found.

In the third place, Dr. Briggs must refute a very influential school of philologists who hold that the connection between thought and language is not arbitrary, but definite. Müller may be taken as a leading representative of this theory. In a treatise published a few years ago he argued strongly for this opinion, and in another issued only last year on "Natural Religion," he further fortifies his position. In Lecture XIV. he says that "we think in words," and that "a concept cannot exist without a word." We do not assert that Müller is right, but we say that Dr. Briggs must refute the learned philologist before his way is clear for a complete rejection of verbal inspiration. If the concept carries the word with it, then the inspiration of the concept also involves the inspiration of the word. So, too, when we have the word we can be so much more sure of the concept when both are bound together; and if there be a divine element in the word, any translation which truly reproduces the word carries the concept with it, and gives at least a secondary divine authority to a reliable translation. All of this Dr. Briggs must clear away, else his theory is wrecked.

In the fourth place, Dr. Briggs is not only in conflict with the consensus of leading Presbyterian theologians, but he has broken with the traditions of even Union Seminary on this question. Dr. Briggs is well aware that all the leading theologians of the Presbyterian Church, both North and South, hold in its general outlines the theory of verbal inspiration; and all the great treatises from their pens set forth this opinion. But Dr. Briggs thinks that these theologians, especially the "Princeton divines" and the "Southern scholastics," have been erecting barriers about the Bible, and that his mission in the chair of Biblical Theology is to break these barriers down, so that men may easily find a God, now half-hidden from view by verbal inspiration and other obstacles. It is of more significance to note that Dr. Briggs has broken with the traditions of Union Seminary by his views on inspiration. The devout and philosophic H. B. Smith will be taken by most of the friends of Union Seminary to be a noble representative man. Of him the late Dr. Hitchcock, of the same seminary, once said, that "he was alike conservative and progressive in his theology." Let us hear what he has to say in his *Introduction to Christian Theology*: "Inspiration is the divine influence upon the word and utterance of man, through which the revelation from God is presented to men." And again: "Inspiration is that divine influence by virtue of which the truths and facts given by revelation, as well as other truths and facts pertaining to God's kingdom, are spoken or written in a truthful and authoritative manner." (P. 204.) In regard to verbal inspiration, he adds: "Inspiration gives us a book properly called the Word of God, *inspired in all its parts*. The inspiration is plenary in the sense of extending to all the parts, and of extending also to the words." (P. 209.) With the views of Dr. Shedd, till last year Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Union Seminary, most of our readers are familiar. He adopts the verbal theory in such terms as these: "The suggestion of ideas inevitably involves the suggestion of words." "Verbal inspiration is the truth, if thought is prior to and suggests language." (*Dogmatic Theology*, pp. 89, 90.) He then argues at length to show that words are not arbitrary signs of ideas, and so confirms his views of verbal inspiration, and the inerrancy of Scripture. It is painfully manifest that Dr. Briggs has broken with the traditions of his own seminary, and it is to be feared that the friends of the institution are, in great numbers, drifting from their old moorings, and we can only ask *Whither?*

But the limits of this note are more than exceeded, so that we must

forbear saying some things we had intended concerning the contents of the Biblical Theology indicated in the syllabus. We had intended to show that it is defective, not so much by what it says, as by what it leaves unsaid, but it is enough to remark that unless he gives more prominence to the objective redemptive facts which the Scriptures record, especially in regard to vicarious sacrifice in his teaching than is indicated in the syllabus, his system will be very incomplete. Biblical Theology has a place and important work, but it must be biblical in the strict sense, and not merely rational and ethical.

The views contained in the syllabus concerning "miracles" and "prophecy" may be understood when it is merely stated that the ordinary doctrines regarding them are considered "Barriers to the Bible" by Dr. Briggs. To speak of "mercy as the favorite divine attribute" is surely to forget that infinite perfection pertains alike to all the attributes of Deity. He asserts that progressive sanctification after death is the doctrine of the Bible, but he utterly fails to explain whether this shall consist in the removal of some remains of sin, or simply in growth in divine life. If the latter, few will deny it; but if the former, he is hard by the door of purgatory. Election is merely "the election of men to salvation by the touch of divine love." What he means by this sentence is more than we can understand: "The Bible does not teach universal salvation, but it does teach the salvation of the world, of the race of man; and that cannot be accomplished by the selection of a limited number from the mass." And how all this can be harmonized with the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church is a question which Dr. Briggs must answer.

Attention has been called by several journals to the fact that the General Assembly must pass upon the election and installation of Dr. Briggs, and that the Board of Union Seminary has forestalled the Assembly by settling Dr. Briggs in his chair. *The Independent* and the *Presbyterian* both allude to this fact. From "Moore's *Digest*" (p. 390), and from Minutes of Assembly for 1870 (p. 148), it is clear that the Assembly has veto power in the case of Dr. Briggs.<sup>1</sup> This at once raises and forces on the Assembly a distinct issue. If the Assembly next May in Detroit should pronounce its veto, what will Union Semi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Since this was written it has been claimed in certain quarters that the Assembly cannot exercise its veto power in the case of Dr. Briggs, since he is merely transferred from one chair to another, not elected for the first time. Should Union Seminary not report the election to the Assembly for action, it remains to be seen what the Assembly will do in the premises.

nary do? But if the Assembly takes no notice of the matter, then it will be admitted that a man may hold the views of Dr. Briggs, and teach them in a high position and yet be in good standing in the Presbyterian Church. Our brethren at the North cannot avoid the issue thus raised, which in its practical results may be far more important than the report of the Revision Committee.

We conclude this already too long note with a quotation from *The Independent*, which cannot be regarded as an extreme or harsh critic: "What we have said has been said in sorrow, and with much regret, and from a simple sense of duty. We do not think the address fitted to the theme or the occasion, or adapted to do good service in the interests of Biblical Theology, and have felt constrained to put on record our objections thereto. That sort of higher criticism which accepts as true what it finds in the Bible, not because it finds it there, but because it is true, and hence rejects what in its judgment is not true, even if there found, logically undermines the very foundations of a *supernatural* revelation from God, such as the Bible purports to be, and as we believe it to be. We believe the Bible to be 'the word of God' in the sense of a supernatural inspiration, and hence believe that when the meaning of its language is ascertained, the absolute law of faith is supplied touching all matters therein embraced. If this be 'Bibliolatry,' then so be it. It is just the kind of 'Bibliolatry' which Christ and his disciples clearly had in respect to the Old Testament Scriptures."

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

## VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### GLADSTONE'S "IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE."

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. *By the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P.* Revised and enlarged from *The Sunday-School Times*. 12mo; pp. 358. Philadelphia: John D. Wattles. 1891.

This work is Mr. Gladstone's latest contribution to the Christian literature of our day. Its author has passed the ordinary limit of active life, "fourscore years," yet the work before us shows no marks of failing intellectual vigor; but, on the contrary, will add to the reputation of the great English statesman and scholar with all thoughtful men.

Twenty-five years ago M. Guizot, the great French statesman and historian, published his *Meditations on Christianity*, a work of the same general character as this of Mr. Gladstone. At that time M. Guizot was seventy-nine years old; very nearly the age of Mr. Gladstone. In this work M. Guizot writes: "For myself, arrived at the term of a long life, one of labor, of reflection, and of trials—of trials in thought as well as in action—I am convinced that the Christian dogmas are the legitimate and satisfactory solutions of those religious problems which, as I have said, nature suggests and man carries in his own breast, and from which he cannot escape." The dogmas of "Creation, Providence, Original Sin, the Incarnation and Redemption," he adds, "constitute the essence of the Christian religion, and all who believe in them I hold to be Christians." Of these he writes:

"One leading and common characteristic in these dogmas strikes me at the outset; they deal frankly with the religious problems natural to and inherent in man, and offer at once the solution. The dogma of Creation attests the existence of God, as creator and legislator, and it attests also the link which unites man to God. The dogma of Providence explains and justifies prayer, that instinctive recourse of man to the living God, to that supreme power which is ever present with him in life, and which influences his destiny. The dogma of Original Sin accounts for the presence of evil and disorder in mankind and in the world. The dogmas of the Incarnation and Redemption rescue man from the consequences of evil, and open to him a prospect in another life of the reëstablishment of order. Unquestionably the system is grand, complete, well-connected, and forcible; it answers to the requirements of the human soul, removes the burden which oppresses it, imparts the strength which it needs, and the satisfaction to which it aspires. Has it a rightful claim to all this power? Is its influence legitimate, as well as efficacious?" (Pp. 40, 41.)

Mr. Gladstone, in speaking of the title chosen for his book,—"*The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*,"—writes:

"The words sound like a challenge. And they are a challenge to some extent, but not in the sense that might be supposed. They are a challenge to accept the Scriptures on the moral and spiritual and historic grounds of their character in themselves, and of the work which they, and the agencies associated with them,

have done in the world for some thousands of years, and are doing still. We may, without touching the domain of the critic, contend for them as corresponding by their contents to the idea of a divine revelation to man. We are entitled to attempt to show that they afford that kind of proof of such a revelation which is analogous to the known divine operations in other spheres, which bind us as to conduct; and which in other matters, from the simple fact that we are rational beings, we recognize as entitled so to bind us. And, again, we may legitimately ask whether they do not differ in such a manner from the other documents of historic and prehistoric religions, while these too are precious in various ways, as to make them witnesses and buttresses to the office of Holy Scripture rather than sharers in it, although in their degree they may be this also." (Pp. 4, 5.)

Subsequently he adds:

"So, then, these high-sounding words have been placed in the foreground of the present observations, because they convey in a positive and definite manner the conclusion which the observations themselves aim at sustaining, at least in outline, on general grounds of reason, and at enforcing as a commanding rule of thought and life. They lead upward and onward to the idea that the Scriptures are well called Holy Scriptures: and that, though assailed by camp, by battery, and by mine, they are nevertheless a house built upon a rock, and that rock impregnable; that the weapon of offence, which shall impair their efficiency for aiding in the redemption of mankind, has not yet been forged; that the sacred canon, which it took (perhaps) two thousand years from the accumulations of Moses down to the acceptance of the Apocalypse to construct, is like to wear out the storms and the sunshine of the world, and all the wayward aberrations of humanity, not merely for a term as long, but until time shall be no more." (Pp. 6, 7.)

From these brief extracts it will be seen that M. Guizot and Mr. Gladstone alike, in the ripe maturity of their age, reached a conclusion on the great questions of religion, in which they could rest with entire satisfaction, and that conclusion is, that the Christian Scriptures are a trustworthy revelation from the one only true God, and so, of supreme authority in the settlement of all such questions. "I am convinced," writes M. Guizot, "that the Christian dogmas are the legitimate and satisfactory solution of those religious problems which nature suggests, and man carries in his own breast, and from which he cannot escape;" and, to Mr. Gladstone, the Holy Scriptures are an "impregnable rock," which will "wear out the storms and sunshine of the world, and all the wayward aberrations of humanity till time shall be no more." In sad contrast with this was the condition of Mr. Charles Darwin, as expressed in a letter to a German student, written a short time before his death, "I am much engaged, an old man, and out of health, and I cannot spare time to answer your questions fully; nor, indeed, can they be answered. Science has nothing to do with Christ, except in so far as the habit of scientific research makes a man cautious in admitting evidence. For myself, I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation. As for a future life, every man must judge for himself between conflicting vague probabilities." (*Darwin's Life*, Vol. I., p. 277.)

This faith in the Christian Scriptures as the Word of God, entertained by these two great statesmen and scholars, came to them not as "a mere prejudice of education," though both of them enjoyed the advantages of a Christian education; nor as the result of a willing ignorance of the arguments and cavils by which the claim of Christianity to be a religion from God has been assailed. In his *Meditations* M. Guizot tells us, "In my own mind I have borne the burden of the objections to the Christian system, and to each of its essential dogmas; I have experienced the



anxieties of doubt. I shall state how I have escaped from doubt, and the grounds upon which my convictions have been founded." (P. 44.) From numerous articles from the pen of Mr. Gladstone, which have appeared in the *Contemporary* and other Reviews, during the last few years, as well as from his book under review, it is evident that he, too, has studied carefully this whole subject. In the case of both alike, that faith in Christianity as a religion from God in which they rest, is the result of a long-continued and careful study of the Scriptures themselves; in other words, on what are called "the internal evidences" of the divine origin of Scripture. To the cavilling Jews our Lord said, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." (John vii. 27.) Christianity is preëminently a practical religion; and in these, his words, our Lord proposes a practical proof; and it is on this practical proof that the faith, not only of the unlearned Christian, but of Christian scholars, such as M. Guizot and Mr. Gladstone, rests with greatest satisfaction.

The most subtle, and for a certain class of minds the most dangerous, attack upon Christianity, is that which has been made by what is styled "the destructive higher criticism." The internal evidences of Christianity lie beyond the range of this attack. As Mr. Gladstone remarks:

"They" (*i. e.*, the internal evidences,) "leave absolutely open every issue that has been or can be raised respecting the origin, date, authorship and text of the sacred books, which for the present purpose we do not require even to call sacred. Indeed, it may be that this destructive criticism, if entirely made good, would, in the view of an inquiry really searching, comprehensive, and philosophical, have as its result not less but greater reason for admiring the hidden modes by which the great Artificer works out his designs. For, in proportion as the means are feeble, perplexed, and to all appearance confused, is the marvel of the results that are made to stand before our eyes. And the upshot may come to be, that on this very ground we may have to cry out with the Psalmist, absorbed in worshipping admiration, 'Oh, that men would therefore praise the Lord for his goodness, and declare the wonders that he doeth for the children of men!' For 'How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.' For the memories of men, and the art of writing, and the care of the copyist, and the tablet and the roll of parchment, are but the secondary and mechanical means by which the Word has been carried down to us along the river of the ages; and the inherent weakness of these means is but a special tribute to the grandeur and vastness of the end, and of him that wrought it out." (Pp. 5, 6.)

From the fact that the articles which make up this book were originally written for *The Sunday-School Times*, it might be inferred that the argument it contains was presented in such a way as to be especially adapted to the comprehension of children. Such, however, is not the fact. Mr. Gladstone seems to have had before his mind the case of the teachers rather than the scholars in our Sabbath-schools; and his argument requires careful thought in order to its full appreciation. That it is an able argument, the name of its author is sufficient guarantee. That it will bring rest to troubled souls—troubled by the specious objections to Christianity urged by such men as Herbert Spencer and Professor Huxley,—I have no question; and it is this class of writers the author seems to have especially in mind in writing the book. One thing I am certain will impress the reader, and that is the uniform courtesy with which Mr. Gladstone treats his opponents, and the scrupulous fairness with which he meets their arguments.

## REITH'S "ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL."

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. With Introduction and Notes. By Rev. George Reith, M. A., Glasgow. Vol. I., pp. 196; Vol. II., pp. 178. Price of two volumes, \$1.60. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1890.

This is one of the series of *Hand-books for Bible Classes and Private Students*, edited by Rev. Prof. Marcus Dods, D. D., and Rev. Alexander Whyte, D. D. It is a book not without decided merits. Among these may be mentioned:

1. The *conception* or *idea* which underlies the book as a whole. It is a book designed for intelligent laymen. It aims to adjust its treatment of the Gospel of John to the present situation of things in Biblical studies. It avoids the minutæ of critical commentators and the prosy moralizing and spiritualizing of some so-called practical commentaries. While not ignoring or relegating to the background those features of the Gospel which are of paramount and permanent interest, it also attempts to handle as they arise the questions suggested by recent literary and historical criticism. The writer reserves for the present his judgment upon the manner in which these questions are handled. The only point now made is that a commentary projected upon these lines is so far to be commended. There may have been a time when such topics would have been out of place in a commentary intended for general readers. It is so no longer. These questions are in the air. Bible-class teachers and scholars are likely to meet them in their books and magazines. When error thus thrusts itself upon public attention, the friends of truth may be excused for a certain feeling of indignation that what they know to be error, and that too old and oft-exploded error, is being palmed off as the child of truth. Under such circumstances we are tempted to relieve ourselves by an outburst of denunciation. This may be natural, but unless our denunciation is either preceded, accompanied, or followed by a calm, clear, convincing refutation it is not likely to avail much. If we would only throw the same amount of energy into the restatement of an old answer to the error that has excited our ire, or into the devising of a new one, it would probably be equally, if not more effective. The writer has no objection to a pretty good charge of powder, but he is disposed to think that when it is *preceded* by a certain amount of cold lead it is better calculated to check the advance of an aggressive enemy. Hence he ventures the opinion that the man who, in a popular commentary on any portion of God's word, shows that he is thoroughly acquainted with the errors now being circulated under the name of the literary and historical criticism of the Bible, and that he is prepared to refute them, will do no mean service to the church. We say popular commentary, for when error is popularized, why should not truth be? Mr. Reith then has, in our judgment, done well to devote sixty pages of his first volume to a special introduction, in which he treats of: I. The Life and Character of the Apostle John. II. The Authenticity of the Gospel, giving (1), the External Evidence; (2), Internal Evidence. III. Place and Time of Composition. IV. Object and Scope of the Gospel. V. General Characteristics. And so he has done well in his notes to touch upon questions which are not mooted in many of our older commentaries. We wish we could add, that his handling of these questions is satisfactory.

2. Another commendable feature of the book is the fact, that the author recognizes and undertakes to exhibit the *unity* that characterizes the Gospel of John. He finds the object of the Gospel stated by the Evangelist in Chapter xx. 30, 31:

"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." He shows that this theme determines the selection, arrangement, and treatment of the Evangelist's material, and that it is developed in an orderly and climactic way. According to Mr. Reith, the following is the general plan of the book: I. The Prologue—The Word in His Eternal Being—Self-revelation in Creation, in Conscience, in Reason, and in Flesh for Man's Redemption, i. 1-18. II. The History of Christ's Manifestation of His glory as the only begotten Son; (A), In Public, chs. i. 19-xii; (a), First Stage, chs. i. 19-vi.; (b), Second Stage, chs. vii.-x; (c), Third Stage, chs. xi., xii. (B), In Private to His own, chs. xiii.-xvii. III. His Betrayal, Trial, etc., chs. xviii., xix. IV. Resurrection and Appearance to His Disciples in Jerusalem, ch. xx. V. Epilogue—Appearance in Galilee, etc., ch. xxi.

3. We must group together some of the other commendable features of the book. Its style is excellent, clear and vigorous. Its tone is calm, but not negative. There is a manifest acquaintance with the exegetical literature on the Gospel, though Mr. Reith is too wise to burden his pages with a rehash of other men's views. The evidences of scholarship are not wanting, but here again there is a judicious absence of parade. The comments are forcible and quite suggestive.

Having said this much in praise of the book, it is with regret that we turn to note some features not to be commended. Here we must be brief:

1. There is a manifest and constant tendency, not indeed to deny the miraculous, but certainly to underestimate, if not positively to disparage, the *evidential* value of miracles. Witness language like the following: "Thus, for example, there is an evident endeavor all through to raise men above desires to see wonders, and above the faith that springs out of miracles and the like, and to bring them into higher, truer conception of what God's power over human minds consists in."

2. There is a taint of the prevailing *naturalism* about the book from first to last. The human element in Scripture is, so at least it seems to us, frequently much exaggerated. Thus, speaking of the difference between the synoptists and John's Gospel, he says: "The difference will be felt when it is remembered that the first three Gospels are collections of the most striking acts and words of the Lord Jesus and accounts of his sufferings; biographical sketches and traditions, more or less full, as the evangelists had access to the original sources; and, speaking roughly, they represent the early and current apostolic fashion of repeating reminiscences of their Master's ministry as the rudimentary instruction in the Christian faith required. They are pieced together, of course, on a system," &c. And again: "We see how teaching which could not but be obscure at the first, and which was naturally passed over by the earlier popular traditions, had become more luminous in the retrospect. Hence the development of truth in this Gospel is simply the proof that John had at last attained the height to which his Master strove to bring the apostles when he was yet with them."

3. The theology of the book is scarcely sound from a Calvinistic view-point. Occasionally there is a comment that smacks of synergism. As for example the following in vi. 44: ". . . If we compare the very similar passage in v. 37-40, where Jesus accuses the Jerusalem Jews of rejecting the witness borne by the Father to him in *word* and *conscience*, we conclude that the drawing by the Father to Christ of men who have heard and learned from the Father, presupposes the

fact that those so drawn, instead of rejecting this witness, through word and conscience have been listening to it, questioning with their own hearts what it signifies, yielding to its teaching and admonition in so far as these imply an ideal of righteousness to be striven after with sincerity, a sense of moral and spiritual imperfection, a dependence on God, and a need of him to know, and trust, and love as a Father," etc.

But we must close. We had noted a number of details which it would have been proper to touch upon, some in the way of commendation, others in the way of dissent, but they must be omitted.

To conclude, the book strikes us as scarcely adapted for those for whom it was designed. Those who can read it to advantage must have more information and more established views than are found in our ordinary Bible-class teachers or pupils. But while this is true, many of our ministers "who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil," might profitably purchase the book. They would find it instructive, stimulating, suggestive and edifying.

W. M. McPHERTERS.

#### CHADWICK AND MACGREGOR ON EXODUS.

THE BOOK OF EXODUS. *By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D. D., Dean of Armagh, Author of "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," "As He that Serveth," "The Gospel of St. Mark,"* etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pp. xx. 442. (The Expositor's Bible).

EXODUS, With Introduction, Commentary, and Special Notes, etc. *By Rev. James Macgregor, D. D., Oamaru; Sometime Professor of Systematic Theology in the New College, Edinburgh.* 2 Vols., pp. 207 and 181. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. (Hand-books for Bible Classes and Private Students).

Exodus is one of the most fundamental books in the Bible. We need not say with Kalisch that it is "the most important volume which the human race possesses." For there are many books in the New Testament which we should place above it. But it *is* fundamental. It contains the basal facts of Israel's history and religion; facts of which every Bible student must get a knowledge in order to any intelligent appreciation of the progress of doctrine in the Old Testament and the New. It is not surprising, therefore, that commentaries on this portion of Scripture should continue to multiply.

Dean Chadwick's work is not a commentary, however, in the strict sense, since "its object is to edify in the first place, and in the second place, to inform." In a commentary that order is reversed. This, then, like all the other volumes of the "Expositor's Bible," is a series of popular lectures, in which more attention is given to the practical lessons that may be learned from the record than to details of textual interpretation. The standard set for the whole series by such master-workmen as Alexander Maclaren on *Colossians*, is a high one, and one that will hardly be reached by all the contributors; but this writer falls short of it very little in some portions of his book. The method of his interpretation he indicates in his preface:

"No task is more difficult than to exhibit the Old Testament in the light of the New, discovering the permanent in the evanescent, and the spiritual in the form and type which it inhabited and illuminated. This book is at least the result of

a firm belief that such a connection between the two Testaments does exist, and of a patient endeavor to receive the edification offered by each Scripture, rather than to force into it, and then extort from it what the expositor desires to find. Nor has it been supposed that by allowing the imagination to assume, in sacred things, that rank as a guide which reason holds in all other practical affairs, any honor would be done to Him who is called the Spirit of knowledge and wisdom, but not of fancy and quaint conceits."

These are golden words. And, indeed, so far as real Bible scholars are concerned, the days of allegorism are numbered. Another indication of our author's endeavor to be a faithful interpreter is his intelligent use of the results of recent research in Egypt and Sinai. This is now one of the distinguishing marks both of the well-equipped commentator and of the fresh and striking preacher. The only fault we find with our author in this matter is that he takes for granted on the part of the people a knowledge of Egyptology which they do not possess, and therefore his references to recent discoveries are sometimes too meagre. Whatever may be the fact as to England, our people are only beginning to inform themselves on these subjects. After learning that he is abreast of modern archæological research, the reader is prepared for our next statement, viz., that his critical views are sound. He now and then pays his respects to Welhausen, Kuenen, and the like, in very vigorous fashion.

Here is what he has to say about the "borrowing" of jewels and raiment from the Egyptians by the Hebrews, (Ex. iii. 22):

"So much ignorant capital has been made by skeptics out of this unfortunate translation, that it is worth while to inquire whether the word 'borrow' would suit the context in other passages. 'He *borrowed* water and she gave him milk' (Judges, v. 25). 'The Lord said unto Solomon, because thou hast *borrowed* this thing, and hast not *borrowed* long life for thyself, neither hast *borrowed* riches for thyself, nor hast *borrowed* the life of thine enemies' (1 Kings iii. 11). 'And Elijah said unto Elisha, thou hast *borrowed* a hard thing' (2 Kings ii. 10). The absurdity of the cavil is self-evident."

He speaks to the point also in the case of that other mistranslation in Ex. vii. 13, where the unrevised version apparently tries to throw the responsibility for the "hardening" of Pharaoh's heart upon God. Nearly all his remarks on this subject are judicious, and yet in another place, where he speaks of "the palsy-grasp of the tyrannous deity of Calvin," he shows that he belongs to the company of those who, in the language of Dr. Marcus Dods, "misunderstand Calvinism and sympathize with its ignorant defamers." His treatment of Old Testament "types" is almost as superficial and inadequate as his apprehension of Calvin's doctrine of Divine sovereignty. With some grave exceptions like those just mentioned, the book is a fair example of fresh and practical and popular exposition.

The other work before us belongs to the series of "Hand-books for Bible Classes and Private Students," and is in sharp contrast with the one just noticed. They are totally unlike as to externals. Dean Chadwick's book, like all the volumes of the "Expositor's Bible" is handsomely bound in dark red cloth and beautifully printed. Dr. Macgregor's has a flimsy binding of brown linen. The covers curl badly whenever you sit down before your study fire to read it. The print is small and crowded. The work is in two volumes, both small. We insist that a "hand-book" should have only one. It would have been a great ad-

vantage, in this case especially, if the author had "boiled down" the two volumes into one. He has introduced much extraneous matter. His style is often diffuse and sometimes involved. It lacks the crispness and directness of such a commentator as Canon Cook, for instance. He should have remembered too that Latin phrases freely quoted do not compensate for the lack of real learning. And yet he is often sprightly, and at times humorous, as where he says of the "borrowing" (Ex. iii. 22) that "our authorized version gave occasion to gainsayers, because they erred, not knowing the dictionary"; or where he rejects Brugsch's theory that "the Israelites did not pass through the Red Sea, but waddled through entanglements of marshes, lagoons, salt-water lakes—as if Israel had been a runaway hippopotamus." We say nothing of the dignity or reverence of such remarks. Is "this here rod" good English? In writing a "hand-book for Bible classes," has a man the right to call anything "the *trikumia* of climax?" The author is not always consistent. He first denies Hengstenberg's theory concerning the natural basis of the ten plagues in general, and then admits it in detail. But it is gratifying to have him reiterate as he does his assurance that they were all wrought by supernatural power, and were all unquestionably miraculous.

There are of course many good points about this book, but it has not sufficient merit to supersede in popular use certain other brief commentaries. The work by Canon Cook in the Bible Commentary still holds its place as the best of its class, remaining preëminent among the shorter commentaries on this portion of Scripture.

*Hampden-Sidney, Va.*

W. W. MOORE.

#### SCHURMAN'S BELIEF IN GOD.

BELIEF IN GOD: Its Origin, Nature, and Basis. *By Jacob Gould Schurman, Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University.* Pp. 266. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890.

This neat little treatise consists of six lectures given last year at Andover Theological Seminary on the Winkley foundation. The book itself is all that we would expect from the firm of Scribner's Sons. The author is a Canadian by birth; and though but a young man, he has had a brilliant career. He was educated in Canada, Britain and Germany. He was professor first in Acadia College, Nova Scotia, and afterwards in Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S. A few years ago he was called to the Chair of Philosophy in Cornell, and has filled that position with distinction ever since.

The treatise before us deals with a question of perennial interest, and is written in a remarkably lucid and expressive style. Even when dealing with abstruse themes there is no obscurity, so that the reader has little difficulty in finding the author's meaning.

In the preface the author tells us that the Winkley lectureship is "hampered by no conditions whatever," and he counts this "a rare and surely a fortunate circumstance for any theological school." He does not inform us whether this is intended to be a sort of apology for some of the views which he unfolds in his lectures, or whether he means to hint that in the pursuit of religious inquiry revelation must abdicate in favor of reason. In any case, there is the commendation of a principle which is utterly destructive of sound views alike in philosophy and

religion, for all true and sound thinking must conform itself to the standard of revelation, otherwise we shall be at the mercy of every man's erratic speculations. This laudation of supposed religious freedom is too often the glorifying of a spurious liberty, which soon runs into wild license and produces what may be termed mob rule in religious thought.

But we must inspect without further delay the contents of these six lectures. The theme discussed is "*Belief in God*"; and the titles of the several lectures are as follows: "Agnosticism"; "The logical character of belief in God"; "Origin and development of the belief"; "Belief in God as cause or ground of the world"; "Belief in God as a realizing purpose in the world"; and "Belief in God as Father of spirits."

In the first lecture, agnosticism as a barrier to the possibility of a knowledge of God, is discussed in a brief but acute manner. Its three modern phases, as a *method* of knowledge, as related to the *object* of knowledge, and as connected with the *subject* in knowledge, are in turn canvassed. The first, much as it is exalted by Huxley, is shown to be only a method of knowledge, which no one cares to deny, wherein evidence is made the measure of mental assent. The second, which H. Spencer represents, leads, as our author makes plain, to most absurd results, both in regard to science and philosophy. The third, which dates back to Hume and Kant, is the most subtle of all; and the way in which Prof. Schurman proceeds to show that a sound psychology is the refutation of that phase of agnosticism, which is nothing else than philosophical skepticism, deserves highest praise.

The second lecture deals with the logical character of belief in God, and, on the whole, this lecture also has much which is to our liking, though some things are not. The question as to whether the existence of God can be *proved* is not formally discussed; still the way in which the question is stated is effective, as against those who deny that our belief in God is a rational, well-grounded belief, for which good reasons can be given. The position of our author seems to be this: Our belief in God is not of the nature of "demonstrative knowledge," nor is it really "inductive knowledge," but it is merely "an hypothesis to explain certain facts." As these facts are found in nature, they provide the *cosmic* basis of theistic belief; and as they are found in man, they provide its *anthropic* basis. The two taken together constitute *anthropo-cosmic* theism; and this new term denotes our author's view.

At this point there seems to be some confusion of thought in the discussion on the part of our author. The difference between belief and knowledge is not explained, nor is it announced that they are identical. On such an important point as this the reader should hardly be left to his own inferences as to the author's meaning. Then, too, the real nature of the logical process seems to be overlooked when it is said that it is not "inductive knowledge" but "an hypothesis to explain facts." Professor Schurman no doubt knows enough about logic to be familiar with the radical difference between induction from the recital of particulars (*inductio per enumerationem simplicem*), and the strict inductive method based upon the great principle of the general uniformity of nature, which involves a true doctrine of causation lying behind it. Failure to keep these two phases of the inductive method clearly in view introduces confusion into what would otherwise be a good discussion. Making an hypothesis to explain certain facts, and then verify-

ing the hypothesis by the facts is surely the true Baconian inductive method; so when our author speaks of belief in God not being inductive knowledge, but an hypothesis to explain certain facts, there is an evident confusion of thought of which no experienced logician should have been guilty.

And further, while we admit that the postulate of the divine existence as the explanation of certain facts in the universe affords *one* important mode by which belief in God may be vindicated, yet we cannot assent to the view that this is anything like a complete analysis of the logical nature of that belief. In many other ways can it also be shown that theistic belief is a well founded logical belief. The *a priori* proofs have their force and use, and the moral argument is of great value, yet both of these are but lightly regarded by our author. That this view of our author's doctrine is correct seems to be confirmed by the rather timid, uncertain way in which the proofs are exhibited in some of the later lectures of the course.

But we hasten to the next lecture, where what we regard as radical error is boldly expounded. The subject under discussion is "The origin and development of belief in God." This is a subject which at the present time is much debated, and in some respects it is more important than the question of the proofs for the divine existence, since the conclusions reached in regard to the origin of theistic belief will shape our views touching the grounds of it, and greatly modify our ideas as to the professedly divine revelation contained in the Scriptures. It is with regret that our dissent is entered against nearly everything contained in this lecture, for the discussion evinces much learning and ability. It is here that we first distinctly note the more than doubtful philosophical standpoint of our author, for we now discover that subtle idealistic pantheism of neo-Hegelian type which, with its grain of truth and mountain of error, evidently underlies such statements as these: "All objects of thought are in a state of becoming," "Identity in difference is the character both of being and of thought." Are there then, no permanent abiding objects of thought? Are thought and being identical?

When our author turns to discuss the question of the origin of belief in God, the bias of this philosophy, which identifies thought and being in absolute unconscious reason, and finds the universe of nature and spirit to be the necessary unfolding of the absolute idea, and then in the religious consciousness of man discovers in man's knowledge of God God's knowledge of himself, comes boldly into view.

Accepting this philosophy of idealistic evolutionary pantheism, we are not surprised to find the evolutionary, or, as he prefers to say, the historical method adopted by our author in accounting for the origin of the belief in God. In a general way he thinks that neither *animism* nor *fetichism*, strictly speaking, marks the beginning of the consciousness of God in the mind of primitive man, although at times he seems to admit that there is much truth in the explanations given along these lines by Positivists, H. Spencer and others. He ventures to give preference to the opinion that the origin of the belief in question is to be found in "polydæmonistic beliefs of savages." Having thus secured a starting point, the usual historical evidence is adduced to show how, through later prehistoric and early historic ages, the belief in God, or consciousness of God, became more and more distinct. Fetichism, pagan mythologies, and comparative religion, by a strange perversion of the facts in our author's hands, mark various stages of natural



growth in theistic belief, until we find Christianity described as "the noblest fruitage of the Semitic religion." That primitive divine objective revelation had any place in shaping the growth of the belief in God is denied, for on psychological grounds Professor Schurman is sure that primitive man could not receive such a revelation. The only revelation possible is that made in the religious consciousness of men, as they are gradually rising to clearer theistic belief; and the Scriptures, or any other sacred literature, simply register the religious ideas of any given age. Jehovah is the diety of Israel, just as Baal was of the Canaanites, Bel of the Babylonians, Chemosh of the Moabites, and Dagon of the Philistines. Such are some of the radical conclusions from which we enter emphatic dissent.

But further, in order to make sure that there will be time enough for all this to take place, a great antiquity for man is quietly assumed by Professor Schurman as if it were fixed fact, for no attempt at proof is made. The beginning of theistic belief, he says, dates away back "to that long period when a thousand years were but as a day," and during "an incalculable aeon of savagery and barbarism, of which every trace has perished," for we are further informed that "rude tools and weapons are memorials of later prehistoric ages." This assuredly is a cavalier mode of dealing with the question of man's antiquity. No proof is given, and no regard is paid to the Biblical data on this question, though in the latter part of this lecture and the opening of the next the mythical nature of the record in Genesis seems to be assumed, and the most radical results of the negative or destructive biblical critics appear to be admitted. This shows to what straits our author is driven by his philosophical bias. And to crown all, did Professor Schurman really expect his cultured Andover auditors to accept his authoritative statement as to what took place during that "*incalculable* aeon of savagery and barbarism of which every trace has perished?" We can understand the propriety of reasoning about man's antiquity from prehistoric ages, of which in stone and other relics we have some traces; but to speak of prehistoric periods "of which all traces have perished" is simply to make common sense laugh at the philosopher.

There are other points in this lecture which deserve attention, but enough has been said to indicate the line of exposition taken in it, and to show how fundamentally erroneous and untenable it is. All the facts which are adduced can be explained in accordance with a doctrine which does ample justice to them, and which gives the true philosophy of man, and which treats with reverence the record of the Scriptures.

Of the other three lectures little can now be said. One sets forth the substance of the *causal*, a second the gist of the *design*, and a third the dim outlines of what seems to be intended for the *moral* argument; but the influence of the philosophical theory which dominates our author has so transformed these proofs that it is not easy to see that even their logical form has been preserved. Instead of a first cause, who is not only Creator but also constant preserver of the universe, we find a doctrine proclaimed which regards God as merely the "immanent ground of the universe," with no real numerical distinction between the universe and its ground, and which announces creation to be nothing more than "the eternal self-revelation of God," who as infinite Spirit is the immanent ground of the universe. Instead of a directing intelligence, in vital relation with the universe, adapting means to ends, we have an "immanent teleology," where all finality or design is lost in the restless sea of the unconscious movement of nature as it

"seeks to realize the ideas" of the infinite Spirit, which is the immanent ground of the universe.

Finally, instead of the moral proof, which finds the nature of God the basis of immutable moral distinctions, and the will of God the ground of moral obligation, we have a vague and somewhat sentimental theodicy, which neither conceives the problem of evil correctly, nor affords any reasons whatever for believing that the "immanent ground of the universe," regarded as "the Father of Spirits," has any moral attributes at all. Our author makes far too much of the immanency of God in the universe, for in his doctrine the relation of God to the universe is expressed in terms of pantheism, and this must result in the logical destruction of the transcendency of God, for thereby the numerical distinction between God and the universe is reduced to zero on the side of immanency. A true theistic theory, which shall at once be a rational theology and a theistic cosmology, must hold, in well-balanced relation, both the immanency and transcendency of God in relation to the universe, and also refuse to allow them to be reduced to unity in terms of either the one or the other.

But we gladly lay aside the pen, for criticism is at best but ungracious work. Yet in order to make book reviews of any value, fair and candid scrutiny of an author's opinions must be made. We have perused this able treatise with feelings of interest and pain. The ability and freshness of the thought, and the clearness of the expression sustained interest on to the very last page. But at the same time, it was a source of real pain to find, in connection with a Christian institution, views advocated which can never provide a basis of Christian theism, but rather with a friendly kiss betray it to an old foe. And to hear in the same connection and in the name of the religion of Christ those Scriptures which we hold to be that Word of God which cannot be broken, spoken of as not essentially different from the Vedas or the Zend-a-Vesta, filled us with sadness. These lectures we greatly fear will not add to the reputation of the author, save in the opinion of those who do not wish the prosperity of Christianity as a distinctly supernatural religion.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

#### BURNEY'S "PSYCHOLOGY."

STUDIES IN PSYCHOLOGY. "*Ψυχολογία*." By S. G. Burney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University, author of *Studies in Moral Science, Soteriology, Atonement and Law Reviewed, etc.* Published for the author. Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing-House, Nashville, Tenn. 1890.

This work by the venerable Dr. Burney is a publication of his lectures to his classes, at their request, and is designed to be a college text-book. It is comprehensive; its five hundred pages discuss the intellect, the sensibility and the will in regular order, with an appendix devoted to the last of the three great powers. The views of English, Scotch, and American psychologists are given, usually in extracts from their own writings. The treatment is largely polemic and critical; the Doctor regarding all views but his own as "absurd." It is quite original and interesting. The proof-reading was not well done, as frequent inaccuracies show.

Let us turn the pages and notice some of the more striking views and passages.

In the *Introduction*, psychology is made the science of self exclusively, and is denied to be founded at all upon observation of the conduct of other men. Page 8, we are told that "one complex object" of the mind's thought "is little less than a contradiction of terms." Can it be that we are confined to simple objects of thought? It would rather seem that the vast mass of our ideas are complex.

Page 27, *et seq.*, we are taught that consciousness is not a cognitive faculty, but the faculty of feeling, and that many accept this view, no one of whom, however, is mentioned. This is the most startling view, perhaps, in the volume. Etymology, lexicographers, usage that is almost unvarying, all avail nothing to the contrary. We are all mistaken when we think consciousness is intellectual, cognitive, a power of knowing. When we are conscious of working a problem in mathematics, we do not know that we are working it, but we feel that we are doing so; when we see the paper which we are now reading, we do not know that we see it, but we feel that we see it. The reasons for this strange doctrine are, some of them, as novel as the doctrine itself. Page 27, one of them is thus given: "A diversity of cognitive faculties is an unsupported, not to say absurd, assumption." On the next page, another, "It is self-evident that a plurality either of emotional or of volitional faculties would destroy the unity of the mind itself." The ground taken is that there is but one faculty of the intellect, but one of the feeling, and but one of the will. Yet, on page 31, we are told that "pure intellect includes (*a*) sense-perception, (*b*) rational or supersensible perception, (*c*) memory, (*d*) imagination. (2) Feeling includes (*a*) sensation, (*b*) affection, (*c*) desire or motive power. (3) Will includes (*a*) attention, (*b*) determinative volition, (*c*) executive volition"; and, in different chapters of the book, these are treated as the several powers of the mind, just as in our ordinary works on the subject. Aside from this, it is not apparent what the simplicity of the generic powers has to do with determining that consciousness is feeling and not knowing. Another of his proofs is the assertion (page 33) that consciousness and conscience are identical. With regard to this it is manifest that conscience is not identical with consciousness, though they have some points in common; and that conscience is not exclusively feeling, but is a generic name for the mind when occupied with moral questions. We have moral intuitions, judgments, memories, imaginations, feelings, affections, desires, hopes, choices, volitions; and all of these may be said to pertain to the conscience. Another proof is that consciousness is a witness, and therefore is feeling. To most minds the inference would be, that consciousness as a witness must be intelligent; as a witness is called upon to state what he knows, not what he feels. In this connection (page 38), he says that knowledge cannot bear witness to feeling, because feeling is subsequent to knowledge. This seems conclusive; but suppose that knowledge, while antecedent to feeling, continues and co-exists with feeling; or suppose that knowledge reflects upon a past feeling; in either case, may it not be a competent witness to the feeling? Moreover, the theory is suicidal. According to Dr. B., consciousness is the ultimate and universal witness to all mental acts and states, and in this all psychologists agree. Then, according to Dr. B., consciousness is not knowledge, because, if so, it cannot witness subsequent feeling; it must be feeling to witness antecedent knowledge. Very well, if this be so, how can feeling witness subsequent volition? According to his reasoning, consciousness must be volition, in order that, as the subsequent, it may witness both of the antecedents.

We are now attracted by the statement (p. 40) that the "intellect, judgment,

memory, imagination, and volitional power are all the subordinates and servitors of feeling, just as are all means the subordinates and servitors of the ends they are intended to serve." Feeling is supreme, intellect and will the subordinate servitors; feeling is the end, intellect and will the means. Intellect and will "exist and perform their functions solely in the interest of feeling, and are absolutely worthless except so far as they are tributary to feeling." Page 38, he teaches that knowledge is not only the antecedent of which feeling is "the necessary consequence:" but also is the cause of which feeling is the effect: if so, then feeling, the effect, is made supreme, and knowledge, the cause, a subordinate servitor; but causes are usually regarded as superior to their own effects, or at least equal. Again, he makes volition a means to feeling as an end; this would make a subsequent a means to an antecedent. Again, how does the supremacy of feeling to volition consist with his doctrine of the self-determining power of the will?

P. 20, "All perception gives rise to feeling in some form." P. 29, "Every cognition is followed by a corresponding modification of the sensibility." Yet, (p. 32) we read, "Cognition is not conditioned upon either feeling or volition; for cognition is possible without the action of those faculties." Still again (p. 38), "Perception is the invariable antecedent, and feeling the necessary consequence."

P. 111, "In sensation and sense-perception the mind deals exclusively with material phenomena. Nothing is known in itself, or apart from its phenomena, or its appearing." This is relativism. Dr. B. is a dualist.

P. 116, "We would not predicate extension of any form of subjective phenomena, and yet all such phenomena are objects of sense-perception. What we really perceive in such cases is not material and extended bodies, but the qualities or accidents of such bodies." This seems to be ideal representationism, or, as Sir Wm. Hamilton calls it, cosmthetic idealism.

P. 131, "Sensation is said to be an affection of the sense-organs and not of the mind." This is probably the correct view. Yet (p. 140), he says, "The light reflected from the book produces . . . a feeling in the mind, which, because it comes through a sense-organ, is called sensation."

P. 150, "We often predicate of the object what is true only in relation to our sensations, as when I say the rose is red, sugar is sweet, the odor is pleasant, or the stove is hot." This is the accepted view, but it does not seem to accord with common sense. That is, my sensation is red, but the rose is not; my sensation is sweet, but sugar is not; my sensation is pleasant, but the odor is not; my sensation is hot, but the stove is not. On the contrary, my sensation may be cold, while I am sure that the stove is hot. This critic believes that the secondary qualities of matter are as real and as directly cognized by us as the primary.

P. 156, "What is actually furnished by memory seems to me to be . . . but an image of the original." This is according to usage. The word "image" is objectionable as too narrow; it would confine memory not only to sensible objects, but, strictly construed, to visible things alone. "Idea" seems a preferable term.

P. 158, "To create a special faculty, whose office is to recall knowledge out of unconsciousness into consciousness is to create a nondescript psychological cynosureship, or an officer without duties." This is probably a misprint of "cynosureship" for "sinecureship."

P. 160, "Memory does not conserve, nor retain, nor recall perceptions, or ideas, or knowledge; for when these phenomena vanish from the sphere of cogni-

tion and consciousness there is absolutely nothing to conserve, or retain, or recall." This is a novel and startling doctrine; but be patient, the Doctor does not really hold it. Read p. 153, memory "is also appropriately called the retentive faculty;" again, p. 173, "With my eyes fixed upon a house I perceive or cognize it. Turning my eyes away, the perception vanishes in an incomprehensible manner out of consciousness into memory, whence it may be recalled;" again, "It is believed that whatever really becomes an object of memory, or whatever makes a distinct impression upon the sensibility is never utterly obliterated from the mind, though it may fail to be recalled for nearly a whole life-time."

P. 161, "The capacity to know is pure passivity." "In this unique relation [knowing] there is no action of the subject, or the mind, upon the object, the thing known." That is, the mind does not act in knowing, but is merely passive. Yet read, p. 9, "Non-action is proof of non-existence"; p. 172, "Mind or spirit is essentially active. It has absolutely no power not to act."

P. 165, "Past existence and personal identity are not given by memory at all, but by original and direct cognition." "I have had a direct and unbroken cognition of my bodily existence from the dawn of rational consciousness to this moment." That is, the whole of our past life is to us an intuition, a direct cognition, not a memory. Moreover, it is not only direct, but unbroken, by sleep, delirium, somnambulism, multiplicity, or lapse of time; and yet a complex thought is an absurdity.

P. 182. He quotes from Haven the opinion of Rosenkranz, "There are indeed certain limitations or categories of thought, but these so-called laws of association are not to be confounded with these categories." That is, the alleged laws of association are not laws, because their manifoldness does not evince unity; but are properly categories. Dr. B. is probably right in his approval of this view.

P. 184, Dr. B. falls into the common error of making recognition a function of memory. Memory furnishes the data upon which the judgment perceives the relation of identity, or recognizes the present as the reappearance of the former object.

P. 204, "The question has often been forced upon my mind whether . . . all knowledge possessed by mind or spirit unconnected with a physical organization is not intuitive and present knowledge, consequently that with the human mind when disembodied, all past knowledge becomes present knowledge; nothing is remembered, but everything known is intuitively seen." Why should this be a question, when he teaches, on p. 165, that such is really our present condition?

Dr. B. holds to the subjective theory of space, time and beauty. P. 272, "Instead of speaking of unoccupied space [the subjective theory], affirms that unoccupied space (so-called) is nothing." That is, there is no space in an absolute vacuum. P. 273, "Bodies have position, but not in space." "Bodies have position in relation to other bodies, and what intervenes between bodies is distance, but distance is not space." The Bible teaches the subjectivity of time; "for a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past." So Dr. B. argues.

But nineteen, out of five hundred and thirty-five pages, are given to the exposition of the discursive faculty in all its forms. These are scattered into four chapters, scores of pages apart. This is the most unsatisfactory portion of the discussion; it is so meagre as to be practically of little value. In this connection attention is called to the arrangement of matter in the book. We have sense-perception

treated in Chapter I., of the intellect, and then again in Chapter IV. ; memory in Chapter II., and in Chapters VII. and VIII. ; imagination in Chapter II. and in chapters IX. to XII. It is also to be noticed that, although he regards the sensibility as the supreme faculty, and the intellect and will but subordinate servitors, he gives but thirty-one pages to its treatment.

There are no complex emotions, according to Dr. B. ; and yet his love has combined with it a feeling of pleasure ; his desire has in it pleasure and love ; and his hope is the accumulation of pleasure, love, desire and itself. The joys and sorrows are simple ; the loves, desires and hopes are complex.

His position upon the will is, of course, that of contingency, giving it the power of self-determination. He accepts Bledsoe as the exponent of his views. He calls all those who hold to the self-determination of the mind, the theory of moral certainty, necessitarians, and those who agree with him are alone libertarians. Dr. B. possibly would be offended were he called an Arminian ; and yet it is supposed he did not mean to be offensive when he classes those who hold to human liberty and accountability as loyally as does he with fatalists who deny both. It is a familiar device to bemean your opponent by calling him names.

There is genuine analytical ability shown in the discussion.

*Lexington, Va.*

J. A. QUARLES.

#### BALDWIN'S "PSYCHOLOGY."

HAND-BOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY. SENSES AND INTELLECT. *By James Baldwin, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in Lake Forest University.* New York : Henry Holt & Co. 1889.

The author in the preface justifies "another hand-book of psychology" in a series of propositions somewhat complicated, if not obscure, a careful analysis of which gives the following reasons :

1. The "rapid growth of psychology," resulting from "enthusiastic and productive specialism."
2. "New facts, which must be interpreted in a system for educational purposes."
3. "New philosophical conceptions of the sphere and function of psychology should be embodied in special works."
4. "The new conception now prevalent is widely different from that of twenty years ago."
5. This new conception is, "That psychology is a science of fact, its questions are questions of fact," and "the treatment of hypotheses must be as rigorous and critical as competent scientists are accustomed to demand in other departments of research."
6. This book is written in the interest of the recent "adjustment of the mutual claims" of psychology and metaphysics, the terms of which adjustment are these : "On the one hand, empirical investigation must precede rational interpretation, and this empirical investigation must be absolutely unhampered by fetters of dogmatism and preconception ; on the other hand, rational interpretation must be equally free in its own province."
7. "Consequently" he proposes to give "most special attention to the rich and popularly little known results of the new methods in psychometry, psychophysics and neurology" ; and to suggest and estimate "hypotheses of their ground and bearing upon the mental life," as far as he may be able. And he adds : "Empirical psychology must be concerned chiefly with the first of these tasks, and with the latter only as far as rational inferences can be confirmed empirically in the stage of development reached."

Such are the reasons and aims which are set forth by the author as inspiring the book, and if they are all sound and pertinent, there surely never was a louder call for a book.

This volume is devoted to the "Senses and Intellect," and is soon to be followed by a second, on the "Emotions and the Will." The book is well gotten up, and the more difficult and abstract discussions are printed in smaller type, making thus two courses of instruction for pupils of different advancement. At the end of each chapter are found "Further problems of study," with ample references to fields "partially unexplored." The author thanks Dr. McCosh for instructions and personal training, and Prof. A. T. Ormond, of Princeton, for profitable suggestions, and says: "My greatest indebtedness is to Prof. Wundt, of Leipzig, and to Prof. Rabier, of Paris." This book is the second American treatise following the lead of Prof. Wundt, and might as well also be named *Physiological Psychology*. Prof. Ladd's treatise antedates it by two years, and is too elaborate for a handbook. Either of these books might be termed, in the words of Ladd, a "treatise on the activity and nature of the mind from the physical and experimental point of view," and at this point the compound title, "Senses and Intellect," given to this discussion of the "Intellect," becomes significant.

The author makes an honest effort to save all that is best in the Scotch philosophy and at the same time appropriate the terminology and the facts of the extreme "sensualistic" and materialistic schools, approaching the whole strictly from the empirical side as a science of fact, and giving only such rational interpretation as may be verified. His arraignment of their false hypotheses is gallant and often masterly, and incontrovertible from the older point of view; but it is often a question whether too much of the truth is not surrendered to make it possible to save the citadel.

It is difficult for an old-fashioned thinker to read the definitions in the introduction and not approve his apparent assumption of the independent existence of mind and matter, with different and irreconcilable properties and qualities, even though he is careful to say, "Whether mental facts find their ultimate basis in an independent mental substance or in the brain, the facts and the science of the facts remain the same." That he does not intend to assume the existence of any such "mental substance" is apparent from the following proposition on p. 153: "The assumption of a substantial persistent independent soul, which is capable of undergoing permanent modifications, is not allowable from a strictly empirical standpoint at this stage of our progress. If there were no other way through psychology or physiology of accounting for retention we would find here a legitimate argument for such a postulate." He does find another way through physiology which will be duly noted.

He sets forth the psychological method with great force, except that he trips with Mills in trying to define induction; but one is struck at the outset with the prominence proposed to be given to "Animal or Comparative Psychology," "Infant Psychology," and "Abnormal Psychology;" and one is surprised as the discussion progresses, to see how necessary these three are to the setting up of hypotheses, whereas the very nature and value of supposed facts drawn from these sources are themselves largely hypothetical. Inasmuch as this notice cannot illustrate these points by following and citing the discussion, a word of stricture here may not be out of place. He puts comparative psychology on the same valuable

footing as comparative anatomy, whereas comparative anatomy is based on an identity of relations justifying an identity of rational interpretation. Does comparative (animal) psychology present such an identity of relations? As for infant psychology, its facts all start as assumptions, and become facts whenever needed for constructive purposes. And in the uses made of abnormal psychology and pathology, it sometimes seems that a particular affirmative is mistaken for an implied universal negative, a very common fallacy in attempting to apply the logical "method of difference."

It will give some notion of the trend of the system of our author to notice his doctrine in several points of detail.

1. *Consciousness*: "Consciousness is the common and necessary form of all mental states; without it mind is not and cannot be conceived. It is the point of division and differentiation between mind and not mind." "*The one condition and abiding characteristic of mental states.*" He seems to say in one place that it is "original awareness." No materialist nor idealist will object to a word of this in connection with the statement that the doctrine of the "substratum of the soul," or of the "unifying something beneath intellect, feeling, and will, the substantial spirit," is a "metaphysical doctrine which does not concern us here." If the above definition is the definition of consciousness it is difficult to see just what the author means by the "development of consciousness," or how he can say "Apperception is the highest and most comprehensive form of active consciousness," unless he also uses the term in the sense of a *summum genus* for all mental states and activities.

2. *Preception, Sensation*. "Sensations are the primary events of the mental life"—the "results of impressions on the nerves and nerve centres from an external stimulus;" hence the term "mental states." In fact, he sees in attention the only exhibition of "mental energy as opposed to mental states." He recognizes a "knowledge element" in sensation, and this is what he calls the "presentative" in sensation, but he finds sensation and perception to be "really the same fact looked at in two different ways." He admits that it "seems to be true that in most sensations there is an immediate perception of a not-self, to which the sensation is referred as opposed to self;" referring to Hamilton, but too cautious to agree with him. But is he really a presentationist? "Perception is the apperceptive or synthetic activity of the mind, whereby the data of sensation take on the forms of representation in space and time; or it is the process of the construction of our representation of the external world;" and again, "our perception of the external world is a matter of mental construction;" and again, "this fact, that the mind deals with its images primarily, and with external realities only through these images, is best seen when we consider that all mental states are intensive modifications of a thinking subject, and that the perception of the external world, however real that world may be, with its conditions of space and time, is possible only by some power of mind whereby these conditions can be mentally reconstructed, etc." These quotations give no uncertain sound.

The "perception of space" is accounted for thus: "The mind has a native and original capacity of reacting upon certain physical data, in such a way that the objects of its activity appear under the form of space." He calls this "nativism of process." The notions of space, time, self, cause, etc., all originate the same way, and as finished products are mental constructions.



3. *Retention, Memory, Association, Imagination, Illusions, Elaboration.* These are all made to depend on *Retention*, which is made to rest only on a physical or physiological basis—"a matter of the modification of brain and nerve-structure or function; such modification giving rise to a physiological habit or tendency." "The perfection of the mechanism of memory tends to the suppression of the psychological fact of memory; consciousness retreats behind the nervous system, and there is a progressive materialization of our thought, a tendency to automatism. As the force of the sun is stored up in coal, so thought finds permanent realization in the structure of the nervous system." "What was once pure intelligence now becomes mechanism." "The entire nervous system is a single organ of sensation, and its present state is a history of its life and the life of its progenitors. Generations of unconscious experience are stored up in its present form. And unconsciously to us it gives tone and cast to our first impulses, directs the revival of images, and determines the effect of feelings." This sounds like the baldest materialism, destructive of responsibility and will. But our author would spurn the charge of materialism, and makes many shrewd distinctions to show the limits of the psychological and the physiological, and to distinguish the mental from the physical product, all of which is eminently sound from the point of view of the older philosophy. It is at least a great mistake to prosecute such inquiries by assuming the actuality of body and leaving the actuality of mind to be set up later as a rational process. The assumption of one is no more a metaphysics than the assumption of the other. The very existence of body as body can only be apprehended by spirit as spirit. Ignore either and the other vanishes, and nihilism is the only logical conclusion.

4. *Reason.* But our author does not propose to ignore the soul, or mind, or spirit, as a personal energy, not to be confounded with body or bodily organism. He seeks to reach it by experimental methods and scientific processes, with rational interpretations empirically verified. The "rational function," "reason," seems to furnish the data. It is "not a process," but "conditions and underlies all mental processes,"—"The constitutive, regulative principle of mind, so far as it is apprehended in consciousness, through the presentative and discursive operations." If he means anything in his discussion of the "constitution of mind," he means that the "absolutely essential" in mental states constitutes the very essence of mind—"is constitutive of mind." He makes a distinction between "reason as truth" and "reason as knowledge." "Reason considered as truth, or as the essence of the mind, does not enter into the range of empirical science. But its value as knowledge is inestimable." Is he playing with words? Or does he mean to say that truth is substantial spirit? Or does he mean to say with the idealist that we have no knowledge of anything but phenomena, and that these phenomena are all of existence? The confounding of *casus* and *casua* underlies equally materialism, idealism, nihilism and pantheism.

He then deals with "reason as *Intuition*," and reason as "mental *Product*." Intuition is a "mental *act*," and not a "process," making "immediate revelation" "at one time of one principle, at another time of another principle." "It is only as reason is operative that these 'processes' are possible," and the *principles* rise and are apprehended through a *process*. So far so good, if we understand him. But the point that gives trouble is this: in dealing with reason as a mental *process*, he cites all the intuitions of power, time, space, cause, self, substance—and

in short all the intuitions of sense and intelligence, reaching to the infinite, not only as principles of reason, but as products of mental processes, on the data of sensation, with their necessary mental reactions, and as finished in the workshop of constructive imagination, which itself works through retention and association and representation, which in turn have a necessary physical basis, as hereinbefore set forth. By intuition the mind recognizes the universal and the infinite. Reason clusters its rational principles around three "centres of rational convergence," the "*world, self, and God,*" each sweeping the entire area of rational intuition in its own sphere, for its own organized intuition, in the first two, world and self. Reason thus gives two unities. The third is the final unity, the "ultimate generalization" and final "unifying postulate, *God.*" We quote his exact words, "unity, identity, constructive-infinity, end, cause, perfection, categorical being—all lead on by the necessary progression of intellect, through the conditions and limitations of finite mind, to the intuition of the absolute and unconditioned subject, *God.*"

The writer of this notice is not disposed to classify the system of the author according to the usual standards of classification, for I suspect that no one name could be named to which he would not demur, unless he would answer to the name "Empirical," which ignores all the distinctions of the older schools. But it is hard to see that he escapes their vices in his method (not altogether new) of "holding with the hounds and running with the hare."

His methods and his system give undue prominence to physical causality without and within the censorium or organism, and minimizes the active causality of the spirit; and if we consider the theological aspects of the system, it would be a matter of grave doubt if the spirit, suddenly separated from the body, could use any of the faculties of memory, perception, or elaboration. How much better is the older view, that the personal spirit is the paramount energy in man, an active causality in its apparent passivities, using the bodily organs with their delicate mechanism and sensibilities for its own purposes. This certainly is nearer to the experience of "common sense," and far more in accordance with Bible data.

And again: A judicious use of the comparative psychology would include, not only animals or lower forms of intelligence, but also the higher intelligences, which are above man. The Bible data concerning them are ample and too well ascertained to need the application to them of empirical processes, and do properly pertain to the science, as set forth by our author under his head of Folk Psychology. But perhaps the acceptance of such data would rivet on science the "fetters of dogmatism and preconception." Alas! alas!! Faith yearns for the day when science shall humbly and boldly accept the Holy Ghost, speaking through Moses, Daniel, and Paul, as the supreme witness to the fundamental data of all the sciences. Sciences which ignore such data are "falsely so-called"; sciences starting on such data might well be called heaven-born.

*Davidson College, N. C.*

J. B. SHEARER.

#### THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK, ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT. *Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D. D.* Vol. I., Genesis-IV. Kings. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1887. xxviii., 828 pages. 5¼x8 inches. \$2.25.

THE PSALMS IN GREEK, ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT. *Edited by H. B. Swete.* Cambridge, at the University Press, 1890. 75 cts. [Being part of Vol. II. of above.]

The closing double decade of the nineteenth century has been distinguished by an interest in Biblical study unprecedented since the days of the Reformation. Every branch of this study has been prosecuted in all its varied ramifications. The character of that study has been determined by the characteristic spirit of the century. Find what explanation as is pleasing in the philosophic metaphysics of the age, the spirit of the century is the spirit of criticism.

This spirit has analyzed the Iliad into a medley of separate lays reconstructed and conjoined by the awkward hand of a prosaic redactor. It has tested the foundations of all knowledge and has overthrown many an ingenious and time-honored theory. The end, aim, and purpose of this criticism has been the attainment of absolute truth, freed from the silken cobwebs of plausible error. The latest outcome of criticism in the domain of language has come to hand this year in the complete overthrow of the Asiatic theory of the home of the Aryans.<sup>1</sup>

In science, there has arisen the evolution theory, which, in its modified form, is but the embodiment of the hand of God in creation and providence.

This weapon of criticism has been wielded by foe and friend in the attack and defense of our divine religion. The foundations of our faith have been assailed and triumphantly defended. The arguments for the being of God from natural religion and the laws of thought have been placed upon an unassailable basis. All departments of religious knowledge have been thoroughly and critically studied. Friend and foe have plunged this weapon into what seemed our vitals, but proved to be but the casings of our armor. Yea, the very text of our beloved Scriptures has been vigorously assailed. Passage has been arrayed against passage and point-blank contradictions in the received text pointed out. These contradictions have been forever disposed of by the same weapon. Passages which, like 1 John v. 7, have been proven untenable in the contest have been found unsupported by documentary evidence and removed. Weak places have been strengthened.

Now since the spirit of the age has always aimed at truth, the desire of men has been to find the true text of the word of God—which alone is divinely inspired—freed from the dusty cobwebs which have obscured its light during the ages. Hence, have arisen the critical editions of the New Testament in Greek by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and the final settlement of the text by Westcott and Hort. These results have been embodied in the revised Luther translation into German, and that wonderfully accurate monument of modern Biblical learning, the Revised Version.

In a former review<sup>2</sup> I have given a few notes upon the series of Hebrew texts by Baer and Delitzsch, which contain the true Masoretic text, so far as it can be ascertained. This year has seen the publication of the Vulgate New Testament of Jerome, based upon the most ancient and almost contemporary manuscripts.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *The Origin of the Aryans*, by Isaac Taylor, M. A. Litt. D., Hon. LL. D. Scribner & Welford, New York, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> *Union Seminary Magazine*, Vol. II., No. 1, Oct., 1890.

<sup>3</sup> *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, Latine, Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi ad Codicum Manuscriptorum fidem recensuit, Johannes Wordsworth, S. T. P., in operis societatem adsumto Henrico Juliano White, A. M.* 4to. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1890.

From this can be ascertained how far the Clementine editors have departed in their authoritative recension from the purity of the pristine Jerome.

Apart from the Hebrew manuscripts, our most ancient as well as best witness for the Old Testament text is the Septuagint Greek version. Its text is more than eight hundred years, its oldest manuscript more than three hundred years older than the most ancient manuscript of the Hebrew Bible. Only to be compared with it, in respect to hoary antiquity, is the Samaritan Pentateuch. In many cases of doubt this venerable version is our only sure clue to the reading. It is hence of the utmost importance to ascertain the most ancient current form of this valuable text. The work under review is the first really critical edition to answer the question, What is the true reading of the Septuagint? Four forms of Septuagint Text have been current since the invention of the printing press, designated by the title of their primary editions. I. The *Complutensian* text of the *Biblia Polyglotta Complutens*, 1514-1517, was based upon unknown manuscripts, all of which were of recent origin, and contained Syrian readings. II. The text of the *Biblia Graeca Venetiana in aedibus Aldi et Asulani*, 1518. This text was the basis of the many German reprints until superseded by the text of III., *Vetus Testamentum Juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V.*, ed. Romae, 1587. Itself was based upon the pride of the Vatican library, *Codex Vaticanus*, Gr., 1209, known in textual criticism as B. Upon the text of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, British Museum, Royal MS. 1 D., was based IV., the edition of Grabe, Oxford, 1707-20. This is the three-volume edition put forth by the Oxford press, and is the received text of England. But gradually the Sixtine text displaced the other competitors and took the lead, being reprinted and reprinted. The Oxford press issued in 1798-1827 the great work of Holmes and Parsons, which "offers merely a reprint of the Sixtine text, in which even its obvious errors are left without correction." But vast stores of critical materials were collected by these editors, and are yet of great value. Tischendorf put forth four editions of the Septuagint in his lifetime, 1850, 1856, 1860, 1869. Posthumous editions, with the prolegomena of the second edition, appeared in 1875 and 1880, the latter under the supervision of Professor Nestle. Tischendorf merely corrected the errors of the Sixtine text and added the critical digest from the Alexandrine, Sinaitic and Ephraem Syrus manuscripts. So that his labors have not the same value for Old and New Testaments. Probably I should do many an injustice in not mentioning the edition of Leander Van Ess, 1824. In its Van Ess form the Sixtine text reigns supreme in America, being the standard edition of our Bible Society. So that all accessible editions of the Septuagint are but reproductions of the Sixtine text, based upon MS. B. Does the Sixtine text represent the readings of B.? No, it was made at a time of inaccurate collations. None of the redactors of the Sixtine text have used an accurate collation, not even the great Tischendorf himself. He, it is true, made a hasty collation, but it has since been proven very inaccurate. Only in the last decade has the edition of Vercellone, Cossa and Sergio, 1868-'81, made the Vatican text accessible. Therefore it follows that the accessible editions of this great version are chock-full of errors, and hence there is need of a new critical edition.

This need was expressed by Dr. Scrivener, the great critic, in 1875; the syndics of the University Press undertook the work in hope that Dr. Scrivener remain editor. His health and arduous labors forbidding this, Dr. H. B. Swete was appointed in 1883 to carry on the work. How well he has done it is shown in the

volumes under review. Two editions are under way, the one the subject of this sketch, a manual edition in two volumes with a limited apparatus; the other to be the work of many hands and years, and to present well-digested the whole known critical apparatus.

Dr. Swete is well-known as an editor. He is a man of whom Gonville and Caius College may well be proud, a man fully equal to the work set him to do. His elegant edition of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul* is sufficient of itself to give him a name. So far as I can judge from material at hand, the editing of these volumes is admirably done. Their mechanical features are all that could be desired. The convenient size, excellent paper and admirable press-work of the University Press publications are well known to all. These volumes form no exception to the rule.

The text of the Vatican MS. is followed in the present edition, supplemented where B fails by the Alexandrine text. So, at last, we have a form of the text of the Septuagint as it was current in the fourth century. Back of this we cannot go with our present apparatus. Below the text is given a digest of the most valuable readings. Here one cannot help but compare the paucity of the Septuagint in variant readings and the superabundant richness of the New Testament. God be thanked! Our New Testament apparatus is all that could be desired. The readings of six manuscripts have been thought worthy of a place in this digest. **Σ**, Codex Sinaiticus; A, Codex Alexandrinus; B, Codex Vaticanus; D, Codex Cottonianus Geneseos; E, Codex Bodleianus Geneseos; F, Codex Ambrosianus. The student of New Testament Greek will here notice that only the first three letters denote the same MS. in Old Testament and New Testament. 'Tis a pity, too, that the same letters do not mean the same thing in both cases. Two of these MSS., D and E, cover only Genesis, and that only partially. F extends only from Gen. xxxi. 15, to Joshua xii. 12, with many *lacuna*. In it Numbers only is complete. **Σ** is very defective in the Old Testament. In the present volume aid is had from it only in Gen. xxiii., xxiv. and Num. v., vi., vii. In the Psalms fortunately it is complete, and gives invaluable aid. A and B, while nearly complete, are not entirely so. *We have no complete MS. of the Septuagint*; but we have enough material to give us in the present text the long desired critical edition of the LXX. And the edition represents the probable extent of our present knowledge. It is fully abreast of the times. I have but one stricture to make upon this edition. It follows:

The Septuagint is a translation. We have the original text, and we know, from the care taken by the Israelites of the letter of their law that this text is *substantially* the same as when committed to writing. From the history of this version it appears that it was made by men who knew both languages as vernacular. And especially was this the case in the Pentateuch, acknowledged to be the most accurate part of that version. It comports to reason, then, to say that the version as it came from its authors was an exact one. A manuscript, therefore, whose text agrees most closely with the original text in certain readings has *a priori* the best claim to be followed in those which are doubtful. And the editor who presents us with a revised text should print as his basis in every case that text which most accurately represents the Hebrew. Doctor Swete has not done this.

From the statement of a verbal critic, and studying exhaustively the book of Exodus as well as other parts of the Heptateuch, I have been irresistibly led to the conclusion that of all the MSS. F is nearest the mark. To go into all the passages

and to note all the difference would require a small volume. The cursory reader will see evidences of this statement of every page where F is read. F is the closest adherent to the Hebrew of all the MSS.

This difference between F and B can be seen in many places,  $\chi\alpha\iota$  B for  $\bar{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$  F representing  $\gamma$  conversive, the omission and addition of words, the introduction of explanatory clauses, the employment of pronouns, tenses, numbers, persons; in many a case does F show its loyalty to the Hebrew. We conclude, then, that F, shows a much earlier text than B. The same thing, so far as I can judge, is true, though in a less degree, of  $\aleph$ , A, and D. B it seems does not represent a primitive text; but as I think a later recension, of which we know there were three by Hesychius at Alexandria, Lucian at Antioch, and Eusebius and Pamphilus in Palestine, the latter being grounded upon Origen. From the fact that B is manifestly not the best MS. in certain passages, I would deplore its use in doubtful ones. Does this militate against its supremacy in New Testament criticism? I think not. But of this I am assured: a critical edition of the Septuagint should adopt the readings of F, wherever possible, in preference to all other manuscripts; and this closeness is clearly not the result of a recension, because recensions work out entirely different results. Here I am constrained to think Dr. Swete has missed it. F is a worthy rival of B, an uncial MS. of the fourth century, upon the thinnest, whitest and smoothest vellum, and well written with accents and breathings *a prima manu*, with three columns to a page and initial letters. It was bought in Coreyra by Borromeo (1561-1631), founder of the Ambrose library. It is of Macedonian origin, and in point of antiquity is not a whit behind the great B, while its text is much earlier and infinitely better; and its text deserves to be followed in preference to any of its rivals. In spite of this objection the fact remains: Dr. Swete has given us a model edition of the Septuagint, and one which will, I hope, take the place of all those we have now.

*Union Theological Seminary, Va.*

R. B. WOODWORTH.

## IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. *By Henry Burton, M. A.*

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. With a New Translation. *By Samuel Cox, D. D., author of Commentaries on Job, Ruth, etc.*

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH. Vol. II., Isaiah xl.-lxvi. With a Sketch of the History of Israel from Isaiah to the Exile. *By the Rev. George Adam Smith, M. A., Minister of Queen's Cross Church, Aberdeen.*

Each Cr. 8vo.; about 450 pages. Red cloth, \$1.50. To subscribers to the series, six volumes for \$6.

These are the latest additions to that admirable series, "The Expositor's Bible," so often described in these pages. The series is now becoming quite full, and is a rich treasure-house to its happy possessor. Naturally there is a certain amount of "unevenness" in a work coming from so many hands, but we believe there is not a poor book among them all. A few of them will have to be taken carefully and error in them guarded against, but as a whole the publishers have been remarkably successful in supplying us with one of the most helpful, suggestive and popular series ever issued. The work is not a commentary, and in many instances not even an exposition, but consists largely of discourses upon the salient features of each book.

Burton's LUKE is a striking presentation of the prominent features of that Gospel, the author telling us, in the first chapter, the distinguishing characteristics of its writer and his special design. Using the word "gentility" in a sense different from its ordinary meaning, and with a new accent, he declares it to express the leading feature of this Gospel. It is the gospel preached to the Gentile world, the "good tidings" to "all people." The peculiar fitness of Luke to be the medium of this proclamation to the world is well set forth. In a special chapter on "The Eschatology of the Gospel," the author maintains that there is nothing in this Gospel to warrant the illusive dream of "the larger hope," as some have been pleased to call it; that the direct words of Christ in many instances, and his parable of Dives and Lazarus, leave no room for such a belief.

The volume on ECCLESIASTES contains lectures by its author which were published under the title of *The Quest of the Chief Good*, in 1867, now revised and rewritten with special reference to later studies and riper experience. In his Introduction he treats of the authorship, form, design, and contents of Ecclesiastes and the history of the captivity. He rejects the Solomonic authorship, and gives at length his reasons for ascribing the book to a period far later, certainly, he maintains, not earlier than B. C. 500, and probably somewhat later. Following the Introduction there is a careful translation in poetic form. The author then unfolds its teachings under the title of "The Quest of the Chief Good," tracing this

quest through wisdom, pleasure, devotion to the affairs of business, wealth, and "the golden mean," until, failing in all these, it attains success in a wise use and a wise enjoyment of the present life, combined with a steadfast faith in the life to come. While setting forth, in his last chapter, the fact that the writer of the Book of Ecclesiastes reaches a conclusion as to the perfection of man through means which are common to many of the ancient systems of morality and religion, Hindu, Egyptian, Persian, Chinese, Greek, Latin, he is yet careful to show that in the Supreme Pattern, the Lord Jesus, we find the greatest help to reach the ideal; yea, more, that this help is sovereign, since by the sacrifice of the cross Christ took away the sins which rendered the pursuit hopeless, and by the gift of his Spirit wins us to the love of our neighbor, fidelity in the discharge of duty and cheerful and constant trust.

Turning to the ISAIAH, we are prepared what to expect by the very division of the volumes. The author deals with these twenty-seven chapters as a prophecy entirely separate from the first thirty-nine chapters, and belonging to a period a century and a half later than Isaiah himself, and so different in its style and subjects as to require a different method of exposition. To the maintenance of this now most common division of the book and post-exilic theory of the authorship of its latter part the author devotes large attention, so that the student will here find a full and perhaps the strongest possible presentation of that theory of the higher critics. The post-exilic view of the book controls the exposition throughout. The Exile, the Lord's Deliverance, the Servant of the Lord, the Restoration, are the titles of the several books into which the work is divided. One finds in it more historical and critical matter than is usual in the volumes of this series. While utterly rejecting the author's view of the latter part of Isaiah, we would recommend this work to any who desire to know the general grounds upon which it is based.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York.* Vol. III. The Epistles of Paul: Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philip-pians, Colossians, Philemon. 8vo, pp. 565. \$4. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890.

This work occupies a middle ground between the dictionary and the commentary, though it is somewhat like both. In the volume before us, the third in the series, the author sustains his reputation for ability and scholarship. In the treatment of the apostle's words in the eighth and ninth chapters of Romans, however, he is decidedly off solid Calvinistic ground, and somewhat disposed to sneer at it. This is seen especially in his statements in connection with the interpretation of "did foreknow" (*προέγνω*) where he adds, in a foot-note: "This is the simple common-sense meaning. The attempt to attach to it the sense of prelection, to make it include the divine decree, has grown out of dogmatic considerations in the interest of a rigid predestinarianism. The scope of this work does not admit a discussion of the infinitesimal hair-splitting which has been applied to the passage, and which is as profitless as it is unsatisfactory." He further says: "It is to be remarked . . . that a predetermination of God is clearly stated as accompanying or (humanly speaking) succeeding, and grounded upon the foreknowledge" . . . and "that the relation between foreknowledge and predestination is incidental."



The volume opens with a concise introduction, dealing with the subjects of special introduction, as the author, the people addressed, the object of the epistles, the occasion of the writing, the method and character of each, etc. Here and there through the book are given analyses of the apostle's writings, though the author's principal object is to deal with the words rather than sentences. The chief value of the work lies in its enabling readers who lack a classical training to more nearly approach the standpoint of the Greek scholar. A full index to the Greek words is given at the close of the volume.

THE MIRACLES OF OUR SAVIOUR. Expounded and Illustrated. *By William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 449. Cloth. \$1.75. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

In this companion volume to his "Parables of our Saviour," which proved so acceptable a work that it has already passed through four editions in as many years, the author's aim, as before, is to be expository and practical rather than apologetic. The question of miracles is not raised after a brief introductory discussion of their possibility and credibility, and their evidential value. In the body of the work he deals with them as "signs," as being not merely authentications and proofs of Christ's Messiahship, but very much more than we usually consider them—a part of the revelation of God and a parabolic illustration of divine truth. This idea is the controlling one in these expositions, and, followed with all the rare ability, spiritual insight, and gift of application of the well-known Tabernacle pastor, results in giving us a work which, for practical purposes and popular use, far surpasses even the rich pages of Trench.

ST. PAUL. His Life and Times. *By James Iverach, M. A., Professor of Apologetics and Exegesis of the Gospels, Free Church College, Aberdeen, author of "Is God Knowable?" etc.* 12mo, pp. 216. Cloth, \$1.00. New York. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

One of the publishers' "Men of the Bible" series. It presents in most compact form the life of the apostle of the Gentiles. It is concise and clear. Its scope forbids such elaboration as Conybeare and Howson's, or Farrar's works, but it rarely omits anything that will interest the reader or instruct the student. The contents are: Paul's Youth and Education; Conversion; In Arabia, Damascus, Jerusalem, and Antioch; Set Apart for Mission Work; The Council at Jerusalem; In Asia Minor; At Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens; In Corinth; In Ephesus; From Ephesus to Jerusalem; In Jerusalem and Caesarea; From Caesarea to Rome; In Rome; Pauline Theology. In the last-named chapter the author manifests his thorough soundness.

THE BIBLE VERIFIED. *By the Rev. Andrew W. Archibald.* With an Introductory Note by Prof. Ransom B. Welch, D. D., LL. D., of Auburn Theological Seminary. 12mo, pp. 215. Cloth, 75 cents. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1890.

In fifteen chapters, which were originally sermons, Mr. Archibald has given us here a most admirable treatise for general use in instructing the people as to the questions of the formation of the Sacred Canon, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Miraculous Element in the Bible, the Incidental Confirmations of the Bible, the

Relation of the Bible and Science, and kindred topics. The author is fully abreast of the times in all respects, deals fairly and bravely with the difficulties of criticism, and defends the Bible against the cavils and objections of its enemies, and leaves the reader with a decided impression of his soundness and conservatism. The little volume deserves a wide circulation. While it is brief, it is always satisfactory. It will strengthen the faith of believers everywhere.

THE LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL; or, Europe and America in History and in Prophecy.  
By C. L. McCartha, A. M., Professor of Natural Science, Alabama State Normal College. 12mo.; pp. 210. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1890.

A most fanciful attempt at identification of the nations of Europe and the people of America with the "lost tribes" of Israel. The author's theory is based first upon the passage found in the Apocryphal book of II. Esdras (xiii. 39-48): "Those are the ten tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land. . . . They took counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passage of the river; for the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half; and the same region is called Arsareth [*margin*. Ararat]." Assuming these statements to be inspired (p. 66), and supposing the annual inundations of the Don and Volga to have been temporarily suspended, he describes the captive tribes (not ten in number, but eight, owing to the absorption of Simeon into Judah and of Levi into all the others, and counting Joseph as but one), as filling all the regions of Europe north of the Black Forest, and observing there the customs and maintaining the principles and purity of ancient Israel, especially in respect to monotheism, monogamy, and government by elders, multiplying in numbers and strength, and prepared at last to burst through their forest barrier and conquer the pragmatic sons of Japheth, who had established themselves in Southern Europe. From this starting point he goes back to Jacob's death-bed prophecy concerning his sons, and Moses' dying blessing on the tribes. Taking up the prophecies one by one, and endeavoring first to show that in most instances the details could not be, and were not, met in the Palestinian career of each tribe considered, he proceeds to identify it with some nation of modern Europe. As a specimen of this identification the following will be sufficiently indicative of the author's method. He finds Reuben in France: "Reuben, thou art my first-born," is fulfilled in the establishment of the French government before the other western kingdoms; "my might, the excellency of dignity and the excellency of power" in the well-known characteristics of the French people; "unstable as water," in the fickleness and instability of the Frenchmen, especially in government; "thou wentest up to thy father's bed," in the reputed incontinence of that people! Zebulon's dwelling "at the haven of the sea," and "rejoicing in thy going out," is found only in Sweden and Denmark, and in the piratical character of the Norsemen, the colonization of the Hebrides and Orkneys, Iceland and Greenland. Issachar, "a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens," and "sucking the abundance of the seas, and of the treasures of the sand," is found in Holland and Belgium, and their stolid, phlegmatic people,

stronger to endure than to act, and deriving their richness from the fertile lands reclaimed from the sea, "crouching down between two burdens," meaning its low-lying situation, hemmed in between lordly England and imperial Germany. "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path," etc., is found in the Spaniards, cruel, revengeful, treacherous, vindictive, constitutional assassins!

The book is written in good spirit, with fine language, and shows on the part of its author an ability which we could wish were applied to a more practical and reasonable theme.

A CONCISE CYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Biblical, Biographical, Theological, Historical, and Practical. Edited by *Elias Benjamin Sanford, M. A.* 8vo, pp. 985. Fine cloth; gold stamped. \$3.50. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co. 1890.

The ordinary reader will find in this book, in condensed form, a mass of information which hitherto he has been compelled to search for through many volumes. The editor has gathered from the most reliable sources that which is most likely to be of service in popular use. Where subjects are dealt with that are of importance, a sufficiently full treatment is given. The accounts of the various denominations are well proportioned and prepared by able hands. It is especially full in respect to subjects of special interest to American Christians. The contributors of original matter are all men of recognized ability and scholarship; and the quoted matter is from the best sources, as Smith, Schaff, Herzog, McClintock and Strong, Bissell, and others. Well printed, accurate, comprehensive, a marvel of condensation, it deserves, and will find, a place in thousands of homes which in the past have been denied such a source of information.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Matthew i.-xxi. 12mo, pp. 410. Cloth, \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890.

The same. Matthew xxii. to Mark xvi.

These are the first volumes of the series on the New Testament. Like their predecessors on the Old Testament, they are made up of the best homiletic literature of the day. If one wishes to know the best that has been said upon a given text, he will find it here, together with references to other sources of information. Each volume is complete in itself.

MODERN MIRACLES. Being a Manifestation of God's Love and Power. By *Leila Thompson*. With preface by Rev. Alexander McLaren, D. D. 16mo, pp. 156. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1889.

A series of vivid and graceful sketches of experiences which witness to the power of a living Christ working among us to-day, and telling us what Christ is still willing to do amongst us now.

OUTPOURING OF THE SPIRIT; or, A Narrative of Spiritual Awakenings in Different Ages and Countries. By *Rev. W. McKay, B. A., pastor of Chalmers Church, Woodstock, Ontario, Canada*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 32mo, pp. 141. Price, 40 cents. 1890.

This little book tells the story of revivals in Bible times, in England, in

Scotland, in Ireland, in America, in Canada, and gives a chapter on eminent revivalists and honored texts. The closing chapter is entitled "Shall we have a revival?" The volume is full of intense interest, and will be stimulating both to pastors and teachers.

FROM JOPPA TO MOUNT HERMON. A Series of Narrative Discourses on the Holy Land, delivered in the Church of St. Matthias, Philadelphia. *By Robert A. Edwards, Rector.* 8vo, pp. 256. Illustrated. \$1.50. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. 1890.

A most happy and successful effort to combine discourse and narrative in a practical use of the author's journey through Palestine in 1889. Personal experience and observation and spiritual lessons are so delightfully blended as to sustain the interest of the reader from beginning to end. The author's style is always graceful without sacrificing vigor, and his descriptions are most vivid, recalling, with singular clearness, the scenes which we shared with him the pleasure of beholding. There is no attempt to deal with archaeological questions or to settle many of the disputed points connected with Palestinian exploration. The discourses are simply designed to present the Land as it is, and to impress upon its readers the many helpful lessons which the narrator enjoyed while viewing the sacred sites.

FROM MANGER TO THRONE. Embracing a new Life of Jesus the Christ, and a History of Palestine and its people. *By Rev. T. De Witt Talmage, D. D.* 4to, pp. 656. *Sold only by subscription.* Richmond: B. F. Johnson & Co. 1891.

A volume full of handsome illustrations, many of them being those familiar to us through "Picturesque Palestine," reproductions of the famous paintings of the world, and sketches made from photographs taken by the author's tourist party last year. The book contains an account of Dr. Talmage's journey through the East. All is written in his well-known vivid, picturesque style, and the volume is designed to become a most popular one. Its chapters will be read with all the interest with which his published sermons are read. Dr. Talmage announces that the book is intended for the masses; that not a word of Latin or Greek shall be found in it, unless translated. With mooted questions, archaeological difficulties, examination of tradition, and such like, he has nothing to do. That he has reached the ideal set before him no one who reads it will question for a moment. The book will undoubtedly be found in multitudes of homes, and will attract old and young alike.

IN SCRIPTURE LANDS. New Views of Sacred Places. *By Edward L. Wilson.* With 150 original illustrations engraved from photographs taken by the author. Large 8vo. Price, \$3.50. C. Scribner's Sons. 1890.

Another and most valuable addition to the vast number of books descriptive of the lands of the Bible. This one differs from its predecessors perhaps more in respect to its pictorial character than in any other feature. It deals with the Scripture lands as they appear to-day. It is the product largely of the camera of the modern photographer and the pen of the modern artist, rather than of the critic or explorer. It is fresh, vivid, and in every way a most readable book. Its contents are: the Land of Goshen, Sinai and the Wilderness; from Mount Sinai to

Mount Seir; a Visit to Petra; a Search for Kadesh; Three Jewish Kings; the South Country; Round about Jerusalem; Where was Calvary? Judea to Samaria; Round about Galilee; Nazareth Old and New; Sea of Galilee; Lebanon to Damascus.

A. M. MACKAY, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda. *By his Sister.* With portrait and map. Author's edition. 12mo, pp. viii., 488. Cloth, \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1891.

A book of a thousand, it should be in every home and in every library. "Mackay of Uganda" will be ranked among the heroes of the church. A youth of rare promise, he ranked high in the calling for which he was educated, that of mechanical engineering, but with his devotion to this profession, he was as zealous in religious duties. Unexpectedly called to the Uganda mission, after long contemplating going to Madagascar, he responded at once, and began a life of four-teen years in the unhappy kingdom of Mtesa and Mwanga as a brave soldier of the cross. He was never ordained to the ministry, but no ministry was ever more potent than his. As early as the time when Bishop Hannington was making his way towards Uganda, that prelate's diary records that Mackay's name was on every lip as he approached Mwanga's territory. Stanley pronounces him "the best missionary since Livingstone." Grant, the companion of Speke, writes of him in the same terms. His mechanical skill shown in boat-building, carpentering, and printing deeply impressed the simple Africans, but not less did they learn to admire and respect the man who never flinched when his life was in danger, and who boldly preached the truth when those who accepted it sealed their testimony with their blood. The biography before us is made up principally of Mackay's letters, arranged in such a way as to illustrate the prominent features of his work and life, the condition of the people among whom he worked, and the needs of that work. To these letters his biographer, his sister, adds very little more than a short sketch of his boyhood and youth. The book will have a permanent place in our missionary literature, and the name of its subject will live forever.

AMERICAN HEROES ON MISSION FIELDS. Brief Missionary Biographies. *Edited by Rev. H. C. Hayden, D. D.* 12mo, \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

A collection of very brief biographies, by different writers, of prominent missionaries from this country who have finished their work and entered upon their reward. The biographies embraced are those of Mrs. Clara Gray Schauflier, Henry Sergeant Wise, M. D., Rev. David Tappan Stoddard, Asahel Grant, M. D., Rev. William Goodell, D. D., Rev. Titus Coan, Rev. Harrison Gray Otis Dwight, D. D., S. Wells Williams, LL. D., Rev. Elijah Coleman Bridgman, D. D., Miss Julia A. Rappleye, Rev. Adoniram Judson, Rev. William G. Schauflier, D. D., and Rev. John Eliot. This book is admirably adapted for family reading and the Sabbath-school library, and will be found inspiring to all who love the work of the church in foreign lands.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD. Editor: Arthur T. Pierson, D. D.; Associate Editors: J. T. Gracey and A. J. Gordon. Published monthly. Subscription, \$2 per year. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

We must again, without solicitation by its editors or publishers, call special attention to this greatest of all the missionary journals that come to our table. *The Missionary Review of the World* will be found the fullest, most reliable, most suggestive, and most readable publication of its kind. It is invaluable in the Ladies' Missionary Society, in the Monthly Concert, in the pastor's study. It keeps one abreast of the movements of all the churches and in all lands. It discusses the great questions involved in the work. It furnishes the information needed to understand the world's needs. It inspires the church of God to do more. It tells of the grand results.

**HOW TO BE A PASTOR.** *By Theodore L. Cuyler, D. D., late Pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Church, Brooklyn.* 16mo, gilt top, pp. 151. 75 cents. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1890.

This book deals exclusively with that large department of ministerial duties which lies entirely outside of the pulpit, but which, rightly attended to, adds power and effectiveness to the latter. The importance of pastoral labor, pastoral visits, visitation of the sick, the treatment of the troubled, how to have a working church, training converts, where to be a pastor, are among the topics discussed. These, with other subjects, are treated in the well-known clear and vigorous style of Dr. Cuyler, whose vast wealth of experience and success in the very things of which he tells is here freely called upon and used to incite others. It is a book which will commend itself to every earnest pastor by its practical good sense, experimental acquaintance with the needs and results of pastoral work, and sympathetic dealings with the problems of a minister's every-day life.

**THE PASTOR AMIDST HIS FLOCK.** *By Rev. G. B. Willcox, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary.* 12mo, pp. 186. New York: American Tract Society. 1890.

The author speaks from the experience of twenty-six years in the pastorate and eleven years as an instructor. The discussion, conducted in the form of questions and answers, is embraced in ten books, covering the subjects of the pastor's outset in the work, his personal duties as to health, study, business affairs, etc.; his pulpit duties, his relations to organization and administration, to the social life of the church, to the children, to financial affairs, to the people in their homes, to special services, to other churches and ministers, etc. The feature of the work which is most prominent is its suggestions as to practical church work—the organization by the pastor of the activities of the congregation. It is intensely practical, full of common sense, and helpful. A very full index will aid the reader to refer to any one of the many hundred practical points treated of.

**THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY.** Lectures given to the Meadville Theological School, June, 1889. *By Rev. W. P. Tilden.* 16mo, pp. 186. Boston: George H. Ellis. 1890.

Another work on the practical relations of the minister to his work. While written from the standpoint of Unitarianism, and thereby sapping the fundamental principle and inspiring motive for work for Christ and human souls, these lectures yet contain many wholesome suggestions to evangelical ministers. The reader will

be pleased with one hopeful suggestion made to the Meadville students, viz. : that the Bible be placed above the writings of Confucius or Buddha, and not on a level with them, and that they become better acquainted with its rich treasures. He is evidently opposed to too great a "liberalizing" on the part of his co-religionists.

THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. *By J. T. Sunderland, M. A., author of "What is the Bible?" and "A Rational Faith."* 16mo, pp. 96. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis. 1889.

This little treatise is composed of two parts, one being "The Liberal Christian Ministry as a Calling for Young Men;" the other being "The Liberal Christian Ministry as a Calling for Young Women." In defining "liberal" the author says that he does not mean Unitarian, but uses the larger term to include Universalists, Liberal Friends and Independents, and to some extent also the more progressive wing of some of the so-called orthodox bodies, as the Broad Church Episcopalian and the Andover Congregationalists! A nice company, this! His reason for young men entering this ministry are, first, that there's room in it, yet it is not overcrowded; next, that it is a desirable calling, one measured by better standards than other professions, a healthy calling, one of fine social advantages, one that leads naturally to a companionship with a knowledge of nature, one whose thought of human life is very high, and one of great literary opportunities and privileges. He then shows how worthy it is of their powers in its theological, ethical, philanthropic, spiritual and personal possibilities. The part of the book devoted to the demands of the liberal ministry upon young women is almost altogether taken up with an examination into the question of women preaching, and with answers to the objections thereto.

SERMONS IN CANDLES. Two lectures upon the illustrations which may be found in common candles. *By Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.* With an Introduction by Rev. R. S. McArthur, D. D. 12mo.; pp. 170. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1891.

The versatility of Spurgeon was never more manifest than in these striking lectures. The sub-title sufficiently explains their purpose. He tells of the Scripture use of illustration, of candles as emblems, of candles lighting other candles, of candles under bushels, of candles that sputter, and many other kinds, and through it all runs a vein of both wit and wisdom which will delight and instruct. May it be many a year before his candlestick be removed!

ROBERT BROWNING. *Personalia.* *By Edmund Gosse.* 16mo.; pp. 96. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

A reprint of an article published in *The Century*, in December, 1881. It deals principally with the earlier days of the poet, and the struggle through which he passed before winning that appreciation which was in later years so generously given him.

25, 1891

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 17.—JULY, 1891.

---

I. AUTHORITY IN REVELATION AND MORALS.

FIVE FALLACIES AND ONE FIASCO CONVERGENT.

CURRENT literature, popular addresses and constantly recurring conversations in social intercourse, discover six convergent influences actively at work in society. Four are newer; two older. The aim of each is to shift the basis of authority in moral and religious life. The six forces differ widely in nature and in the character of those who direct the propagation and transmission of them through society. But, without collusion and moving along different, and sometimes antagonistic, lines, they tend to the same result, the annihilation of finality and authority in ethics and revelation. The convergence implies the superintendence of the same evil personality, shrewdly intruding himself into these different spheres of life and giving a common direction to their movements.

1. Blatant last century infidelity holds that miracles cannot be proven by testimony, and that, therefore, the claims of Christianity cannot be established because resting on them. It denies the relevancy or pertinency of what are called the evidences of Christianity, and in regard to Scripture would say: granted that a revelation has been made, it cannot be authenticated. It scoffs at religion as a superstition, and sneers at authoritative morals as the silly scruples of childhood and inexperience—greenness. Its ethics are utilitarian only. The best that it can say is, moral principles must be obeyed, because it is for the good of society. The evil of such a system was shown long ago in the famous passage about balances when held in the hands of self.—*David Hume, his confrères and followers.*



2. Christian rationalism. The appeal to miracles and historic evidences establishes the probability of Christianity and the claims of the Bible to be a direct, inspired revelation from God. But enlightened reason, an educated conscience and spiritual perception must corroborate that objective evidence and historic testimony before the Bible can be binding or exact acknowledgment. The same reason, conscience and spiritual perception must determine what in the Bible is pure revelation, and what is vitiated by the channel of communication, or added gratuitously by the authors and copyists. The Bible is a lot of crude material, out of which man, each man, may construct his own revelation.

This is modified skepticism in religion and incipient anarchy in morals. He who makes his own Bible will make it to suit his morals, and his morals will suit his convenience.—*The broad-church school of theologians.*

3. A modern moral philosophy, historic ethics. Moral principles used to be thought secure against the arbitrariness of the individual, inviolable, authoritative and unchangeable. "To-day we easily penetrate both what was correctly conceived in this thought, and also the optical illusion that accompanied it." The "security, inviolableness, authoritativeness" of moral principles, according to this theory, come from the force of the will of the community. "The will of the community speaks to the individual concerning his practical conduct with authority—authority of the family, of teachers, of public opinion, of priests, of judges." Everybody born into the community finds in it this common will, bending his will. If he tries to run counter to it, "he will everywhere strike hard against the surrounding will, which is stronger than his own." That is the only *objective* authority in morals, the will of the community. Finally, the force of this "common will" impresses itself upon the individual, and he "appropriates" the principles taught him, or rather *imposed* upon him by family, teachers, public opinion, priests and judges, as his standard of right and wrong. This is "conscience," subjective authority in morals.

The judgment, the principles of this "common will" in regard to right and wrong are "nothing else, therefore, than the conception in the community of all that is reciprocally required *in a practi-*

*cal direction* of its members, for the advantage and profit of the community and the individual persons in it." The conception of what is reciprocally required is the *experience* of the community in its historic development. "The optical illusion," therefore, of the old notions about morality consisted in mistaking the "will of the community" for God, the force of public sentiment for authority inhering in moral principles, and extrinsic origin for unchangeableness; because these so-called moral distinctions were formulated by the community before the individual was born, and forced upon him from without, with no will allowed him in the matter, he supposes them unchangeable. But it is not at all so. "When the conception in the community of what is reciprocally required changes, then ethical principles change also," and conscience with them.

Morality, then, is historic, not intuitive, the *evolution* of experience in society. And conscience is the *factitious product* of public sentiment, not an original faculty. The theory is the ultimate outcome of the methods of the selfish system of utilitarian ethics developed by Hobbes and English deists two centuries ago, which has run through the refinements of the approbation, the benevolence, the beneficence schemes of Christian moralists since.

They all make conscience and morality a *growth*, dependent upon the perception of the useful, the beautiful, and the commendable in reciprocal relations. It is in ethical psychology the correlative of evolution in biology. As morals in general are evolutions from the environment of reciprocal relations in society, so the Scriptures specially are the expressions of highly wrought, but imperfect perceptions of these relationships in the past in particular local communities.

This is one of the more recent fads in continental incubation of artificial thought, among "the latest things out, you know!" But it is altogether evil, and is destined to most pernicious results. It (historic ethics) and scientific evolution reduce religion to sociology, and morals to radicalism. It is the very thing, just the basis wanted, to justify the perversions of the conventional codes of honor and etiquette in society, the corruptions of "business"

in commerce and trade, the revolutionary purposes of socialism and communism in politics. The rascal will be glad to find that the God whom he has been dreading is only "the will of the community," from which he can "skip;" that the morality which has been haunting him is nothing but the uncomfortable effect of public opinion; that conscience which has been torturing him is only an inconvenient factitious growth, like an incysted tumor, which he need not mind, but just treat "gently;" that supposed facts are fancies or obsolete notions; that the sufficient justification of any course is that the times demand it, or that the stage now reached in social evolution calls for it. Morals are the fruit of tradition, education, and environment. Approximation to perfection advances *pari passu* with the historic development of society.—*Prof. M. Jodl, of Prague, with European and American fellow-thinkers.*

4 Mysticism in religion. It rivets attention upon the divine element in the form, style and subject matter of the Scriptures. It exults in the blessed witness of God's Spirit in the heart to the truth of his word.

Occupied thus inwardly in subjective devotion, it loses sight too much of the moral law and of the objective proofs for Christianity by external adducible testimony, which refers the Bible back to God as its author by incontrovertible evidence. Sometimes the sufficiency of those evidences is denied, and even laughed at in the house of friends.

Modern mysticism is not the product of meditative seclusion. It is the frictional sentiment of active piety excited by the aggressive energy of the evangelistic and missionary spirit of the day.

No school of Christians surpasses it in personal work for souls, in personal fealty to Jesus, in strength of faith, in intensity of affection. But it is an unwholesome development and transmits unhealthful influences.

It counts objective evidences of but little value, if it does not deery them, and insists that the recognition of authority in the Scripture can come only from subjective states disposed by grace to it.

It confounds, in consequence, among other things, historical and saving faith.

It allows the man who is convinced only intellectually of the truth of the claims of Christianity from historic evidence no standing. By the logical momentum of emotional vehemence it impels him "to make a profession of faith" without regeneration, or drives him into open antagonism to religion. If he persists that he has faith in Jesus and his Scriptures, and resists classification as an infidel, it insists that he is mistaken, that he is either an infidel, or his faith is the work of grace.

It also equals rationalism in the end. Rationalism finds *in* the Scripture *a* revelation. Enlightened reason and spiritual perception sort it *out* and arrange it. Mysticism takes the Bible as a whole, it is true. But, according to it, illuminated spiritual perception alone can see the authority of God speaking in his word. Now it is a very easy next step for this illuminated spiritual perception to set up a censorship and divide the Scripture, saying, "I see God speaking in this, but not in that." Then it will present an eclectic and evicted Bible, as rationalism does. The truth of history is that Lutheran subjectivism, nigh akin to mysticism, in the Reformation sowed the seed which has grown into German rationalism, which has flowered into agnosticism. When objective evidence is ruled out, honest subjectivity will very soon find itself an ignoramus, knowing nothing—certainly "knowing nothing yet as he ought to know" it.

When a censorship of the authority of Scripture is assumed, of course a censorship of authority of morals goes with it, and subjective morals follow—MORALS, *according* to inclination. For the ecstasies of emotion, even when excited by the Spirit, are impatient of having their eductions and interpretations, either in revelation or morals, corrected or limited by any objective authority.

The danger in mysticism, then, is that it may fill the church with unconverted members in one generation, and society with skeptics in the next.

For outsiders must set the Scriptures at naught when told that their authority depends upon subjective experience, and they have

not that "experience."—*The Plymouth Brethren School, Higher Life People, Premillenarian Brethren, et al.*

5. Romanism. When the church was not able through ignorance to produce the evidence that the Scriptures were written by men accredited directly or indirectly by miracles, she taught that they must be received on her "say so," on her testimony. She found this convenient, both to cover ignorance and to enslave souls.

She took accordingly to herself the sole authority of fixing the canon, of interpreting Scripture and determining morals.

The location of this office of censorship used to be uncertain. It was in the church. But where—in each priest, or in councils, or in the Pope? Some said in one place, some in another. At last the Vatican Council of 1870 fixed it in a single mind sitting in "Satan's seat" at Rome. And to-day the foundation of Romanism in revelation and morals is the infallible authority of the Pope. But these authorities, whether councils or popes, present no miracles or other credentials that they may be known to be from God, the only source of infallible decisions.

Like Hume's infidelity, rationalism and mysticism, Romanism either denies the pertinency of objective evidence, or admits its insufficiency. Yet Protestant mysticism and Christian rationalism are the extreme reaction of the revolt against Romanism. But the extremes meet in this, that mysticism and rationalism locate the authority in the subjective perception of each *individual*, and Romanism fixes it in the subjective perception of the *Pope* or church. Like historic ethics, it first substituted "the will of the (ecclesiastical) community," the church, for God, and now, in collusion with evil, tyranny seats that common corporate will in the Pope.

The scheme reduces faith in the Scriptures to a superstition, and ethics to Jesuitry, the principles of which cannot be unfolded here for want of space. Its morals are the policy required to sustain the seat of the Pope, right or wrong. It knows no other principle of action.

6. The Fiasco is a coalition of mysticism and rationalism.

The "musts" of an infallible Bible, an infallible church, an unerring reason, convincing evidence, are laid aside. They are

declared one and all to be inadequate grounds of authority in revelation and morals. "To-day the ordinary grounds, or proofs of our religion are justly called in question, and we are asking for a fundamental, universal *ground* (an *Urgrund*) of them all—of prophecy, miracle, the incarnation, the Bible, the church and reason—for the authority of all these authorities." (Yes, and might as well be asking for the creator of the Creator, the cause of the first cause of all. The Scriptures are authoritative, because objective historic evidence refers them back or up to God as their author, who cannot lie and who *must* be obeyed; and morals, because they are the dictates of conscience apprehending the intrinsic distinction between right and wrong in conduct. That is all.)

But the theory continues: "mere *external evidences* and authority are no antidote to doubt, no ground of certitude in our day." Very true, they are but a poor antidote (if any antidote at all) to doubt in a spiritual sense, but if "external evidences and authority" are not a ground of certitude—that is, do not certify a thing—then no such ground can be found for unregenerate man, and he is without authority in religion and morals.

"This *Urgrund* must be an organic first-principle which unfolds into a philosophy of religion as the only final and satisfactory apologetic for Christianity."

That is, it must be some germ thought which, worked out in the brain and heart, will necessitate *belief* in Christianity and *action* in morals, and give the populace, *the masses*, some certainty.

This is to become "The Catholic Faith," the contents of which will be "the consensus of the Christian consciousness in regard to God, man and the world."

But unfortunately for the masses, the few élite who have accepted the scheme so far are not agreed as to the "organic first-principle" and its course in philosophic development. And what is to be expected of such vague transcendentalism for the common people if the simple evidence connecting the epistles with the hand of Paul, accredited by miracles, is insufficient? Or of what moral force can it be, when it teaches that moral principles have no valid basis of authority till this philosophy of the *Urgrund* find one, and that for the present it is not very certain about it. It is

rationalistic mysticism, and is worse than historic ethics. Unguided by experience in society, by original moral notions or by Scripture, its votaries shut themselves up in their studies to evolve from their own thoughts a philosophy with which to come out and measure both Scripture and morals, and the authority of both must rest upon the result of the test. For the postulate was: neither has any sufficient basis of authority, we will go find one.—*The Catholic Party, Dr. J. McBride Sterrett and others.*

#### THE CONVERGENCE.

It is very strange to find these six tendencies convergent. The schools of men and thought, Protestantism and Romanism, Christianity and infidelity, are "at enmity among themselves." It would seem impossible for them to be allied in a common destructive assault at the same points upon the foundations of both natural and revealed religion. The Christian brethren implicated will deny the charge indignantly, because they know that such alliance is not in their hearts.

This is true, but nevertheless they are "party to the fact." They converge in a destructive assault upon the foundations of religion and morals, natural and revealed: 1, In asserting (or at least admitting) with infidelity, the impossibility of proving the supernatural or super-physical by objective evidence; for Romanism substitutes assertion for proof, while rationalism, mysticism and the rest resort to subjective sources for it, or pass it by.

2. In admitting, therefore, that the objective evidences of Christianity cannot exact obedience to the Scripture from the natural man, the best that they can do is to make out a plausible case. Faith and reason must see subjectively divinity and infallibility in the *Scripture* according to rationalism and mysticism; in the *church* according to Romanism.

3. In denying the existence of any eternal abstract principles of morality engraven upon the heart and read by intuitive consciousness in its first actings. In short, they all exalt subjectivity excessively. They yield the position to infidelity by granting that the Scriptures and unwritten moral law cannot be proven in force by *objective* evidence. They must wait for even the *right*

to authoritativeness upon the subjective assent of the reason and conscience of the individual.

#### RESULT.

When such principles are granted, everything is lost. All is confusion in religion and anarchy in morals. Each man becomes "a law unto himself." The demoniac spirits of self, of radical socialism and of political and commercial expediency are let loose, to work out the sweet wills of their own subjectivities—their preferred inclinations. Each generation must make its own Bible and fabricate its own code of morals "to suit the times." No restraint to immorality is left but the dread of a public sentiment, level to the masses of the citizenry (a very low level), and the fear of a physical force uncertain in its action.

For a law without an objective source and sanction is no law, though, of course, the subjective assent inwrought by grace is essential to cordial spiritual obedience.

#### THE SCRIPTURES AND MORALS AUTHORITATIVE OBJECTIVELY.

But the objective evidences do construct the basis for an authoritativeness in the Scripture and morals which does not wait upon subjective assent.

1. For the commands of Scripture and the dictates of moral principles presuppose the sufficiency of such evidence. Otherwise, they would be unreasonable, for they come to men who have neither the subjective experience nor philosophy.

2. Because the Scriptures refer to and appeal to these evidences for their authority. Nicodemus *knew* that Jesus was a teacher come from God because he did "these miracles." (John iii. 2.) Jesus promised to attest his apostles by such evidences or "signs" following them. (Mark xvi. 17.) But what would the attestation be worth, if it was valid only for the direct witnesses, and could not hold for the next and succeeding generations? The apostles appealed to their miracles as their attestations. (Acts iv. 9, 10.) Elisha came directly from Elijah's ascension, and with his mantle on him; yet he wrought a miracle to convince himself that he was not deluded in thinking himself Elijah's successor and



to accredit himself to "the prophets which were to view." (2 Kings ii. 14, 15.) Peter, when he was about to "put off this tabernacle," made affidavit for coming generations to the miracle of the transfiguration, which he had witnessed, as proof that he and they "were not following cunningly devised fables." (2 Peter i. 13-18.) It was a matter of objective certainty, not of subjective delusion. But of more importance even, Jesus himself appealed to his work as the credentials of his mission. (John v. 36; xiv. 4.) And these things "are written [recorded by eye-witnesses] that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." (John ii. 31.)

3. Reason demands such objective evidence, and the demand implies its sufficiency. The moment a man presents himself with some pretended revelation from God, reason says:

"Your credentials, if you please. Perform some work connecting you with God and accrediting you from him."

If he brings the revelation in the form of the writing of another, reason asks: Its seals, if you please? What are your evidences that the author was from God?

4. The moral instincts and consensus of mankind corroborate. The original authority of moral principles is received by all and was never questioned by any, till an elaborate and involved philosophy did it. The conviction among men that miracles are credentials of a divine commission, is so strong that jugglery and sorcery easily impose upon credulity.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE DEFENSE.

The protectors of truth must settle well first the questions which lie at the root of evil in each of these tendencies and maintain their positions stoutly.

1. What is practical *certitude*? All of these schools imply that it can be attained only through some physical or *spiritual* sense. But testimony, inspected and examined by reason, is the ground of certitude in most cases of knowledge.

---

<sup>1</sup> Such objective ground for canonicity and authority in revelation was the subject of Dr. McPheeters' very able and timely Inaugural Address at Columbia Theological Seminary, South Carolina. It is a well-chosen keynote for a Biblical course, and good things may be expected from it. See PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, January, 1891.

2. What then is *sufficient* evidence and testimony, and the conditions of it? The thinking world must be made to see by logic and illustration that evidence in religion and morals is as convincing as in history and science, and that testimony in religion and history is valid and final.

Else universal, unbridled skepticism and agnosticism must reign, and each man's knowledge be limited to his own experience. For the existence of Cæsar, London, and such matters of fact, by far the larger portion of everybody's information, are knowledges of testimony.

In fact, inferences from competent testimony are often much surer than inferences from observed physical phenomena. The danger of a false deduction is less. The thinking world will be made to see this only by continually harping upon it.

3. What is the *authority* which forms the basis of morality? It is above and independent of the will of the community.

The "will of the community standard" is towards immorality.

Unquestionably education affects morality, and public sentiment quickens or dulls conscience. But that by no means exalts them into the position of the begetters of conscience and the sources of authority for moral principles. The very statement of moral principles carries the sense of the duty of obedience. Education, reason and conscience merely recognize the authority inhering *per se* in them, but do not originate them. They confer nothing towards conferring that authority, but only apprehend it.

Then, in the second place, the maintainers of the supremacy of Scripture and morals must master the evidence and arguments for the canonicity of Scripture and the eternal authoritativeness of moral principles, so that they can produce the witnesses from history and psychology, and bring them to bear without intermission.

Else Christianity must be relegated in the popular mind to the position of one of the superstitions of the earth, and morals to the category of philosophies; for the position of Christian rationalists and mystics is unsatisfaction to thoughtful and true working minds.

They claim authoritativeness for the Scriptures and demand submission to them; yet they make that authority wait upon subjective esoteric experience. The basis of authority must be objective, or it will be as unstable and shifting as the fancies of speculative thought. The defenders of the faith must not abandon old armories of weapons, old truths and old fields of evidence. They must ransack them more carefully and bring out "things new and old," but adjusted in method and style of presentation to the shifted position of the enemy (now within the camp) and the changed habit of the times in thought. If the supernatural and superphysical origin of both the Bible and morals cannot be proven, then their authority "vanisheth away."

#### PREVALENCE OF THESE THEORIES.

These fallacies now permeate all grades of American society and are sapping its morality and spirituality.

They are insidious, because enough truth enters into each of them to give it the semblance of correctness.

They are the craze of the writers and readers of periodical literature and current fiction. They have been popularized and disseminated till they are found in every country hamlet, and are rife among the city masses. Their congeniality to native impulses makes them "taking."

Last century infidelity is far spent. It was the blasphemy of intense carnal hatred of God, and is growing obsolete in its coarser form, as a relic of the impolite, rude intellectual state of the past. It survives, however, in Ingersollism and refinements from it.

Christian rationalism and historic ethics are exponents of the super-refined culture, æsthetic taste and ostentatious learning, which are the conceits and pride of the nineteenth century.

Romanism is the old apostasy originated and perpetuated by evil influences from the evil one.

Modern mysticism and the fiasco of "the Catholic faith" result from the unfortunate tendency of emotional and speculative piety to suppress the demands and movements of even sanctified reason. The reaction, though deferred by practical godliness, must come and be bad.

## DANGERS OF THE HOUR.

These are the dangers of the day, of the hour, to society in morals, politics and religion. Every agitator is left to produce his own code of principles from his view of the demand of the present environment in the social and political spheres; every new theology to build its own basis coördinate in authority with the basis of any other, differing only in plausibility; each individual to formulate his own creed and believe as he chooses, and then do as he chooses, for practice will follow doctrine. It is the character of the campaign now to attack the basis of authority in these, or some similar forms, and shift it from definite objective supports, so that liberty or license in doctrine and practice may obtain in morals, religion and politics, for the foundations of the principles underlying civil government are involved, and they are assaulted as vigorously in some quarters as those underlying religion and morals.

The lovers of truth must recognize the common element of danger in each form, and resist its ravages. Many of its propagators will be found among very dear brethren, loyal in allegiance to Jesus and active in his service. And such a course may subject to the obloquy of ridicule. But the centre of truth must be held. Else the wings of workers on either hand cannot push successful advances, or even maintain good ground, though they do not think so.

*Postscript:* Of course, all forms of materialism, pure and simple, refuse to admit the authority of the Bible and moral principles. According to it, man is only an arrangement of atoms and ceases to be at death.

Therefore his susceptibility to pain or pleasure is the only basis for morality, and moral principles can have no application except to impel to relieve suffering or to restrain from inflicting it. And if there be a God and he make a revelation, it can only be to reveal to men what is expedient for their physical well-being and comfort.

But the Bible has very little to say about the body and its welfare in this life. It deals chiefly with a supposed non-material soul and the relationships of that soul after death. It is therefore irrelevant and false and cannot be a revelation from God. There can be no such thing as religion in the Bible sense, for man has no relationships after death.

Materialism, even in its highest forms, can furnish neither a revelation nor ethics. To those who hold to a "physical basis" for mind in any sense accepted among materialists, authority must be an absurdity. For thought, perception and emotion are only sensations in brain cells produced by impressions from without, passing along nerves connecting with them, when objective; or when subjective, sensations in brain cells produced by agitation among the molecules of the brain, either spontaneously or under the laws of association.

Religion and morals, then, can be only sentiments; very beautiful and beneficent, perhaps, but after all nothing but sentiments fixed into habits by repetition, the frequency with which any set of cells and nerves is brought into exercise perfecting their facility. And the Turk's sentiment of habit connected with the Koran is as authoritative as that of the Christian connected with his Bible. In fact, the Christian religion being based upon two unique events, unlike all others, the birth and resurrection of Jesus, requires the creation of new cells and nerves, or, at least, the opening and development of a set before unused, before it can be taken in.

Every new process is difficult at first, and facility in it is attained gradually by the use of the corresponding nerves and cells. So it is with faith in the Christian's revelation. It is the development of a new faculty. All that the Christian can do, therefore, is to pity the uninitiated infidel who lacks the faculty. He cannot blame him. For revelation and morals have no authority. They are only brain sentiments. *Dr. Maudsley and others.*

So the slogan of Satan in this age, then, is "no authority." In politics, in business, in science, in morals, in religion, he raises up anarchists, soulless corporations and impersonal stock companies, materialists, evolutionists, rationalists, to push the campaign, either by tearing down the flag of authority altogether, or by shifting the base in which it is planted. And, unfortunately, he makes unconscious allies of many good people in the socialistic, philanthropic and Christian movements of the times. The reason is easy enough to see. Without authority,

no morality; without morality, no holiness; and "without holiness no man shall see God." While without the admission of objective evidences and abstract first principles, authority cannot stand. If it is made dependent upon the testimony of the senses or upon subjective perception, the individual cannot be brought under compulsion to acknowledge it. He has only to say: My senses make no report about it, my subjective perception does not receive it, and he is free.

T. P. EPES.

## II. INSPIRATION.

The inspiration of the Bible is one of the living questions of the day. Many regard it as a vital question to Christianity. Some of our late apologists, however, do not so consider it. Fisher, in his *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, takes the position that the inspiration of the Scriptures, though a fact, is not essential to our faith in Christ; that the Bible may be regarded as a purely human book, and yet the proof of Christianity remain substantially unimpaired; that all the evidence we need from the Scriptures we may get, if we regard them as the production of reliable men. These statements naturally shock us at their first presentation. Reflection, however, will probably lead us to conclude that Fisher may be right; that our religion is divinely pure and perfect, and its evidences unassailable, even though the record of it had been the work of merely good though uninspired men.

Within the limits of Christendom there are few intelligent men who deny the inspiration of the Bible. This is true of heterodox as well as of orthodox thinkers and writers. The question is as to the nature, not as to the reality, of inspiration. Baur, Strauss and Renan, as well as Calovius, Buxtorf and Quenstedt, believe that the Scriptures are inspired; but they are poles apart in their understanding of what inspiration is.

It will help to a simpler and clearer discussion if we consider this question under two main heads, the manner, or nature, and the extent of inspiration.

### NATURE OF INSPIRATION.

There are two radical views held as to the manner of inspiration:

I. That it is ordinary, natural, human. There are several forms of this belief. Schleiermacher, Coleridge and Morell regard inspiration as a kind of genius, a natural, or a naturally-acquired, power of intuition. Just as all men are able to perceive first truths and primary ideas, such as space, time, cause and the axioms of math-

ematics; and as some men are naturally gifted as musicians, painters, sculptors, poets, orators, to see the beautiful and the sublime, so there have been men who had the power of religious intuition—some to a larger, some to a less degree. This view is not necessarily inconsistent with the higher or supernatural theory; surely not, as presented by Morell, for he holds that this power of religious intuition possessed by the writers of the Bible was a “state of mind consequent upon special and Divine arrangements—a state in which there is involved an extraordinary and miraculous elevation of the religious consciousness of certain chosen individuals, for the express illumination of humanity at large.” It is credible that God might have endowed the sacred penmen with this extraordinary power from their birth, or might have conferred it upon them in their maturity. Even as so held, however, the theory seems liable to the objection, that it regards the inspired as remarkable men in themselves, so far as religious truths are concerned, as having a general power of religious intuition; whereas many of them were quite ordinary men, and were used only as passive instruments in the communication of the divine will. This theory is thoroughly naturalistic, when inspiration is held to be mere genius turned to religious truths, and like all human genius, more or less imperfect and erroneous.

There is a modification of this view, according to which the inspired were extraordinary men, not by nature but by cultivation; purer, more intelligent and spiritual than others. That they were superior was due to their faithful and efficient use of the means of grace and illumination possessed by them in common with all believers. Inspiration is, therefore, the common gift of the Spirit.

Evolution has been pressed into the service of Christianity in more ways than one. It has been applied to inspiration; its advocates contending that the Biblical writers were the natural products of their race and age, “simply more fully developed men.” This theory needs to account for the fact, that this natural process has not produced a succession of inspired men with increasing powers of divination.

Several objections appear to all naturalistic interpretations of inspiration. 1. They all leave us in doubt as to the reliability of



the revelation, as they make the Bible virtually a human book. This objection might be met by the assertion, that God chose these men because they were naturally fitted for the work. But this would satisfy those only, who are prepared to believe that the Bible is not distinctively God's book ; that it is essentially human and partakes of the imperfections incident to its authorship. If the Bible is a perfect book, or contains superhuman truth, it could not have come from the fallible mind of man.

2. These theories are inconsistent with the fact, that ignorant and wicked men were the subjects of inspiration. As stated under the first objection, this fact would be fatal, even if the writers were the most superior men, mentally, morally, spiritually, that the race has known ; that is, on the presumption that the Bible is infallible ; for " who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? " The point of the difficulty here, however, is that some of the inspired men of the Bible were not the best men, not superior to others ; a few not equal to their uninspired contemporaries : " Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness ; " Solomon, who " loved many strange women, " " had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, " " went after Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites, " and " did evil in the sight of the Lord ; " David, the adulterer and murderer, who was not allowed to build the temple, because he had " shed much blood upon the earth ; " the disobedient prophet slain by a lion ; Jonah, who thought he could escape the Omniscient and Omnipotent in his wilful refusal to obey God's command, and who was angry because God was merciful ; Amos, a mere " herdsman and gatherer of sycamore fruit ; " Peter, whom Jesus rebuked as Satan, who denied his Lord, and dissembled with Paul ; John, who was ambitious for preëminence among the apostles ; and Caiaphas, the judicial murderer of Jesus, 1 Cor. xiii. 2 seeming to imply that one might be gifted with prophecy and yet be without charity ; and in 1 Cor. i. 26-28, we are told that God chooses, not the wise, but the foolish, the weak, the base, the despised, " that no flesh should glory before God. "

3. This human or naturalistic hypothesis is contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures, that the inspiration came to the writers

from without and not from within themselves. John xvi. 13-15: "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth. He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you." 1 Peter i. 11: "Searching what time, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." 2 Peter i. 21: "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. ii. 13: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." All of these statements show that it was not the writer's intuition, nor his superior wisdom and spirituality, nor his developed personality, that inspired him; but the Spirit of God, a distinct mind and person, dwelling in him, informing him and speaking through him.

II. The opposite view is, that inspiration is extraordinary, supernatural, superhuman, divine; a special bestowment by the Spirit of God upon the minds of those chosen to write the Bible, by which they were qualified to make known infallibly God's will. Here a discrimination must be made between those parts of the Bible naturally known to the writers and those not known. One of God's economical laws is that of parsimony; he does not act for his creatures where they can act for themselves.

1. A very large number of facts and truths recorded in the Scriptures were known to the writers independent of any inspiration they might possess. Moses was an eyewitness of the events of the exodus; Samuel, of those of his own time; Matthew and John were daily attendants upon Christ's ministry; Luke was not only Paul's companion in his later travels, but tells us that he had learned the facts of the gospel history from those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning. David was probably a natural poet. Solomon had wisdom to make many proverbs. So of the truths set forth, the precepts laid down, the warnings uttered, the consolations given in the Bible; many of them are manifestly within the compass of human ability. It is doubtless true that much more than one-half of the entire Scriptures is a statement of facts and truths naturally known to the writers. What has inspiration to do with this part of the book? Manifestly the Spirit did not enable

the penmen to see these things, for they already saw them. Was inspiration, therefore, unnecessary? By no means. Here is a radical mistake of Morell, who contends that inspiration is limited to the intuition, as distinct from the rational intellect. Suppose the composite theory of the Pentateuch is true, was no unerring, heavenly guidance necessary in the selection of the material thus brought together? Or, to take a better example, did Matthew or John write all he knew of Christ's acts and words? John, if he wrote the last chapter of his Gospel, tells us plainly that he did not. Did Luke record all that was told him? In all this part of the Bible, inspiration effected two objects: 1, It guided the writers in the selection of facts and truths already known; and 2, It controlled them in the arrangement and expression of the truths and events. Both of these are necessary, if the Bible is God's book, and we may rely implicitly upon its declarations.

2. The more important, though it be the smaller, portion of the Scriptures presents truths and facts not known naturally by the writers. A distinction may here be drawn between those things which the sacred penmen did not know and those which no human mind could know. Prophecy, in a sense, represents both of these, and particularly the former. The seer in his day could not naturally know the future event, while the generation living at the fulfilment would witness it. Creation is a fact which no human eye observed. The Trinity of the Godhead, the twofold nature in the one person of Christ, are truths which the reason of man could not have discovered. With reference to this entire class, the sacred writers were of themselves alike hopelessly ignorant. The central truth of the Bible, the redemption of the world by the mediation of Christ, belongs to this category.

The office of inspiration with regard to this class is also twofold: 1, To reveal to the writers the unknown facts and truths; and 2, To guide them in the infallible expression of them. Inspiration is thus seen to be complex, composed of three elements—1, Selection; 2, Revelation; 3, Expression. It is essentially a divine power; it is, indeed, exclusively so. But it is a divine influence exerted upon the human mind, and shows itself in the effects produced in the inspired mind. The divine inspiring Spirit in-

spires the human mind. The sacred penmen, however, were not always wholly passive under this influence; when the Spirit was discharging the function of revelation, they were passively receptive; but in the processes of selection and expression, they were active, and the inspiring influence simply controlled and guided their activity.

This introduces the psychology of inspiration. As already said, Morell is mistaken in limiting the inspiring influence to the intuition. It is rather probable that there was no faculty of the mind which was not on some occasion, as might be needed, energized and directed by it. In all visions, the perceptive powers were quickened, as when Saul met Jesus near Damascus, he saw and heard him, though he was not seen by Saul's companions. It is specially promised that the Spirit should stimulate the memory of the apostles (John xiv. 26). In the selection of what they should record, and in the presentation of the relations of truths to one another, the judgment and the reasoning faculty must be guided. In the setting forth of the glorious wonders of the apocalypse, the conceptive imagination was inspired. The affections and desires were also doubtless controlled, and through them the will. Balaam had a strong natural wish to curse Israel and thus obtain the reward of Balak; but his desire was restrained, and he was compelled to bless. The power of expression was helped and directed to a clear, forcible, accurate utterance.

A word may be said about the modes of inspiration. These concern mainly, if not exclusively, the element of revelation. They were numerous, and may be classified as immediate and mediate. The immediate was the direct influence of the Spirit upon the mind of the writer, upon his perception, his memory, his judgment, or his will, as the truth revealed might require. The most important truths, and probably the majority were made known in this way. The mediate modes were, dreams by night, visions by day, the Shechinah, Urim and Thummim, angels, inscription on the two tables of stone, writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace, a voice, possibly the Bath-Kol, etc. The theophanies may be regarded as one mode of direct or immediate revelation.

## THE EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.

This is perhaps the more interesting question of the two. In orthodox circles, there is a much greater diversity of views with regard to it:

I. There are those who limit inspiration to the thoughts and exclude it from the expression of the thoughts. According to this view, the truths are divine, and the language human. These may be sub-divided into two classes: 1, Those who hold that the Spirit confined himself to matters connected with redemption, to religious truths and facts. 2, Those who extend his influence to the selection and revelation of all the truths found in the Bible. They agree in believing that the writers were left to their own unaided powers of expression. The thought, therefore, is divine and perfect, while the language is human and fallible.

II. The opposing view holds to verbal inspiration; that the words as well as thoughts were directed by the Spirit. These however, do not thoroughly agree. They divide upon two principles: 1, As before, some hold that inspiration is limited to the religious element of the Bible; while others contend that it is universal, extending to history, science, etc. 2, Again, some exclude human agency altogether, except as a passive instrument in the hands of the Spirit; like Swedenborg, contending that the writers were like a lyre played upon by the divine hand. Others object that the human mind is not matter, and is not, therefore, subject to mechanical laws; and affirm that the Spirit so controlled the sacred penmen that his thoughts were their thoughts, and his words were their words. To use a modern illustration, the former view makes the writers servile amanuenses, taking the words dictated to them by the Spirit, and exercising no more free power than the phonograph. The latter makes these same amanuenses take the idea from the Spirit, express it freely, naturally, according to their peculiarities of style, and at the same time, in such a way that the Spirit is willing to adopt the expression, as well as the idea, as his own. According to the former, the influence of the Spirit, in both thought and language, is positive, directive, suggestive. According to the latter, his influence as to the

thought is positive, but as to the language is negative, corrective, restraining from inaccuracy and error. The divine is at the maximum in both by the former view; it is at the maximum in the thought, and the human is at the maximum in the language, by the latter. According to both, the Spirit makes himself responsible for thought and expression, so that the Bible is both the mind of God and the word of God.

Is verbal inspiration essential to the divine authenticity of the Bible?

1. Dr. Charles Hodge and others contend that it is involved in the inspiration of the thought; that the thought could not have been suggested to the writers except as clothed in language, and in particular language. This does not seem to be true in every mode of revelation; surely not in dreams and visions, in all symbolic revelations. Thought is not the Siamese twin of language. Thought can exist and does exist without language; in brutes, infants, mutes. Even those possessed of speech are conscious of the existence of the thought prior to and independent of its embodiment and expression in words. But it may be urged, that while there may be thought without language, there can be no communication of thought without it. Is this true? Not only the speechless, but those endowed with articulation often converse without it. Moreover, if the finite should be so limited, is it equally true of the Infinite? Is not the Omniscient Spirit free to work with means above them, or without them? Still, again, granting that the Spirit suggested everything to the inspired by means of words, is it necessary to suppose that it was a definite and complete expression in words? May it not have been abbreviated?

2. The admitted varieties of style in the several books of the Bible are of importance in answering this question, when we observe that these variations regularly occur with a change of human authorship. It is conceded that each of the four gospels is written in independent forms of speech; that the Acts have the style of Luke; that the epistles of Paul bear marks in expression which show a different hand from the others. Does not this indicate that the language is human and personal to the individual writers?

3. The quotations of Christ and the apostles from the Old Testament in language different from that found in the original passages would seem to show that they regarded the language as unessential. The same thing is true of some of the most marked portions of the Scriptures. Take two examples. There is no passage in the Old Testament more important than the ten commandments. We are told that God wrote them with his own finger on the tables of stone. They are recorded twice, (Exodus xx. 2-17 and Deut. vi. 6-21). On comparison it is seen that there are variations in the second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth commandments. In the New Testament nothing is more interesting than the Lord's Prayer. It is also recorded twice. Matthew, who possibly heard Jesus speak it, though he was not called to the apostleship till afterwards, gives it as a part of the Sermon on the Mount, (Matt. vi. 9-13). Luke, whose knowledge was gathered from others, records it, (xi. 2-4). Place the two side by side and several important variations are manifest. The same thing is true of the entire Sermon on the Mount.

4. The fact that God has allowed the original autographs to perish, so that they are no longer in the possession of men, and that from the apographs it is practically impossible in some cases to recover with certainty the exact wording of the original, tends to show that the Lord does not regard the *ipsissima verba* as essential.

In connection with this, it should be borne in mind that all except a very few have the Scriptures and can read them only in translations, whose wording, of course, is entirely different from that of the Hebrew and Greek. Practically the world to-day has the Bible in uninspired language.

5. Literalism is too mechanical and mathematical to consist with all the rest of God's dealings with man on moral and spiritual questions. The law of probability pervades the entire sphere of moral truth. Mathematical exactness, compelling belief, is not found there. "The letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life." Room is left for human judgment, in the exercise of which lies our responsibility.

That verbal inspiration is essential, and that verbal inspiration

is a fact, are two distinct propositions. While it may not be necessary that the very words should have been inspired, yet as a fact they may have been so. That there is verbal inspiration in the Bible is undoubtedly true. We are told repeatedly, "The Holy Ghost saith;" Paul says (1 Cor. ii. 13), "which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth."

The verbal theory was not held by such men as Augustine, Luther, Melanethon, Calvin, Zwingle, Baxter, Doddridge, Tholuck, Alford and Farrar. The Helvetian *Consensus*, on the other hand, goes so far as to declare the Old Testament "θεόπνευστος, equally as regards the consonants, the vowels, and the vowel-points, or at least their force."

Is it necessary to the inspiration of the Scriptures that the scientific facts and historical events found in them shall be divinely vouched for? There are three opinions on this question held by orthodox writers. (1). That every statement in the Bible on any topic whatever is inspired; if scientific, it is perfect; if historic, it is absolutely accurate. Not many writers hold this view, but it prevails probably among the loyal and loving readers of the Bible. (2). That the religious portions alone are inspired; and that all other parts are human, and as such subject to imperfection and error. Baxter, Tillotson, Doddridge, Warburton, Paley, Whately, Heber, Scott, Pye Smith, Alford and others have taken this position. Luther thought that the epistle of James was "strawy," and that Paul's argument in Gal. iv. was insufficient. Calvin believed there were inaccuracies, as, for example, the quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9, where Jeremiah is cited as author of a passage found only in Zechariah. (3). A middle view is held by many, who limit inspiration to the religious element, but think that even on other questions no mistakes are made, while there may not be scientific precision. Such was the position of Howe, Burnet, Lowth, Barrow, Conybeare, Hinds, Bloomfield and others.

The necessity for the universal inspiration of the Bible should be settled, *pro* or *con*, by a recurrence to the purpose of the revelation. Whatever is necessary to the perfect fulfilment of that



purpose is essential, and *vice versa*. The design of the Bible is manifestly to reveal and record God's purpose and plan for the redemption of man. Are the scientific facts and historical events a part of that purpose and plan necessary to its fulfilment, or to its revelation; then they must be a portion of the inspired volume. On the other hand, are they merely incidental, but the frame of the picture or the scaffold of the building; then they may be inspired, but need not be.

Facts seem to show that a part of the truths and of the words of the Bible need not be inspired, and possibly are not so; that all religious facts and truths are fully inspired, both as to thought and expression, so that there is no statement upon which the salvation of the soul may turn which is not altogether of the Spirit and infallibly true.

Is there such a thing as passive inspiration? This kind of inspiration is sometimes stigmatized as mantic, and sometimes as mechanic, and its existence is totally denied. Others maintain that there was no other kind. The truth lies between these two. Much the greater part of inspiration was probably dynamic, and consisted in an energizing of the inspired mind, so that with its own faculties it intelligently saw and made known the truth. On the other hand, in some instances, the writer was wholly passive, purely receptive, and in other instances, he did not understand the revelation which he himself made. These are cases of plenary, verbal, mechanic, *ipsissima verba* inspiration in the fullest sense. For example, take the vision recorded in the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Daniel, and read what the inspired prophet himself says at the conclusion (xii. 8), "And I heard, but I understood not." He passively received the revelation, and mechanically, as a phonograph, repeated it. Such, too, was doubtless John's condition when, on Patmos, he witnessed the apocalyptic visions, and such was Paul's, when he was "caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words." In all these instances, the inspired seem to have been subjects of what Plato would have called the divine *μανία*.

The differences of opinion among sincere students and lovers of the Bible are largely cases of looking on different sides of the same shield. There is a basis, more or less ample, for every theory held by the orthodox. They are all more or less true; but they are all more or less partial. A wise, unprejudiced eclecticism, rigidly determined to consider and coördinate all the facts, is doubtless the true position on the vexed points of this question. This is the main idea contained in this paper. It has appeared to the writer in his reading and study upon the question that theologians become the victims of their theory, and seek to convince themselves that, because some of the language is human, it must all be; because sometimes the writers were rapt and passively received and ignorantly gave forth the revelation, such must have always been the case. The facts would seem to show that no exclusive theory is correct and that all have in them a modicum of truth.

It is a serious question, whether the attempt to reconcile all the trivial discrepancies to be found in the Bible, on the assumption that every word on every subject must have been directly dictated by the Spirit, or even so controlled by him as that he made himself responsible for it, does not cost more than it comes to. It is believed that a stronger, more masculine and assured faith looks upon these things as the merest trivialities, as the imperfect human setting of the precious jewel of inspired truth.

We need not wonder that the divine and the human come thus so close together and are so intimately intermingled. So did they combine in the one person of Jesus; weeping as man, raising Lazarus as God. So did they meet in many of the miracles: the brother, raised by divine power, must be unbound by human ministry; the restored daughter of Jairus must be nourished by parental care. So do they meet in every case of regeneration and sanctification; God's perfect work blending with the imperfect exercises of the human soul.

But, it is said, this confounds the divine and the human, and no one can separate and distinguish the elements. Can this be so? Is it true that there is not a marked difference between the finite and the infinite, the imperfect and the perfect, the human and the divine? Can we not unerringly trace the golden thread of divine

truth, interwoven with the texture of the earthly? Must we not dive into the ocean to find the pearls, and dig into the earth for the diamond? Do we fail to recognize them when we see them?

Was inspiration limited in those who were the subjects of it?

I. With regard to quantity, there seems little, if any, ground for variant opinions. It is reasonably certain that, outside of what they were directed to communicate as a part of the divine revelation, the Scripture writers were fallible as other men; they were not inerrant in thought or life. It is doubtless true that some were inspired to speak alone, as Elijah and Elisha; some to write alone, as Luke perhaps; and many to both write and speak, as the apostles. But in every case, there were definite bounds to their inspiration. Not everything that Paul said and wrote was inspired. If so, then God has allowed the inspired epistle to the Laodiceans to perish. Paul and Barnabas had a sharp contention as to Mark. Both could not have been, and doubtless neither was, moved by the Spirit, in thought or expression, in this quarrel. Paul withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. Here manifestly, Peter, at least, was without divine direction. Moses was not moved by the Spirit to smite the rock and exclaim as he did. David, in the matter of Uriah, was clearly under the instigation of the devil; as was Solomon in his worship of idols. Balaam and Caiaphas were inspired to a very limited extent, both as to time and matter.

II. As to limitations of quality, or degree, the Christian world is not at one. The prevailing orthodox opinion is probably a denial of degrees of inspiration. The argument seems a short one; all inspiration is perfect, and, therefore, cannot be graduated. It is strange that we deceive ourselves with such paralogisms. The circle of the ring on the tapering finger of a belle is perfect, but is much smaller than the circumference of the earth. God's knowledge is infinitely perfect, but the amount of it which he may see fit to bestow upon his inspired agents may be quite small. That there is progress in the revelations of the Bible from the beginning to the end can hardly be questioned by the intelligent student. Take its central truth, redemption by Christ; there is no reason-

able doubt that the New Testament is to the Old Testament as the mid-day to the earliest dawn. The same is true of immortality, the resurrection, the Holy Spirit, the church; indeed, of almost every important doctrine. Yet, without question, the Old Testament was as really inspired as the New Testament.

It is interesting to study prophetic inspiration with reference to this point. Did the prophets always see with perfect clearness the events which they were directed to predict? When David wrote the 22d Psalm, did he know its bearing on the Messiah? Is it true that the foretold facts were all seen with equal clearness, distinctness and adequacy? Did not the same prophet have some future events revealed to himself more fully than others were? Is it not apparent that to their contemporaries, some of their predictions were more lucid than others? Did John fully comprehend the revelations of Patmos? Are not some of these visions more readily apprehended than others? Any foreseeing of the future is beyond the unaided power of man. He may conjecture, but he cannot see the future, not even one moment ahead. Prophetic vision may be illustrated by the experience of an aeronaut. While on the surface of the earth, his horizon is the same as that of other men. As he rises, however, it is gradually enlarged; but while the prospect widens, he does not see all objects with equal distinctness. So the prophet is lifted above his fellows, above his own natural condition, so that he beholds the distant future; but, in the prospect, some things stand out in bold relief, while others are but dimly seen. All of these acts of prevision disclose unmistakably the effect of divine inspiration; the dim no less really than the clear.

Not only did revelation gradually unfold its disclosures of truth; not only did the same prophet vary in his degrees of inspiration; but it is also manifest that inspired contemporaries were not on the same level. Hosea and Isaiah lived and wrote during the same period of thirty-five years; did they stand upon the same grade of inspiration? How does Paul rank in the scale of inspiration in comparison with his fellow-apostles?

So it will be seen that inspiration is not an elevated table land, whose surface is like a sea level; it is rather a mountain range,

every height of which is far above the contiguous valleys, while some of them are but foot-hills in comparison with others that rise like Mont Blanc.

It may be worth while to remark that, printed with our common English Bibles, are many things which are human and uninspired additions. Without the text, are the names, superscriptions and subscriptions of the several books; the headings of the chapters, the verses and chapters, the dates, marginal references and readings, title pages and tables. In a sense, the marginal readings are a part of the text, as they are alternative translations to the corresponding passages within the text.

Within the text itself are to be found uninspired additions. Some of these are indicated by an ill-chosen mechanical device, the printing of them in italics. In all other books, italics are used to denote the emphatic portions; it was, therefore, quite inconsiderate that they were used for those portions of the English Bible for which there are no corresponding words in the original. Parentheses would have been better in most cases, and the entire omission in the rest.

There are other added words in our ordinary version of the English Bible which are not indicated by any marks. This is due to the fact that our translators thought that they were part of the inspired volume. We know now, however, that they are the interpolations of scribes. The most noted of these passages are the additions to the Lord's Prayer, and the reference to the Trinity, in 1 John v. 7. It is one of the greatest among the marked superior excellences of our revised version, that a loyal, loving criticism has eliminated these additions, so far as they have been assuredly ascertained.

It must also be remembered that the entire English Bible is, in a sense, human and uninspired, because it is a fallible translation from the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek into English; a tongue quite different from the first two, and bearing but a remote affinity to the last. This translation is one of the very best made of any book, and like Luther's, reads more like an original than a version.

Nevertheless it is a translation, made by uninspired men; and, like all man's work, has its mistakes and imperfections.

A final point of discrimination must be made between the divine and the human elements in the Bible; and these as found in its original tongues. The Koran professes to be a word by word direct revelation from God to Mahommed. Mahommed never speaks in it in the first person. It is throughout written upon the presumption that Mahommed has taken it immediately and given it *verbatim* as it came from the mouth of God. The Bible is not so, except as to a comparatively small portion of it. It contains a great deal besides what is the direct utterance of God to the inspired writers.

Simple and manifest as this fact is, it is often overlooked and, indeed, but seldom noticed. It is an interesting and important matter to distinguish and separate this human element from the divine, with which it is often mingled.

1. It is easy to note the sentiments, words and acts of uninspired men and devils, which are quoted or recorded in the sacred volume. From the very beginning and all the way through, we find more or less of these. The sayings and doings of Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, the devil, are given, but surely none of them are to be regarded as inspired. So in the New Testament, in the Gospels and Acts, ordinary men, women, children and the demons are brought before us in their words and deeds. It is manifest that no such passages should be quoted in the settlement of any matter of truth and duty, as though they were the divine rule.

2. There are yet three other classes of expressions to be found in the Bible. The first is the language of the writer of each book, the human author. It is with regard to this that all differences of opinion and contentions as to inspiration arise. Are the words and opinions of the human author to be regarded as certainly and invariably inspired? This question will be answered by each, according to his general view of inspiration. Whatever limitations there may be, whether of language or of thought, to the fact of inspiration must be found here. If it is believed that this part of the Bible is not necessarily nor always inspired, are we to presume that it is so, unless the contrary is manifest; or is the opposite the-

correct rule? Whatever theoretical difficulty we may have in answering this question, there will be found little or none of a practical nature. As has been said, the pure ore of divine truth will be readily distinguished from the human dross with which it may be united. The presumption, doubtless, is in favor of the inspiration of all such expressions. Paul seems to recognize that some of his statements are inspired and others are not. In 1 Cor. vii, he says, "But this I say by way of permission, not of commandment;" "But to the rest, say I, not the Lord;" "Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord; but I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." The proper conclusion doubtless to be drawn from this is that, *prima facie*, the personal utterances of the inspired writer are to be regarded as divine declarations.

3. There can be no trouble as to the two remaining classes of expressions found in the Bible: The language of God and his acts recorded historically as of a third person; and the same addressed to the writer and ordered to be written and proclaimed by him. If any portion of the Scriptures is inspired, surely these are. As instances of the former class, in the first chapter of Genesis, note first a divine act, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" then a divine speech, "And God said, Let there be light." A single instance will be sufficient for the latter, (Exodus iii. 14), "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

All of these elements are found in the Book of Job: 1. The words and acts of Satan, Job, his wife, the three friends and Elihu, comprising probably three-fourths of the book, are manifestly un-inspired, and cannot be used to challenge faith or practice. 2. The expressions of the writer of the book in the historical introduction and conclusion, and in furnishing the connecting links of the main body of the discussion. All this is meagre and comparatively unimportant. No inspiration was needed for this. 3. The acts and words of God in the historical portions. 4. The direct appearance of the Lord himself for the authoritative settlement of the question in dispute, when he answered Job out of the whirl-

wind. These last two classes of passages are without doubt inspired, and are to be held as binding our consciences in their beliefs and acts.

The conclusion reached is, that no one extreme theory is exclusively true; that the Bible is the mind and word of God; that its inspiration is not natural but supernatural; that the Spirit of God selected or revealed its facts and truths, and guided the writers in their expression; that its inspiration is both verbal and plenary, as to every statement which can affect the salvation of the soul; that inspiration had its degrees, and was manifestly progressive; that, on occasions, it used the writer as a mere passive instrument for communication; that a large part of the Bible is a record of the acts and words of common men, which acts and words are neither inspired nor authoritative; that the extent of inspiration is best seen in the light of the purpose of revelation to make known God's design and plan of saving man; that it is the only divinely-inspired book which the world has; and that "we have the word of prophecy made more sure, whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts."

"All flesh is as grass,  
And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass;  
The grass withereth and the flower falleth,  
But the word of the Lord abideth forever."

J. A. QUARLES.

*Lexington, Va.*



### III. THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

In the January number of the *QUARTERLY*, the Fatherhood of God occupies a leading place, being discussed, in a review, by the Rev. Dr. R. A. Webb, of publications on the subject by two Scotch divines, the Rev. Drs. Candlish and Crawford; beside a page from the same pen, among the "Criticisms and Reviews." In his leading article, the reviewer states four ways by which one may acquire the relation of a son. "A son can become such by the following methods alone: by divine creation, by generation, by regeneration, by adoption." Thus the filial relation is conceived as generic, including four several species, each different from the others, with no common characteristic of any significance, except a supposed sonship, of the precise nature or meaning of which we are left ignorant. As the point for which the reviewer contends is that Adam was, by creation, both a servant and a son, it is important that we learn what it is which, superinduced upon the creature relation, constitutes sonship. But Dr. Webb does not state it. As to sonship by adoption, it is the scriptural designation of that grace of God by which, through regeneration, the relation of sons of God is superinduced upon our natural relation to our earthly parents. As here classified, coördinate with regeneration, it is unknown to the sacred writers.

In the Scriptures, the words, father, and son, express (1), The relations which spring out of generation and birth; that is, the propagation of life from a parental source to offspring. (2), The name, father, is once used in the sense of creator. "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" (Mal. ii. 10). Job xxxviii. 28; and Isa. lxiii. 16; and lxiv. 8, are sometimes cited as illustrating the same use of the word; but the places do not justify the reference. In the text from Job, Jehovah, in his expostulation, supposes an imagined father of the rain, as in opposition to his own creative prerogative, "Hath the rain a father?" In the places in Isaiah, neither the history of that people nor the context of the prophet will allow us to imagine that he, in putting

into the lips of Israel the cry, "Thou art our Father," meant to ignore the gracious covenant relations which God had assumed to that people, and to base their plea upon the mere ground of the creative tie. (3), "Jabal was the father of such as dwell in tents and keep cattle," and Jubal "the father of such as handle the harp and organ." (Gen. iv. 20, 21). Here the word has the sense of an author or originator, and instructor. (4), It sometimes signifies a guardian and helper. Job was "a father to the poor." (Job xxix. 16). "A father of the fatherless is God." (Ps. lxxviii. 5). (5), The word, son, is used to express various relations of congenial dependence. The holy angels who shouted for joy at the world's creation are called "sons of God." (Job xxxviii. 7). The disciples of the prophets were "sons of the prophets." The enemies of Christ were seed of the serpent, children of the devil. (6), In a more general sense, the inhabitants of the east are "sons of the east." "A son of beating" was one deserving stripes. Jonah's gourd, which came up in a night and perished in a night, was "a son of a night." Barnabas was "a son of consolation," while James and John were "sons of thunder."

In this enumeration, evidently the first is the primary, literal and proper meaning of the word, father; the others all being metaphorical appropriations of it; each having reference, immediate or remote, to some one or more partial characteristics of the relations between a real father and his offspring. It would seem, moreover, unquestionable, that *fatherhood* is expressive of the whole contents of the word, father, and that it belongs to the primary meaning of the word; and if applied in any other way without explanation, it must result in confusion and misconception.

The positions which Dr. Webb aims to establish, and to which his statement of four modes of sonship is auxiliary, are two: First, That Adam was created at once a servant and a son of God; second, That "the fatherhood of God was completely disrupted by the fall, and vacated of its contents to man, except wrath and indignation, which were emptied upon him without stint." (Surely these are not contents of fatherhood). Again, he says, "While God still has a Father's heart, he is a Father only toward his own

children; and he emphasizes the fact that the non-elect are not his children, but children of the devil."

While we have failed to discover the precise sense in which Dr. Webb uses the words "fatherhood," and "son of God" in this relation, it is enough for the present purpose that they are not designed as having reference to that divine beneficence which is shared by all unfallen intelligences, and which graciously presides over our fallen race and its destinies. It is something special to Adam, something which superinduced the relation of a son upon that of a servant; something the result of a peculiar paternal love toward him. For, says Dr. Webb, "the argument cannot proceed directly from the existence of love in the divine bosom to the relation of God as Father. The nature of the love must first be determined as parental."

Two questions here present themselves. (1), Do the Scriptures which are appealed to in behalf of the first proposition prove it true? (2), What is its bearing on the doctrine of that grace whereby God's people, born of him, become his very children?

After Professor Crawford, Dr. Webb cites three Scriptures, on which he relies to sustain his first position. They are Luke iii. 28-38; Acts xvii. 28; Luke xv. 11-32. The first of these is the genealogy of the Lord Jesus, as given by Luke, which, in our common version, closes with "Adam which was the son of God." Here neither the version of King James nor the Revised version is strictly true to the original, which literally reads, "Jesus being as was supposed the son of Joseph, of Heli, (or 'from Heli,' such is the force of the Greek genitive), from Matthat, . . . from Adam, from God." There is not a syllable in the original to correspond with the clause, "which was the son." The one only word inserted between the successive names in the original is the definite article, which, according to the idiom of the Greek, indicates the names to have been of public knowledge. As though it were written "*the* Heli of the genealogies." Dr. Candlish objects to inserting "the son." The words, he says, "have no right to be in the genealogy at all." In fact, they *are* not in the inspired record. Our reviewer replies to the Scotch divine, "As the words, 'which was of,' are applied to tell the relation between Adam and Seth,

what else can they mean than 'son of'? And the phrase necessarily has this meaning throughout the genealogical table. Why change its meaning when you get back to Adam? Was it impossible for him to have been the son of God by creation?" "The same relation which Seth sustained to Adam, Adam sustained to God, if the genealogical record is to bear its face meaning. If, therefore, it can be affirmed in any proper sense that Adam was the father of Seth, it may be affirmed in the very same sense that God was the father of Adam."

Respecting the scripture in question, there are several things to be taken into account which are entirely ignored by our reviewer.

1. Matthew asserts in terms which admit of but one meaning that "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary." Joseph, therefore, was not the son of Heli; but, if we may accept a statement from the Talmud, which is probable in itself, Mary was the daughter of Heli, so that Joseph was Heli's *son-in-law*. There are, indeed, those who assert the genealogies both to be of Joseph and not of Mary, the latter of whom they say was "probably" the daughter of Jacob, who is by Matthew described as having begotten Joseph the husband of Mary. The fatal alternative upon this theory is that Joseph and Mary were brother and sister, unless the express testimony of Matthew as to Joseph's birth is to be rejected in favor of this "probable" guess as to Mary; or, that we have *no* genealogy of Jesus Christ "after the flesh," at all. With this fact connect another—that Luke, in the very outset of his enumeration, emphasize the distinction between a real son by generation and birth, and one who merely by technical and legal right held the place of a son in the tables of genealogy. "Jesus being, as was *supposed*, the son of Joseph." He would seem thus to intimate that the real is the only proper sense in which he would use the word in that connection. He did not, because he could not, therefore, truly or consistently call Joseph the son of Heli; and thus, the first link as to that relation being broken, the whole chain was disconnected. As through Joseph, the enumeration is the order of succession and not of blood; and the final link, "Adam, which was of God," no more requires the interpolation of the term of relation, "the son," than does the first, "Joseph [the son] of

Heli," whose son he was not—no more than the paramount relation of God as Adam's creator requires us to recognize Adam in the same relation to Seth, as being his creator.

2. The genealogy as given by Matthew is "of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." (Mat. i. 1.) It will hardly be questioned that it is of Jesus that the sonship is postulated in both these cases. *He* was the son of David; *He* the son of Abraham. So, in that of Luke, the structure of the original seems to justify the conclusion that it is not the relation of the successive persons to each other, but their common relation to our Lord, which was had in view by the evangelist; and if we are to allow the insertion of the word son, it is Jesus who in every case is the son spoken of. "Jesus the son of Heli. . . . Jesus the son of God." Certainly it was not the relation of *Adam* to God that occupied the mind of the sacred writer in making this record.

3. The assertion that "if it can be affirmed in any proper sense that Adam was the father of Seth, it may be affirmed, in the very same sense, that God was the father of Adam," certainly needs explanation. I do not find that Adam is anywhere in the Scriptures called the father of Seth. The sense, the only and all-sufficient sense, in which we so speak of him is, that Seth was begotten of him, the fruit of his body. Was God the father of Adam "in the very same sense?"

The next Scripture to which the reviewer appeals is Paul's quotation from the Greek poet, Aratus, "We are his offspring." (Acts xvii. 28.) The Doctor interprets Paul's argument from this place thus: "In him we live and move, and have our being. He is our Father as well as our creator; and we are his offspring. Inasmuch as he is our Father, it is a shame to liken him to images of gold, silver and stone. Therefore, your idolatry is wrong, because it is a degradation of him who is confessedly your own Father." He adds, "The whole argument hinges on the paternity of God." Again: "This quotation meant to the men of Athens, *We are the offspring of Jupiter*; to Paul, *We are the offspring of God*. The two propositions are substantially different, and the *argumentum ad hominem* is inapplicable." If this be so—if to the men of Athens the quotation meant, "We are the offspring of Jupiter,"

how is it that our reviewer himself makes Paul tell them that God "is *confessedly* your own Father?" In fact, however gross the conceptions of the populace of Athens as to their many gods, it is well known that many of the more intelligent and better instructed—such as would constitute the assembly on Mars' Hill—recognized a spiritual Zeus, the supreme author of all things; and such was no doubt the meaning of Aratus in the place quoted. After the full explanation already made by Paul in his discourse, he could but be understood in this higher sense by the Areopagite assembly. His argument, contrasting this conception of God as the infinite Creator of all with the idols of Athens, was altogether adequate to his purpose and intelligible to his audience. It needed no importation into the poet's thought of the idea of God's gracious fatherhood, which was foreign to Greek conceptions, and would not have been understood by his audience. Compare the words of Seneca. "Inevitable necessity bears on all things, human and divine. *He himself, the Founder and Ruler of all, (Ille, ipse, omnium conditor ac rector),* dictated indeed the fates, but complies with them. Forever he obeys. Once, only, he decreed."—*Senecæ De Provid.* v.

Other points are open to remark. But one remains which is conclusive of the question on hand. If the second of Dr. Webb's fundamental propositions is true, if "the fatherhood of God was disrupted by the fall," if "he is a Father only to his children," and "the non-elect are not his children," it was impossible that Paul could have "hinged his whole argument upon the paternity of God." He could not have said, "Idolatry is a degradation of him who is *confessedly* your own Father." God was not the Father of Paul's skeptical audience. The only interpretation consistent with the record is that which understands the language quoted by the apostle in the sense of the pagan poet, expressing the relation of Zeus, the supreme, as the creative author of all things; with no conception of the scriptural ideas of divine tenderness and fatherhood.

The only other scripture to which Dr. Webb refers is the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 11–32). He quotes with approval from Professor Crawford as follows: "It seems to me im-

possible to put any fair or just interpretation on this parable without assuming that general paternity which God as our creator and preserver may be held to sustain toward all men as his intelligent creatures, and recognizing the subsistence of this relation as at once a most serious aggravation of their sins, and a most powerful motive to urge them to repentance." Without entering upon the exegetical questions which here arise, it is enough to point to the fact that "the general paternity," which is here attributed to God "as our Creator and Preserver," must be something altogether different from that which, according to Dr. Webb, was exercised toward Adam in his creation, and which "was disrupted by the fall." The parable cannot, therefore, avail to sustain the position of our divine with reference to the relations between God and Adam in his state of original innocence.

We have now examined each of the Scriptures which are relied on to establish the doctrine of the reviewer. Are we not justified in the conviction that they are wholly insufficient for that purpose?

A remarkable paragraph from the same pen, which occurs in another part of the QUARTERLY (page 127) here arrests attention. In a brief notice of Black's *Fatherhood of God*, Dr. Webb writes thus, "Our author postulates the fatherhood of God as 'the genetic principle' of theology, 'the principle which interprets and adjusts all the facts of the science.' The fall of man, the punishment of sin, the partial salvation of the race,—can a theology with this central principle construe such facts as these? If the fall occurred under a fatherly government, it is a mere calamity, to be pitied and not punished. Are all inflictions but fatherly chastisements? It is a strange father, who can forgive some of his children and not all, where all are alike disobedient." So writes our reviewer, respecting Dr. Black's opinions. But how are the sentiments thus asserted and implied to be harmonized with those which we have just examined? If the former are correct, the fall did not occur "under a fatherly government." If so, Adam was not by creation a son of God.

Several things which suggest remark have been passed by. The question remains, What bearing do the views here examined

have on the gospel doctrine of the new birth? It is this which has inspired the present writing, accomplished during intervals of alleviation of a prostrating disease of three months' standing.

Dr. Webb's fourth argument is thus stated: "In the *regeneration*, we are 'renewed in the whole man after the image of God.' The qualities which are renewed are those that were lost, 'knowledge, righteousness and true holiness.' (Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 24.) It is universally conceded that in regeneration we become the sons of God; but the qualities which are communicated in regeneration, and expanded in sanctification, are 'knowledge, righteousness and true holiness,' or the elements which go to make up the image of God. But Adam was created in the image of God and so possessed these three constituents. Now it is difficult to see why the re-creation of man in the image of God constitutes him a son, while the first creation of him in the very same image constituted him only the servant of God. Why does the *restoration*, in the regeneration of the Spirit, of the lost qualities of knowledge, righteousness and true holiness, evince the regenerate to be sons of God, when the very same qualities given in the first creation of Adam, proved only a servile relation? We cannot answer."

It may savor of arrogance for any one to undertake to solve the difficulties thus arrayed, in view of the closing avowal of the writer. But believing that the Scriptures afford abundant light on the subject, I will make the attempt. (1), In no case does the likeness between parent and child, nor the attributes or qualities which constitute the likeness, *cause* the filial relation, but the reverse. Seth was not the son of Adam because like him, but he was like him, because Adam *begat* Seth "in his own likeness, after his image." (2), Specifically, the moral attributes of knowledge, righteousness and holiness are not the cause of believers being the children of God; but the fact that they are *born* of God. The reasoning, therefore, which, from their case, as a premise, draws the conclusion that the same attributes in Adam made him a son of God, is evidently unsound, and is just as legitimate with reference to all unfallen angels, each of whom is robed in the same "knowledge, righteousness and true holiness." And yet, "are they not all ministering spirits?"—servants, and not sons. (3),



The statement quoted is characterized by a radical and perplexing defect, which, in fact, runs through and vitiates the whole argument of the review. It springs out of the original recognition of four ways of becoming a son. The result is, that while the *words*, "regeneration" and "regenerate" occur repeatedly in the above statement, and the *word* "relation" is freely used throughout the article, the *idea* of that real, peculiar and intimate relation of sonship, which is the necessary product of generation and birth, and can no otherwise exist, is eliminated from the conception. Instead of real *relations*, nothing but *attitudes* and *qualities* remain, to which the terms of fatherhood and sonship are applied. Hence the attempt to reason from the sonship of the renewed, who are begotten and born of God, to the case of the creature Adam. Hence the assertion that "it is difficult to see why the re-creation of man in the image of God constitutes him a son, while the first creation of him in the very same image constituted him only the servant of God."

To solve the problem thus stated, we must inquire first as to the characteristics attributed in the Scriptures to Adam in innocency, and compare the result with the inspired testimonies concerning God's regenerate people.

1. Adam was a *creature*—a product of the creative will and power of God—in this respect undistinguished from all the other creatures, except that he was honored with a special council and decree for his creation.

2. He was endowed with knowledge, righteousness and holiness, after the likeness of his Maker.

3. He was crowned with a royal liberty of will, as to continuing in the righteousness in which he was created, and was, therefore, not in the enjoyment of the indwelling Holy Spirit of God. If this point be questioned, the proof is, that the Bible is silent on the subject; on which, respecting a point so important, it could not have failed to speak had such an endowment been given; and that the possibility of the fall is irreconcilable with the supposition of the indwelling of the Spirit.

As concerning Adam, the above are, we believe, the only points pertinent to the present question of which we have information in

the Scriptures. Respecting God's people recovered from the fall, the testimonies are equally clear.

1. Very signal emphasis is laid on the fact that they are begotten and born of God. (John i. 17; iii. 3, etc., etc.) It will be objected that as in the case of Adam, so regeneration is expressly declared to be a new creation. (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; Eph. ii. 10; iv. 24.) True, with reference to the transformed character of the man, and of his relations to the world around him, he is called "a new creature," "*creation* in Christ Jesus unto good works," to whom "old things have passed away, and all things become new." But when the nature of the change itself is spoken of, it is invariably and emphatically described as a birth. "Ye *must* be born again." "As many as received him, to them gave he the prerogative of becoming the sons of God, . . . which were *born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John iii. 3; i. 17.) Not only is the nature of the change thus described, but upon the essential nature of this birth are predicated the assured sanctification and salvation of the believer, and the riches of glory of his inheritance, as we shall presently see.

Concerning the nature of generation and birth, it is to be considered that the first and normal example in the Scriptures is of the only begotten Son of God. Writing in absence from my library, I avail myself of a casual citation from an old Scotch divine for a definition on this subject. In human generation, "there is a communication of the essence of the begetter to him that is begotten, whereby he that is begotten partakes of the same nature with him that begets. So here, in this eternal and ineffable generation, the Father communicates to the Son the same divine essence which he himself hath; so that the Son is of the same nature or essence with the Father. And as among men the son bears some likeness or similitude of the father, so here the eternal Son is the Father's express and perfect image and similitude, even 'the express image of his person.' (Heb. i. 3.)"—*Wishart's Theologia*, Edinburgh, 1716, p. 754.

Among the creatures, generation is the communication of life from the parent to the offspring, not by the exercise of a creative will on the part of the former, but by a *propagation* of the parental

life to the offspring. It is illustrated in the whole vegetable world, from its lowest to its highest forms. It characterizes the entire animal kingdom, and culminates in man, in whom the added moral element signalizes the intimacy and identity of the tie between parents and children, all fallen and ruined in the fall of the father of all. God *made* Adam in his own holy image. But fallen Adam "*begat* a son in his own likeness, after his image and called his name Seth." (Gen. v. 3.)

The significance of the relation between the eternal generation in the Godhead and these creature generations will be seen, if we reflect that, but for the illustrations presented in the latter, we would have no means of forming the most remote conception of the nature of the former; and that the Spirit of inspiration uniformly uses them as the means of imparting all the knowledge which we possess concerning that inner mystery of the adorable Godhead. We may hence, without hesitation, conclude that the illustration thus found is not accidental,—that man was constituted as he is for the express purpose of illustrating the divine mystery in question; and that this was one of the features of the image and likeness of God which was impressed on Adam in his creation. It is, of course, the fact that the parallels between these two are but distant analogies. But, on the other hand, that those analogies are real, and convey to us just and true conceptions, though limited, of the divine realities, follows from the use made of them by the Spirit of inspiration; unless we are to suppose ourselves mocked by a semblance of revelation which only misleads. As the eternal generation is the connective of an ineffable nearness, unity and love, and of a community of likeness and of Godhead, between those blessed Persons, so the natural generation of the human race, the propagation and derivation of life from parent to child, is the bond and spring, even in our fallen state—how much more, had man remained unfallen—of a sweetness, tenderness and identity of affections and of interests, between parent and child, the necessary result of a realized oneness of nature, life and blood.

Intermediate between those already spoken of, is that generation by which believers become children of God,—that, the neces-

sity of which our Saviour asserts in such emphatic terms. Respecting it the following points are revealed and signally characteristic:

1. Of it the Holy Spirit is the seed. "Ye must be born again; born of the Spirit." (John iii. 3, 5, 6.) He is "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," who dwells in God's people. (Rom. viii. 2, 9, 11.) "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." (1 John iii. 9.) "Born again, not ( $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta$ ) of corruptible seed, but ( $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta$ ) of incorruptible; ( $\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}$ ) by means of the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." The prepositions here discriminate between the efficient cause of grace, the incorruptible seed, the Holy Spirit, and the Word, the instrumental means.

2. Thus life, the life of God, is transfused into the dead soul. "The Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" dwells in us, imparting divine life, so that Paul says, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. ii. 20.) God sent his Son into the world "that we might live through him." (1 John iv. 9.) The language of these and similar statements is brief and simple. Yet how profound the significance! How amazing the grace! Born of *God*. "Made partakers of the divine nature." (2 Peter i. 4.) Indissolubly united to the blessed Godhead by the indwelling in us of the very Spirit of God, and that as a principle of divine life, a bond of union and channel of fellowship with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ! (1 John i. 3.) Where is the creature in the universe of such exalted rank that he may dream of aspiring to the dignity and privilege of the redeemed, enjoyed by virtue of being begotten of God?

3. All the blessings of grace and glory with which believers are endowed spring out of and are inseparably dependent on this divine birth. At the ascension of the Lord Jesus, the Holy Spirit in all his fulness as the agent of grace, was given to him by the Father. (Acts i. 4, 5; ii. 33; John iii. 34.) That Spirit remaining in Christ as his Spirit is by him, in regeneration, shed upon and enters into God's people as the Spirit of life. Thus, "as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one

Spirit are we all baptized into one body, . . . and have been all made to drink one Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.) Thus our regeneration unites us to the Lord Jesus, as "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v. 30.) Hence, to the sonship of regeneration is added part in the closer filial relation of the only begotten Son. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. iv. 6.) "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," who is "the first born among many brethren." (Rom. viii. 17, 29.) Thus, upon the regeneration, by which we are born of God, are suspended all the riches of the glory of the eternal inheritance. "Brethren, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii. 2.) Blessed be God!

Other points present themselves. But these are sufficient. And now we return to the question propounded by the reviewer, "Why the re-creation of man in the image of God constitutes him a son, while the first creation of him in the very same image constituted him only the servant of God." *Answer.*—1, Because the re-creation is much more than a creation. It is, literally and in the profoundest sense, a birth, whereby the life of God is derived to the dead soul of man, and the child of grace is united to the very persons of the Godhead, by a most intimate and indissoluble union. 2, Because the image of God into which the heirs of grace are born unspeakably transcends that in which Adam was created.

On the general subject, our conclusion is, that the phrase, "Fatherhood of God" is properly used in two relations only. In a metaphorical sense, it means that general divine beneficence which comprehended the holy angels in common with Adam in his original estate, and which now graciously presides over the whole human race. Literally and in its proper meaning, it belongs exclusively to the relation which the eternal Father sustains to his eternal Son, and which, through regeneration of the Spirit, and by consequent union with Christ, believers share with him.

SAMUEL J. BAIRD.

#### IV. REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE CHURCH.

To the general principles of church government presented in the October (1890) number of the QUARTERLY, no intelligent Presbyterian will object. To the application of those principles we feel constrained to make an earnest protest. The whole matter at issue may be embraced under two questions: 1st, *Does the authority of the session include the control of the temporal affairs of the church?* and, 2nd, If it does, is its authority *exclusive of all other authority* in the management of these affairs? The deliverance of Presbytery, which was sustained by Synod, answers both in the affirmative, and makes the authority of session absolute and its decision final, except as it may be overruled by the higher courts.

By the answer to the first question, the authority of session is declared to be "exclusive of all other authority in the matter of calling a congregational meeting to consider the temporal affairs of the church." By the second, the board of deacons have no right "to call or have called" such a meeting, "when in their judgment it is expedient to consult the body of the people concerning their temporal affairs." By the third, it is decided that the session has "the abstract authority" "to decide when and what, if any, changes shall be made in the house of worship, or in the method of seating the congregation." But it is added, "it would not be expedient to use the power without consulting the congregation, except in extraordinary cases." The thing that gave rise to these inquiries will illustrate more fully the bearings of this decision. The question of changing somewhat the arrangements of the seats in the house of worship, and also of the abolition of rented pews, had been long agitated in one of the churches. The board of deacons, to whom the management of the temporal affairs of the church had been by long usage committed, requested the session to call a meeting of the congregation to consider and decide these mat-

ters. The session declined to comply, but claimed authority to decide, and did decide, that no change in either should be made. In view of this decision Presbytery was memorialized to decide the questions here propounded.

It will be seen from this that absolute authority is given to the session, not only in the matter of calling the congregation together, but also to decide when and what, if any, change shall be made in the arrangement of seats, and the distribution of pews. It is in effect a positive exclusion of the body of the people from any voice in the arrangement of those affairs in which they are primarily interested, and which depend on their contributions.

In opposition to this decision, we claim that the session, by the constitution of the church, is excluded from the control of its temporal affairs.

First, this is proven by its distinctively spiritual character and functions. This Dr. Vaughan thinks, "spirituality gone to seed," but certainly not so "seedy" as that theory that would exclude the church from all educational work, while her standards require high educational qualifications in her ministers. Yet the same high authorities exclude the one and grasp the other with the utmost tenacity. The principle of *incidency* holds good or fails as the need of the argument requires.

It is argued that this exclusion of the session from control of temporal affairs "is refuted by the absurd alternative of a body altogether outside of the church, necessary to manage the property and income on which the very existence and work of the church depend." (Page 570.) Very strong language follows this, and if the argument were as forcible as the language in which it is clothed it would be unanswerable, but, unfortunately, the doctor is fighting a man of straw, conjured up by his own imagination. We asserted that the congregation was, in its legal aspect, a different body from the church. Perhaps my language was not explicit enough to prevent misconception; nor can I recall the exact wording, but the idea intended was, The church, as such, is not recognized by the state; it can hold no property, nor do trustees appointed by the state hold property for it, but for the congregation. That congregation, as an organized body, may be made up of those

only in full communion with the church, or it may embrace baptized members, but in either case is under the care and discipline of the session. (*Form of Government*, ch. III.; *Rules of Discipline*, ch. II.) The control of the temporal affairs by this body does not, in any sense, throw them into the hands of a body outside of the church and irresponsible, as is asserted, but remits them to the membership as the original body, in which it primarily resides. It gives no shadow of right to such a body as the imagination of our author has conjured up, or commits to the congregation any such outside authority as he asserts.

It is asserted that "the very existence and work of the church" depends on its property and money. How, then, did the church exist in apostolic days? What houses and lands and money did it possess? The church is a living temple—a spiritual house—not a pile of brick, or stone, or wood; nor is it dependent on these for its life or work now.

But in reply to all this elaborate argument, we point to the frequency and emphasis given to the exclusively spiritual character and functions of the church, and the marked absence of everything that looks to temporal affairs, in the Book. It is a "*spiritual commonwealth*," "*ecclesiastical power is wholly spiritual*," its "*sole functions are to proclaim, administer and enforce the laws of Christ revealed in the Scriptures*." The ruling elders, in conjunction with the pastor, are to "*take the oversight of the spiritual interests of a particular church*." What, except in the most remote sense, has, *e. g.*, the arrangement of seats, or the freedom or renting of pews, to do with the spiritual interests? Much less, one would say, than the education of the church's children and candidates.

Second. But again, the claim is proven by the fact that the functions of the session and every court, and of each individual officer, are minutely specified, and are altogether spiritual. The passages are too long to be quoted. See ch. II, sec. 3, p. 11, and secs. 4 and 5, ch. IV., secs. 2 and 3, etc. The reference to any control or management of temporal affairs is conspicuous by its absence, except in connection with the diaconate, to which due attention will be given in the proper order. Now it is a well established principle of law that such minute specifications exclude all other func-



tions, especially and emphatically when of a different nature. Powers not granted by the constitution are withheld, unless necessarily involved in the execution of those given. But how can it be said that the seating of a congregation, or the changes made in a place of worship, are necessarily involved in taking the spiritual oversight of a church?

Third. The control of the session over temporal affairs is forbidden by a fair construction of the Book. Ch. IV., sec. 4, p. 2: "The duties of this office (deacons) especially relate to the care of the poor and the collection and distribution of the offerings of the people for pious uses, *under the direction of the session.*" "To the deacons, also, may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." Our author does some wonderful pleading on the distinction here made, to which due attention will be given. Let it be observed, 1, That the functions of the deacons are spiritual—they have no control of the temporal affairs of the church *ex officio*, but are restricted to "serving tables," which, in its utmost limit, includes the care of the poor, both in spiritual and temporal things, and, therefore, the care of the poor and the collection and distribution of the offerings for pious uses. 2. These spiritual duties are performed "under the direction of the session." The deacons are executive officers having no jurisdiction. But in a separate sentence, clearly marked to distinguish the thing recommended in it from any official function of their office, and also to distinguish it from those functions in the discharge of which they are to act under the direction of the session, it is added—(mark the care of the wording)—"To the deacons also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." As deacons their office requires the serving of tables; as deacons they are under the government and control of the session in their official work. But outside of, and beyond this, it *may be proper also* to commit to them the management of other things not properly included in their official duties, to-wit, the management of the temporal affairs. Could anything be more plain than that the management of these affairs does not belong to the office of deacon, and that the church in adopting this language intended to exclude the session from control of these things, and

from the direction of the deacons in its management? It seems impossible to construe the language in any other way.

Our author denies our interpretation, 1, On the ground that it cannot be supposed that the kingdom of Christ should have no revenue officer or laws. Admit it, and what then? Does it follow that these laws and offices relate to the temporal affairs contemplated in the book? To assume this is assuming the whole matter at issue. 2, He asserts that a financial officer was appointed (admitted), and then proceeds to say; "a distinction is taken in the standards between funds for pious uses" and "the temporal affairs of the church," *the essential propriety of which is seriously open to question* for the following reasons: First, the distinction is not taken in the New Testament; second, the distinction is repelled by the very nature of the case, for, as far as "temporal affairs" mean money and other property consecrated to religious purposes, they are identical with "funds" or offerings "for pious uses," and a "distinction taken between them is inept." This argument, if sound, might be a good one for altering the phraseology of the Book, but as against our position, is a bald begging the question. It and the argument that follows on pages 584-5, is simply an effort to prove that *may be* means *is*, or that the recommendation or permission to do a thing is not only authority to do it, but a declaration that the thing that may properly be done is already done. He attempts to sustain this by a strange assertion. "There are no formal grants (under the Christian commonwealth) specifying all the positive powers and marking the limitations upon them. A grant was made of one function of office, under which all the functions of office were carried. Thus the teaching elder was empowered directly to preach the gospel, *but he received no direct commission to teach the law;*" and again "the ministry received no positive commission to administer the sacraments; but as these are instruments of teaching by symbol, the commission to teach carried this exclusive function to the great teaching office."

To me these statements are simply astounding, especially as coming from one so accurate as this writer. What does the great commission mean, when it commands not only to preach the gospel, but *baptize* and to teach *all things whatsoever I have com-*

*manded*; or what is meant by the command, This do in remembrance of me, till I come; or Paul's declaration in 1 Cor. xi.?

The whole argument in this is intended to prove that the interpretation that the church has given to the functions of the deacon is false, and that the distinction that the constitution draws between offerings for "pious uses" and "the temporal affairs of the church" is groundless. But even if this were true (which we deny), it remains that the *distinction is made* and made by the church in adopting this constitution, and is, therefore, the law under which the church lives and works.

He proceeds further to offer an explanation "why the 'temporal affairs' were not assigned to them (the deacons) with equal decision and on the same grounds." It is sufficient for our purpose that they were not so assigned, and that a broadly-marked distinction is drawn between the two things—that the one class is performed by the deacons *ex officio*, and under the direction of the session; that the other class *may be properly* committed to them, and are not to be managed under the direction of the session. It remains only to ask: From whom do the deacons derive their authority to manage these temporal affairs? The book is profoundly silent upon this question. This one sentence, twice inserted, is the only allusion made to temporal affairs; but the silence is significant, proving that the government of the church is "exclusively spiritual." The authority is manifestly to be derived from the body of the people, as the original source of all power, and as the legal owners of the property to be managed. Changes can only be made in a house of worship with their money. The whole revenue of the church depends upon their contributions, and it is not only right and just that they should be consulted about the methods of raising it and its expenditure, but it cannot be raised except by their free consent. If, then, they have, by positive law, or by established usage, committed this management to the deacons, the deacons have the undoubted right to call, or have called, a meeting of the congregation, to consider these temporal affairs, whenever, in their judgment, it is expedient to consult them. The deacons are responsible to the congregation for the proper management of property and application of money, if they have been entrusted

with the management. As a matter of courtesy, it is advisable to have all congregational meetings called by the session; as a matter of right, whoever has the management of the temporal affairs of the church, has the authority to call their constituents together whenever the questions before them are of such importance as to require consultation. Other objections are made to this view, on the ground that it multiplies classes of officers and sets aside the headship of Christ. The argument here rests on the assumption that the "management of the temporal affairs of the church" is one of the functions of the diaconate, committed to it by Christ, and therefore the committing of it to the deacons is a multiplication of offices. We may be very obtuse, but fail to see the force of the argument. We do not fail to see, however, that in this, as in the whole argument, there is the assumption that the church is wrong in her judgment of the functions of the deacon, and that it is only by *assuming* this that such an argument is possible. If it be conceded that the deacon is the financial officer of the church, and also that part of his functions is to "manage temporal affairs," then the whole argument of the doctor would be impregnable; but this is just what we deny, and what, in our judgment, the constitution of the church denies, and, therefore, the argument of the doctor fails. It is a perpetual reasoning in a circle. And, with due courtesy, we think he goes seven times round Robin Hood's barn and never gets into it.

There is another aspect of the question that demands brief notice. We think the gist of the questions proposed to Presbytery is overlooked in this discussion. The first question is, "Is the authority of the session *exclusive of all other authority*" in the matter stated? Admitting the primary right of the session to order all congregational meetings, our contention is that this primary right *is not exclusive of all other authority*, but is itself subject to the control of the original body from which they derive all authority—the people. This will be made plain by reference to the book in the only reference made to the calling of such meetings. In the election of officers and the dissolution of the pastoral relation—the only cases specifically provided for—"public notice must be given by the session that the church is to convene

at the usual place of public worship for such purpose. *And it shall always be the duty of the session to convene them when requested by a majority of the persons entitled to vote.*" Here comes in a power back of and superior to the session, that may compel it to act even in opposition to its own convictions of expediency. The authority of the session is not therefore *exclusive of the people's authority*, but subject to it, and we think by necessary inference, not exclusive of the authority of the deacons when the management of the temporal affairs has been committed to them, and when they are unwilling to assume responsibility for these affairs without consulting their constituents. The argument of Daniel Webster, as quoted, might seem to conflict with this view, but with due deference to such high authority in civil affairs, we submit that the analogy halts fatally for this argument. It is always hazardous to argue from the principles of civil to those of ecclesiastical law, and in this case, though the analogy seems perfect, yet at one point it fails. If the legislators in the civil commonwealth refuse to carry out the will of the people, only a short time will intervene before they can choose others who will do it; but in the church the offices are perpetual. There is, indeed, an appeal to the higher courts, but even these may fail to give a remedy; and, as a last resort, if the elders have become unacceptable by reason of this failure, they may be retired from office; but the provisions for this are so complicated and involve so much that is distasteful that the retiring of the majority of the session is utterly impracticable, or, if possible, would be only after such delay as might be ruinous to the church. It is doubtful whether the power to depose or retire an elder furnishes any possible relief. The session is the only body authorized to dissolve the relation of an elder to the church; but if the session persists in proceedings that make them unacceptable to the people, the only remedy would be for them to depose themselves, or a majority of them, which is rather an improbable issue.

This will appear as an extreme case, one rarely met in the practical working of the church; but it is "extreme cases that prove principles," and such cases have occurred, in which the session ignored the wishes of the people, and their power was that

of an irresponsible oligarchy. Now, if it be possible that such things may occur, in the two specific cases provided for in the book, how much more in such as are not provided for, and in which absolute authority is left in the hands of the session.

The case becomes still more palpably wrong when the answer to the third question is considered. It imperils all the rights of the congregation. The session might order the sale of the property, the building of a house, any changes in the property it might desire and see fit to order, and direct its executive officers to carry out their will. If its authority is supreme, as the argument of the author asserts, they possess all authority necessary to accomplish their purpose, and can command the money. (See Dr. Vaughan's argument, page 569.) The right to command implies the duty to obey; and so everything rests in the hands of the session. Disobedience to lawful authority subjects to discipline, and the same authority that can prevent the action of the people in one case can compel it in the other. This is representative government "gone to seed," truly. Abstractly the session has a right to do these things, concretely it would be a very unwise and impolitic thing to attempt them, so says the Presbytery and the venerable Synod. We are tempted by the thought of what is involved in this abstract authority, to reiterate some of the vigorous language of the article reviewed, but forbear to speak evil of dignitaries, or bring railing accusation against any, but console ourselves with the thought, that "all synods and councils, since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many times have erred, and therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both."

D. C. IRWIN.

## V. THE ROYAL TEACHING PREACHER.

We will not at this time pause to discuss the questions of the authorship and design of the Book of Ecclesiastes. We are willing to accept the traditional view, and attribute it to the great name with which it has usually and for many ages been associated. Adopting this view, we may well say that Ecclesiastes is a most remarkable book, written by a most remarkable man, in a most remarkable age, among a most remarkable people. David had founded a great kingdom on the western Mediterranean with his capital at Jerusalem, extending from the Euphrates to Egypt. Syria and Edom and Arabia yielded him uncounted tribute. The Phœnicians were his commercial allies. The commerce of Persia and Africa and India passed across his kingdom, and the caravan trade of all Central Asia poured its riches into the lap of Judah and Israel. Egypt, and Babylon, and the Hittites, the three powers of the East which held the balance of power and disputed with each other the empire of the world for a thousand years, were in eclipse for a season, beaten small by internal dissensions and external foes. David's kingdom stood forth among the nations as the only great and glorious kingdom on earth for eighty years. He and his people saw universal empire in easy grasp, and he numbered the people and mobilized the entire military strength of his kingdom to this end. But his hand was stayed and his plans were blasted by the plague from the Lord.

He had a mission of conquest, but not with the sword. He had a promise of universal empire for himself and his seed, and the time seemed opportune.

Solomon came to the throne with the arts of peace. It was necessary to consolidate the kingdom with commerce and culture, with learning and religion. His mission was to consecrate the civilization of his day. It was no mean civilization. There is no place for fashionable hypotheses of barbaric and semi-barbaric codes and customs in that day. Agnosticism itself now begins to concede the substantial truth of the world-wide tradition of a golden

age in the earlier times. The deeper the archæologist explores into those old civilizations, the more profound is his astonishment at the records. At Jerusalem gold and silver were multiplied as the stones in the streets. Art and architecture, tapestry and needlework, stonecutting and metallurgy, tillage and vine-dressing reached the very climax of excellence.

That people had a mission—a God-given mission—first proclaimed to Abraham ten centuries before, “I will bless them that bless thee and curse them that curse thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

The kingdom was unique, with Jehovah, the Second Person of the Trinity, as the civil head of the commonwealth, himself appointed to be universal king. The time seemed opportune to bless all nations of the earth and to prepare the nations for the coming of David’s son, in whom the covenant should be completely fulfilled. Only a viceroy was needed with the requisite endowments.

Plato’s ideal commonwealth was now, if ever, to be realized. Mentor’s ideal kingdom, so beautifully unfolded to Telemachus, his royal pupil, seemed about to have a realization, of which Mentor nor Apollo ever dreamed.

Solomon was raised up and equipped with wisdom—wisdom to rule, an “understanding heart to judge the people,” to “discern between good and evil.” And because he chose this, the Lord said, “I have given thee a wise and understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither shall any arise after thee like unto thee. And I have also given thee that which thou hast not asked, both riches and honor; so that there shall not be any among the kings like unto thee all thy days.”

His wisdom was all-embracing for acquisition of knowledge, and equally effective for imparting the same to admiring pupils. All forms of learning and wisdom and knowledge met in him. He was a *poet*, for his songs were a thousand and five; he was a *philosopher*, for he spake three thousand proverbs; he was a *preacher*, and the pulpits of all ages discuss his themes; he was a *scientist*, comprehending the whole range of natural history; a *botanist* and a *dendrologist*, for “he spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even to the hyssop that springeth out of



the wall"; he was a *zoölogist* and an *ornithologist*, an *entomologist* and an *ichthyologist*, for "he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes;" and, withal, he was a *teacher*, for he "*spake*" of all these things, "and there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth which had heard of his wisdom."

Nor did he stand alone, for there was wisdom in the "children of the east country" and in "Egypt." He had peers, though not his proper equals, in "Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalchol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol." Could we find such a man to-day, and plant him at one of our great centres of travel, commerce, or education, we would have a great university, to which learned professors and eager pupils alike would flock, and wealth would pour unstinted offerings at her feet; so there, kings and queens were his pupils. The queen of Sheba, herself the wisest among women, "came to prove him with hard questions," and "she communed with him of all that was in her heart," and "Solomon told her all her questions; there was not anything hid from the king which he told her not;" and her voluntary *tuition* offering was "an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones."

Yet his kingdom failed. Alas, alas! Solomon was but a man; his head reeled and turned in the very zenith of his glory; he grew dizzy in those heights; wealth and luxury did their corrupting work for himself and his people. His very wisdom became a snare, and both his wisdom and his power were prostituted to ignoble aims. Lust and sin marred his work and cut off his opportunity.

We have not the heart to unfold the story of his polygamy, idolatry, covetousness, and oppressions, fitly ending in the decay of his kingdom and the secession of ten tribes to Jeroboam, and the centuries of decay and cursing, of which he himself sowed the seeds amid regal splendor.

The Book of Ecclesiastes recounts his experiences of life. He drank at every fountain of mere human good. He tells the story fairly; he tells the story honestly; he tells it sadly, almost bitterly. "Vanity of vanities," you read in the opening; "Vanity of van-

ities," as the story progresses; "Vanity of vanities," "all is vanity," is the echoing wail at the close.

He exhausted every category in search of the *summum bonum*. Let us trace some of his experiments.

1. He sought it in *wisdom* and *knowledge*. (i. 16-18.) "I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem; yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge. And I gave my heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly; I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit. For in much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."

2. He sought it in *riches* and in the *pleasures which they afford*. (ii. 4-11.) "I made me great works; I builded me houses; I planted me vineyards; I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruits. I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees; I got me servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house; also I had possession of great and small cattle above all that were in Jerusalem before me; I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of kings and the provinces; I got me men-singers and women-singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts. And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them; I withheld not my heart from any joy. And behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun."

3. He then sought refuge in a *materialistic* and *epicurean philosophy*. He unified man and beast into one category. (iii. 19-22.) "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preëminence above a beast: for all is vanity." "All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." "Who knoweth the spirit of a man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit of a beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?" "Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better, than that a man should rejoice in his own works; for that is his portion: for who shall bring him to

see what shall be after him?" "Then I communed with mirth, because a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat and to drink, and to be merry." So said the rich fool in the parable, so said they in Isaiah's day, and so in Corinth, and so to-day, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

4. He also *stumbled at the inequalities of Providence* in this life. (vii. 15.) "All things have I seen in the days of my vanity: there is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness." Also (viii. 14), "There is a vanity which is done on the earth; that there be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again, there be wicked men, to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous: I said this also is vanity." And out of it all he argued a shallow expediency and a colorless mediocrity. "Be not righteous overmuch; neither make thyself overwise; why shouldest thou destroy thyself? Be not overmuch wicked, neither be thou foolish; why shouldest thou die before thy time?"

5. He tried *fatalism* and *skepticism*, the unfailing refuge of the sensualist. (ix. 11, 12.) "I returned and saw under the sun that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all. For man also knoweth not his time; as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare; so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falleth suddenly upon them."

"All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." "A living dog is better than a dead lion." "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy are now perished." "There is no work, nor device, nor wisdom, nor knowledge, in the grave whither thou goest."

Oh! the blank despair offered alike by fatalism and skepticism. Your soul cannot rest in it; no more could his. Such a creed is worse than vanity. The soul recoils from its hopeless blank of

nothingness. A certain annihilation were a sweet refuge compared to it.

6. Therefore, forsaking all these, he sought the chief good in *official* and *professional activity*. (xii. 9, 10.) "Moreover, because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; he sought out and set in order many proverbs, he gave good heed." Yea! "the preacher sought to find out acceptable words; and that which was written was upright, even words of truth." How he magnifies his office as *teacher*, *preacher* (?) and *author*! "The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd."

But alas, this, the highest of all callings, is not man's chief good. Oh! how pathetic is his lament, as he adds, "And further, my son, by these be admonished; of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh." What does he mean? Does he disparage his wisdom, and his authorship, and his teaching? Does he discourage academic and scientific learning, or put any slight upon the honors which scholastic ambition craves and wins? We think not. These things are not the chief good—the sum of all one's endeavor and the goal of all one's ambition.

The royal teacher of Israel has *one more lesson*, and that is but the conclusion of all the rest. The whole of his argument culminates in this, and the trend of his logic is to exclude all else but this. He differentiates all else but this. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter, Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Or, as the Revised Version has it, "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard," etc. He states it in proverbial and aphoristic form, the condensed experience of a life-time of observation and experiment, carrying with it all the self-evidencing power of an axiom; and he hurls it at his class with all the power and precision with which his father David handled his weapons of war. 'Tis the last lesson. 'Tis also the first lesson; (Prov. i. 7), "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Proverbs ix. 10 reiterates the same. Psalm cxi. 10, "A good understanding have all they that keep his commandments." This is the "whole of man." You talk of

manliness; why, 'tis godliness. The restoration of God's image is true manhood. All else but this is folly, mere emptiness and vanity, a "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

Was not this your first lesson at your mother's knee, when she taught you to fold your hands in prayer? the first lesson in the catechism? "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." 'Tis the inspiration of the Christian educator, and the very genius of the Christian school. Literature, science, and philosophy have their place, not supreme, but ancillary to true wisdom. Education should be the handmaid of religion. Unsacred secular learning is a delusion and a snare. Daily prayers, Sunday Bible classes and church attendance, throughout childhood, youth, and academic life find their explanation here. Even secular associations, colleges and universities dare not neglect them wholly. The study of the Bible, which is rapidly becoming a universal text-book, seeks to unify all sound learning, and is but the emphasizing of this lesson. What other nucleus will one find about which all his heart and life may crystallize?

But, why such a failure as Solomon, the wise man so unwise? Was he a failure? Was Job a failure as he sat in the ashes, stripped and speechless? God has given notable solutions of the great problems of the ages. Job in the ashes vindicated the righteous against the slanderer for all time. Solomon also: "Who will show us any good?" is the despairing cry of the ages. *He* exhausted the problem. He only, of all men, ever had the opportunity, and we may accept his testimony. This testimony is ample for all times and conditions. Call you a hundred witnesses, each a preëminent votary of his own cherished pursuit, and what can they add to this testimony? "Fear God and keep his commandments." This is personal religion, active service, heart service. Here meet faith and obedience. The preacher does not argue its importance. Nor will we.

He fastens and clinches the nail with one word, *judgment*. "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." (xi. 9.) "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart and in

the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." The judgment is the supreme test of all things—the day of doom. Then let us settle every question in the light of the judgment—every question of pleasure, of ambition, of calling, of duty, and of service. Nor dare we forget that in the judgment "we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

J. B. SHEARER.

*Davidson College, North Carolina.*

## VI. THE INFLUENCE OF THE SCOTCH-IRISH PEOPLE UPON THE FORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE science of government is a study full of interest from every standpoint of investigation. The nature and genius of a government cannot be correctly understood without a clear apprehension of the several elements which enter into the formation of the governmental structure. There are always antecedents of a marked and pronounced character which lead up to every great historical epoch, and these great events of human history must be carefully studied in the light of these antecedents, if they are to be properly understood.

The formation of the Government of the United States is the grandest and most distinguished achievement of human history. It has no parallel in any age or century. It is the outgrowth of principles which had to work their way through long periods of suffering and conflict. The logical and regulative structure of the principles of our government into an instrument, which we call our constitution, was the result of but a few months' labor; the principles themselves, however, had been struggling through martyrdom and blood for many generations.

To understand the government of the United States, the genius and character of the people who settled the several colonies must be carefully studied. Its most distinguishing feature is, that it is a government framed by the people for the people. It is their own conception of the best form of government to secure personal right and liberty.

In the present paper we propose to review the influence which the Scotch-Irish people exerted in various ways in the formation of our government. The inhabitants of the colonies up to 1776 were almost entirely an English-speaking people, coming from England, Scotland, and Ireland. The French Huguenot was not a large element in the settlement of the country, but it was a most important one. There was also a noble

body of settlers from Holland. These different classes of people all have an honorable part, worthy of themselves, in forming the government of our country.

When the government of the United States came into existence, as the voice of the people speaking through thirteen sovereign States, the world stood amazed at the daring and brilliant conception. Tyranny and oppression received a fatal blow in that glorious day, and human liberty found a permanent home in the hearts of three millions of American citizens. Many were the prophecies of its speedy downfall, but with the first century of its history it has taken the first place among the nations of the world. The principles of this government are no longer a matter of experiment, but, as a distinguished writer has said, "they are believed to disclose and display the type of institutions toward which, as by a law of fate, the rest of civilized mankind are forced to move, some with swifter, others with slower, but all with unhesitating feet."<sup>1</sup>

The causes which led to the formation of the American Government were foreign to the people of the colonies. They did not willingly break allegiance with the mother country. It was the oppressive measures of the British Crown which forced them to declare their independence and construct a new government, if they would be freemen. But the birthday of constitutional liberty had come. A mysterious Providence had prepared a people, through long years of suffering and trial, for the glorious heritage, and had held in reserve a magnificent continent for their abiding place. The era of 1776 was not within the range of human conceptions or forecast, but there was above and behind it all a Divine Mind, bringing forward the day with all its stupendous revelations.

In considering the history of any people, it is a serious defect to leave out of view their religious conceptions, as expressed in their formulas of faith. Religion of necessity is the most powerful factor in the direction of human life. Mr. Carlyle has well said, "a man's religion is the chief fact with regard to him."<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> Brice's *American Commonwealth*, Vol. I., p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Carlyle's *Heroes*, p. 4.



a Christian land, with an open Bible, this is preëminently true. With the American colonies, religious liberty was a question of not less vital importance than that of civil liberty. Their religious faith had a most powerful influence in forming their character, and they intended to be untrammelled in its exercise. From New Hampshire to Georgia they were Calvinists of the most pronounced type. Calvinism was their religious creed, and out of it sprung their political principles. This had been the creed of their ancestors from the days of the Reformation. It had stood the test of fire and sword for more than two hundred years. The principles of that wonderful system had permeated their whole being. It gave them intellectual strength and vigor. It intensified to the highest degree their individuality. It developed that integrity and force of character which no blandishments or persecutions could break down. He who puts a light estimate upon Calvinism knows little of its principles, and he knows little of the struggles which brave Calvinists have made in many lands for freedom. Motley speaks correctly when he says, "Holland, England and America owe their liberties to Calvinists." Ranke, the great German historian, as well as D'Aubigne, says, "Calvin was the true founder of the American government." Hume, Macaulay, Buckle, Froude, and Lecky, all affirm that it was the stern, unflinching courage of the Calvinistic Puritan that won the priceless heritage of English liberty. Scotland can never estimate what she owes to John Knox, the fearless embodiment of Calvinism in church and state. Mr. Bancroft makes the statement conspicuous, that it was the Calvinistic faith of the American colonies, which prompted them to resist the oppressions of the British Crown, and maintain the desperate struggle with unflinching courage until the glorious victory was achieved.

The distinguishing feature of Calvinism as a theology is its representative character, holding that sin and guilt are the result of representation in Adam, and that redemption is the result of representation in Christ. The logical outworking of such a theology is a representative government, both in church and state. Calvinism is the chief corner-stone of the American republic.

It was the religious faith of the colonies that made them what

they were, and no adequate conception of their resistance to oppression, or their struggle for freedom, can be had, if this fact is left out of view. The settlers of the American colonies were worthy sons of noble sires. Their ancestors in the plantations of Ulster, in Scotland, in England, in Holland, and in France, had learned from their Calvinistic faith that resistance to tyranny was service to God. Calvinism is sometimes looked upon as a stern and severe religious faith; still, it is the faith that has produced the grandest men and women the world has ever known. This is the faith which breasted for centuries the most terrible conflicts and trials and sufferings, to secure for us the glorious heritage of constitutional liberty. Of these heroes, Mr. Froude has well said: "They were splintered and torn, but they ever bore an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence, or melt before enervating temptation."<sup>1</sup>

In the memorable revolution of 1776, when the American colonies combined to form a government of their own, the Scotch-Irish people, who formed a large part of the settlers of the central and southern colonies, bore a conspicuous part. In speaking of the Scotch-Irish people as transplanted from Ulster, in Ireland, to America, we have found it impossible to separate the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish. They are really one people. During the persecutions in Ireland, thousands of the people were forced to return to Scotland, and at a later date many of them emigrated to America. Often parts of the same families in Scotland and Ireland would join each other in the colonies. This is true of the Livingstons, the Hamiltons, the Wilsons, the Witherspoons, the Randolphs, the Grahams, and others. There is still another mixture in the veins of the Scotch-Irish people; many of them are known to be of Huguenot ancestry. The Caldwelles, the Dunlaps, the Brysons, the Duffields, the Pickens, the Sumpters, and others, came from France to Scotland, thence to Ireland, and thence to America.

In estimating the influence of the Scotch-Irish in the formation of the government of the United States, two questions may be

---

<sup>1</sup>Aberdeen Address.

asked, "What was their religious creed, and what were their political ideas?" Their religious faith was Calvinism. In church government they were Presbyterians; in state government they were Republicans. These three ideas make Scotch-Irish men what they are. Always and everywhere they are the fearless and unflinching advocates of liberty, the determined and unfaltering foes of oppression. They are by nature a bold, courageous, and aggressive people.

At the time of the American Revolution the Scotch-Irish people must have formed near one-third of the entire population of the colonies. The tide of emigration became strong in the early part of the eighteenth century. As early as 1725 a large body of this people had settled in almost every colony. From this time onward, for a period of more than forty years, the steady flow of this people to the American colonies was something amazing. For many years there were never less than 12,000 landed annually at the different ports of the country; and for the two years after the Antrim evictions it is estimated the numbers ran up to 30,000 or more. They settled generally in the central and southern colonies. Some 20,000 or more, however, settled along the coast from Boston to the mouth of the Kennebec. This distribution of the Scotch-Irish over the whole country made it possible for them to exert a most powerful influence, when the occasion should arise. So soon as they were settled down in their new homes, they organized themselves into churches and presbyteries, (for they were Presbyterians), and in 1717 a general synod was formed. By 1770 this delegated synod was the most powerful religious organization in the country. Indeed, it was the only organization which embraced all the colonies. The ministry were an able body of men, graduates of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Many of the elders were graduates of these institutions. This General Synod, with delegates coming from almost every colony, met every year under a written constitution, which they had adopted. This compact organization of able men, coming together annually as delegates from the territory of the several colonies, for a period of more than fifty years, was certainly a most powerful agency in preparing the way for a congress

of all the colonies, when the occasion should arise. This General Synod of the Presbyterian Church, which was the only representative body of the whole country, was very obnoxious to the British Crown, and the governors of the larger colonies were instructed to remonstrate against its assembling. But these Presbyterians knew their rights and had the courage to maintain them. In May, 1775, this General Synod of the Presbyterian Church met in Philadelphia, side by side with the Colonial Congress. It was a critical period. The Congress seemed to hesitate what to do. The Presbyterian Synod, made up of Scotch-Irish, bravely and courageously met the issue. The famous "Pastoral Letter" was issued by that body to their churches scattered throughout the colonies, urging them to maintain the union which then subsisted between the colonies, to adhere to the resolutions of the Congress, and to make earnest prayer to God for guidance in all measures looking to the defence of the country. This powerful letter was scattered broadcast among the people, and a copy was sent to the legislature of every colony. The people were everywhere aroused to the profound significance of the crisis which was upon them. This Philadelphia Synod, and their circular letter, are referred to by Adolpus in his work on the "Reign of George the Third," as the chief cause which led the colonies to determine on resistance. The Scotch-Irish people, by their annual synod, assembling for fifty or sixty years, manifestly prepared the way for the *union of the colonies in a colonial congress*, so that they might jointly inaugurate measures to protect their common interests. In that distinguished body, which assembled in 1774, men of Scotch-Irish blood held an honorable place. There were the Livingstons of New York, John Sullivan of New Hampshire, Dickenson and McKean of Pennsylvania, Patrick Henry of Virginia, and the Rutledges of South Carolina, and others: men whose ability and culture would adorn any position.

This union of the colonies enabled them to realize their power and strength. They petitioned the Crown and Parliament for a redress of their wrongs. But their petitions were unheeded. The conflict was inevitable. On the 4th of July, 1776, the memorable Declaration of Independence was made, and the bold announce-

ment went forth to the world that the American colonies intended to be a free and independent people. The grandest hour of human history had come! The heaven-born principles of constitutional liberty had found a home in the breasts of three millions of people; and a continent—the very paradise of the earth—was to be the permanent resting place! The history of that immortal day is ever full of thrilling interest to the sons of liberty. The Continental Congress fully realized the tremendous issues involved in that declaration. Behind them were the throbbing hearts of a united people, awaiting with intense anxiety for the deed to be done. It was an hour that was to mark the grandest epoch in human history. What a scene was there! On the table, in the presence of that able body of statesmen, lay the charter of human freedom, its clear-cut utterances flinging defiance in the face of oppression, and proclaiming to the world that America was henceforth the asylum of freemen. It was an hour when strong men trembled. But the anxious silence was broken when the venerable Dr. Witherspoon, in whose veins flowed the best blood of our race, arose and uttered the thrilling words, “To hesitate at this moment is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning by every pen in this house. He that will not respond to its accents and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of freeman. Whatever I may have of property or reputation is staked on the issue of this contest; and, although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather that they descend hither by the hand of the executioner than desert at this crisis the sacred cause of my country.”<sup>1</sup>

These burning words from one of the most distinguished leaders of the Congress carried the matter to a triumphant conclusion; the Declaration of Independence was signed, and the foundation of the American government was laid.

This action of Congress was hailed with universal rejoicing by the people, although they knew full well it would involve them in a terrible and bloody conflict with the British crown.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterians and the Revolution*, p. 166.

As to the influences which foreshadowed this memorable event, it cannot be said it was wholly brought about by any single cause; but the historical writers who speak of this period are free to say that a large proportion of the great leaders who influenced the colonies to take this decisive step were men of Scotch-Irish blood. "Patrick Henry, of Virginia," said Mr. Jefferson, "was far ahead of us all; he led the way, and the people from the seaboard to the mountains were aroused to action by his burning words." David Caldwell, Ephraim Brevard, Alexander Craighead, and James Hall, with their worthy associates, had the people of North Carolina educated far in advance of the Colonial Congress, as the famous Mecklenburg Declaration illustrated. The two Rutledges, the eloquent Tennant, and others, kindled the patriotic fires in South Carolina. Duffield, Wilson, Smith, and Thomas Craighead, with their noble associates, prepared the people of Pennsylvania for the coming conflict. The action of the citizens of Westmoreland and Cumberland counties, with that of Hanna's town, in May, 1776, told what fearless patriotism the burning words of these courageous leaders had enkindled. The people of New Jersey, under the teaching of Dr. Witherspoon, were ready and impatiently waiting for the hour. Read and McKean were the brave leaders in Delaware. Smith, Rodgers and Livingston, with their famous "Whig Club," controlled the sentiment of New York. Thornton and Sullivan were leaders of the people of New Hampshire, and already had their forces fighting in the field. These all were Scotch-Irishmen, leading and forming public opinion everywhere. The governors of the central and southern colonies were not far wrong when they informed the home government that the Presbyterian, or Scotch-Irish, clergy were to blame for bringing about the revolution, and that it was their fiery zeal which instigated the people to resistance. That the Scotch-Irish clergy exerted a most powerful influence upon the people, by their constant and faithful instruction in the principles of religious and civil liberty, is unquestionably true. How could it be otherwise? On the walls of their homes hung the "National Covenants" of Scotland, which many of their ancestors had signed with their blood. These famous and historic covenants form the rugged and storm-

beaten back-ground on which came out the glorious Declaration of American Independence. The brave, thrilling words of that immortal instrument tell what important lessons the author had learned from his maternal ancestry. Ephraim Brevard and Thomas Jefferson wrote alike. They drank at the same fountain. They had the same instructor. It can be said without fear of challenge, that Scotch-Irish blood flows through every principle written in the Declaration which forms the foundation of American liberty.

It is a common statement of history, that the clergy of the colonies were in advance of any other class in urging resistance to the oppressive legislation of the mother country. The Scotch-Irish clergy being dissenters, were untrammelled, and bravely did they speak out in defense of their country's right. The published sermons of that day show how ably the ministry labored to form a public opinion that would stand up against every form of tyranny and despotism.

At that period no single agency in the country had such tremendous power as the pulpit. The ministry were universally a highly educated class. They were Calvinists in their creed, and they had learned their principles of liberty from the Word of God. They put the issue upon the highest ground. They taught the people that resistance to tyrants was a duty to God. Their courageous words led the people irresistibly onwards. "Arm for freedom's cause; appeal to the God of battles, and go forward," was their thrilling appeal, sweeping through all the land. Gloriously was their work accomplished when Independence Bell rang out the dawn of freedom's day.

The public declaration of the colonies, that they had severed their allegiance to the British crown, all understood must bring on a fierce and bitter war. Indeed, Washington, with his armies, was already in the field, and the battle had begun. Rapidly the colonies transformed themselves into sovereign States, and, taking the reins of government into their own hands, elected their own legislatures and governors. That seven of the first governors of the thirteen States should be men of Scotch-Irish blood is an honored tribute to that noble race. This proud distinction indicates

the high estimate in which this people were held at the very beginning of the American Revolution. In the long-protracted war waged by England to recover her revolted colonies, the Scotch-Irish people bore a prominent and honorable part. A large number of the most distinguished officers of the army, of every rank, were of this people. Knox, Wayne, Montgomery, Sullivan, Mercer, Starke, Morgan, Davidson, and many others, were conspicuous for their heroic deeds and efficient services on many battle-fields. In the earlier days of the Revolution occurred the famous battle of Saratoga, in which the entire British army was captured. This decisive victory, defeating the well-conceived strategic movement to cut the colonies in twain, has been justly regarded as the great turning point in American affairs, and, as a leading English historian says, "changing the whole current of future history."<sup>1</sup>

It was this important event which secured the alliance of France, the recognition of Spain and Holland, besides bringing to the surface a favorable sentiment in England. Two brave Scotch-Irish officers, Colonel Morgan and Colonel Starke, contributed largely, if not chiefly, to this result. Knowing the importance of checking the invasion from Canada, under Burgoyne, General Washington organized a regiment of picked riflemen, placed it in command of Colonel Morgan, and dispatched it to the support of General Gates. On the morning of the 7th of October, 1777, the two armies met for a decisive struggle. Colonel Morgan commanded the left wing of the American forces, being confronted by General Frazer, with the flower of the British army. After fighting had continued fiercely for several hours, Frazer fell, by the deadly aim of Morgan's riflemen, and, seeing their commander borne from the field, the whole British line gave way, and the great battle of the war was won. Colonel Starke, who had already defeated a strong force at Bennington, seized the fords of the Hudson, thereby compelling the surrender of the entire British army. The whole country was electrified by the victory, and the daring bravery of Morgan and Starke was universally applauded.

During the prosecution of the war, the settlements in Western

---

<sup>1</sup> Creasy's *Fifteen Decisive Battles*, p. 376.



Pennsylvania and Virginia, and the new settlements in Kentucky, were continually threatened and imperilled by Indian raids, sent out by English officers from the line of forts between the Lakes and the Mississippi river. Colonel Roger Clarke, a brave, daring Scotch-Irishman, conceived the idea of organizing a secret force to capture these dangerous out-posts. He unfolded his bold conception to Governor Henry, of Virginia, and obtained a commission to collect a body of trusty riflemen and such supplies as might be needed. He selected men of his own race, hardy, courageous and true. They went forth upon their daring mission, determined to succeed or perish in the attempt. The expedition was a brilliant success. Governor Hamilton, with his line of forts, was surprised and captured. The broad sweep of country from the Ohio to the Lakes was conquered, and it was the magnificent contribution of a few brave Scotch-Irishmen to the government of the United States.

When the British generals, after a number of manœuvres and various engagements, failed to dislodge General Washington from his strong position in the hill region of New Jersey, they turned their attention to the southern part of the country. Lord Cornwallis was in command, and advancing northward from Charleston, he met and defeated the colonial forces under General Gates, at Camden, which virtually gave him control of South Carolina. He then advanced his position to Charlotte and Salisbury, North Carolina, his purpose being to pass rapidly through that State to the southern part of Virginia. Suddenly, however, a strong body of Scotch-Irishmen from the valleys of the Watauga and the Holston, under the leadership of Campbell, Shelby and Sevier, joined by Williams and Cleaveland, of South Carolina, appeared upon the field. They were a bold, fearless body of riflemen. Gloom, distress, and almost despair, had settled upon the southern colonies. Cornwallis had reported to the British government that the whole southern country was subjugated. In a few days came the battle of King's Mountain. Ferguson was killed, and the entire command was captured. It was a Scotch-Irishmen's battle, made at their own suggestion, when they heard the enemy were advancing into the up-country. Hope and courage revived everywhere.

The South-land was the home of the Scotch-Irish, and they were prompt and ready to defend it at every cost. This brilliant victory proved to be the turning point of the war in the South, and it was really the beginning of the end. Three months later, and only a few miles from the same place, General Morgan, the hero of Saratoga, fought the famous battle of the Cow-pens, completely routing Tarleton's entire command, and inflicting a most disastrous blow upon the British army.

This brilliant victory of General Morgan and his Scotch-Irish troops thrilled the whole country with rejoicing. General Davidson, of North Carolina, wrote that the victory "gladdened every countenance, and paved the way for the salvation of the country." The State of Virginia voted General Morgan a horse and a sword in testimony of the "highest esteem of his country for his military character and abilities so gloriously displayed." Congress placed on record the "most lively sense of approbation of the conduct of General Morgan and the men and officers under his command,"<sup>1</sup> also voting him a gold medal, inscribing upon it the terse, but complimentary, words, "*Virtus unita valet*"—"United virtue prevails." Of the effect of this signal victory upon the country, Lord Cornwallis wrote to General Clinton, the commander-in-chief of the British forces in America, "It is impossible to foresee all the consequences that this unexpected and extraordinary event may produce." "As the defeat of Ferguson at King's Mountain, made to Cornwallis the first invasion of North Carolina impossible, so Tarleton foresaw that the battle of Cow-pens would make the second disastrous." These two decisive victories, won by the heroic valor and patriotism of men of Scotch-Irish blood, foreshadowed the coming surrender of Yorktown. It was the hour when the fatal hand-writing came out upon the wall, pointing England to the inevitable result. In her folly, she had sown to the wind; in her bitterness she must reap the whirlwind.

Mr. Bancroft, the cultured historian of the American Revolution, in referring to this last distinguished service which General Morgan rendered to his country, sums up his career in this forcible language: "Appointed by Congress at the outbreak of hos-

---

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft's *History of the United States*, Vol. V., p. 484.

tilities a captain of provincials, he raised a body of riflemen and marched from the Valley of Virginia to Boston in twenty-one days. He commanded the van in the fearful march through the wilderness to Canada. Thrice he led a forlorn hope before Quebec. To him belongs the chief glory of the first great engagement with Burgoyne's army, and he shared in all that followed till the surrender: and now he had won at the Cowpens the most astonishing victory of the war. Forced into retirement by ill health brought on by exposure, he took with him the praises of all the army and of the chief civil representatives of the country. He was at the time the ablest commander of light troops in the world. In no European army of that day were there troops like those that he trained. The corps under him so partook of his spirit, that they were fashioned into one life, one energy, and one action."<sup>1</sup>

In reviewing the different influences which worked jointly and so successfully to the achievement of American Independence we are persuaded that the American clergy have not yet received at the hands of an enlightened public sentiment that tribute of recognition and praise to which their distinguished services so justly entitle them. Mr. Headley, in his attractive little volume *The Chaplains and Clergy of the American Revolution*, has done something to vindicative the memory of these noble and godly men, who stood bravely up for their country's right in that perilous day.

He begins his little work with these significant words: "Notwithstanding the numberless books that have been written on the American Revolution, there is one feature of it which has been overlooked. I mean the religious element. In this respect there is not a single history of that great struggle which is not so radically defective as to render the charge against it of incompleteness a valid one. And he who forgets or underestimates the moral forces that uphold or bear on a great struggle lacks the chief qualities of a historian."<sup>2</sup> In speaking of the American clergy on the present occasion, and the part they bore in the great struggle

---

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft's *History of the United States*, Vol. V., pp. 488, 480.

<sup>2</sup> Headley's *Chaplains of the American Revolution*, pp. 13, 14.

of the Revolution, we are restricted, of course, to those who belong to the Scotch-Irish race. The ministers who were of this blood were almost without exception Presbyterians, and without exception, too, they were staunch supporters of the cause of American liberty. Having urged resistance to the unjust legislation of the British Crown, they were not wanting in the hour when the conflict came. Being men of liberal culture and thoroughly conversant with the issues involved in the struggle, it is not surprising that their influence was great among the people. No class of men did so much to fire the popular heart with a determined spirit of resistance.

Craighead, McWhirter, Hall, Tennant, and others were sent into different sections of the country to arouse and stir the people to action in the great crisis. Many of them raised companies and regiments, and courageously led them in battle. Many were chaplains in the army, and when reverses and depression came, it was their stirring appeals which kept the patriotic fires burning, and awakened fresh courage for a renewed struggle. They served in almost every capacity. They were in legislatures, in State conventions, on councils of safety, in all positions which required wisdom, vigor, and decision. Washington knew the value of these distinguished men as counsellors. Witherspoon, Rodgers, McWhirter, Caldwell, and Duffield were often in conference with him in the darkest days of the Revolution. He knew he had their sympathies, and he had respect for their judgment. He sometimes risked important movements on their information about places, persons and surroundings, and they never failed him.

Dr. Witherspoon, of Princeton, was one of the most conspicuous characters of this period. He served in the Continental Congress for a number of years, and it was conceded that he had no superior in that distinguished body. He was a member of every important committee, and his influence was recognized as a most potent factor in guiding the government safely through that stormy period.

Tennant, of Charleston, was the close associate of the Rutledges, the Pinckneys, Drayton, and Gadsden: they knew his strength, and sought his counsel. He was a member of the State con-

vention, and it was his powerful influence with the people which aroused them from their lethargy when brave men feared all was lost.

Turning to New Jersey, we find the Rev. James Caldwell the popular idol of the State. As chaplain of the First Brigade he kept the enthusiasm of the troops to the highest pitch. When reverses came, his resolute spirit rose with the hour. He flung despondency to the winds, giving encouragement to all by his cheering words. When the supplies of the army were running short and all efforts to secure them were unavailing, he was induced to accept the position of assistant commissary-general. Such was his indomitable energy and his personal favor with all classes, he soon had the army amply supplied. To him the general officers looked continuously for reliable information about the enemy. He seemed ubiquitous, and nothing could escape his keen penetrating scrutiny. Washington esteemed his service invaluable. The invading force could keep nothing concealed from his incessant watchfulness. His own vigorous enthusiasm he imparted to the people everywhere. He seemed by intuition to know the plans of the enemy, and so often did he thwart their plans and purposes in their inception that a large price was offered for his capture. On one occasion he ventured to his home, aiming to get his family out of the way of the frequent raids of the enemy; apprised of his coming, the Hessian troopers made an effort to capture him, but failing in their designs, they murdered his wife in presence of her children, firing the manse over them, and only the prompt efforts of neighbors saved the little children and the dead body of the mother from the flames. It was a fearful blow to the husband and father. His sufferings seemed, however, if possible, to give him greater influence with the army and the people. The best families of the State asked the privilege of caring for his motherless children. Lafayette adopted one of his sons, and gave him the love and opportunities of his princely home. His trials increased, rather than relaxed, his energies in the varied offices in which he served. When the battle came he was always with the soldiers in the thickest of the fight. On one occasion, in a hot engagement at the village of Springfield, he discovered the fire of one of the companies slackened for want of wadding; he quickly

rushed into a Presbyterian church near by, gathered an armful of Watts' hymn books, distributed them along the line, and said, "Now put Watts into them, boys." With a laugh and a cheer they rammed the charges home, and gave the British Watts with a will.

The upper part of New Jersey being a strong strategic position, General Washington kept a strong force there continuously, and the important service of Mr. Caldwell, until the day he fell by the hand of an assassin, it would be impossible to overstate. "He was a man of unwearied activity and wonderful powers. Feelings of the most glowing piety and the most fervent patriotism occupied his bosom at the same time, without interfering with each other. He was one day preaching to the battalion; the next, providing ways and means for their support; and the next, marching with them in battle; if defeated, assisting in the most efficient way to conduct their retreat; if victorious, offering their united thanksgiving to God, and the next day carrying the consolations of the gospel to some afflicted or dying parishioner."<sup>1</sup>

Would that time would permit the mention of other clergymen, Evans, Rogers, Allen, Kerr, Cummins, David Caldwell, Patillo, Alexander Craighead, all belonging to this patriotic race, who wrought with great power and efficiency in the struggle for American Independence.

When a careful review is made of the powerful and influential causes, which led to the successful achievement of our national rights and liberties, we are persuaded no single influence will stand out with greater prominence than that of the American clergy.

We have spoken of statesmen, of warriors, of clergymen, of battle-fields, and victories, that give honor and renown to the Scotch-Irish name. All, however, has not been said. There is another chapter of our history, which can never be forgotten, and over it may be placed the bold head-lines: *The power behind the throne, that is greater than the throne itself.*

What shall be said of the women of the Scotch-Irish blood?

---

<sup>1</sup> Headley's *Chaplains of the American Revolution*, pp. 217, 230, 231.

Glorious women are they! They suffered; they endured; they toiled; they struggled; they encouraged; they prayed; they comforted; they were wounded; they were sabered; they were murdered; they died like heroes; they were faithful to their country; they were faithful to their sires, their husbands, and their sons. They have made Scotch-Irishmen the best blood of the world!

In this presentation of the important and distinguished part taken by the Scotch-Irish in bringing the struggle for American Independence to a successful issue, we would express the highest admiration for the illustrious part borne by others in securing this common heritage.

In the first great crisis of the Revolution, when the sacred cause of our liberties seemed to tremble in the balance, men of Scotch-Irish blood threw themselves into the breach, and struck a blow that made Saratoga immortal. At a later period, when the enemy had overrun the Southland and were proudly boasting the end was near, the brave sons of Ulster gave a lesson in the science of war at King's Mountain, at the Cowpens, and at Guilford Courthouse, which taught the British crown that not a foot of American soil had been conquered, after all the seven years' warfare. And when the "articles of peace" were signed, the western boundaries of the United States were lifted from the top of the Alleghanies to the banks of the Mississippi, and because a handful of daring Scotch-Irishmen had said with their rifles, "It must be so."

And still another word must be written, which reflects imperishable honor upon the noble character of this people. In the dark days of Valley Forge, when Washington was sorely tried, and his spirit heavily burdened, when men in the Congress and in the army, who should have held up his hands, were combining to accomplish his removal, thanks to the God of the brave! no Scotch-Irishman ever laid the weight of a feather upon the troubled heart of his country's chieftain. Everywhere, in the Congress, in the army, in the gloomiest days of the Revolution, this patriotic people stood by their great commander until he returned his commission into the hands of those who gave it, with its sacred trust gloriously accomplished.

And in after days, when times of peace had come, and Virginia

was prompted to give to General Washington a testimonial of her appreciation of his distinguished services, he received it; but turning to the Scotch-Irishmen of the Valley of Virginia, who had stood by him in his darkest hours, he presented the entire donation to them for their "Liberty Hall," that their sons might be educated in the principles of their noble sires.

When the great Revolution of 1776 was brought to a successful termination, and the British government recognized the independence of the United States, the American people found themselves confronted with a profound problem, full of difficulties and dangers. A better organized and more efficient government must be constructed, while the eyes of the nations are looking upon the bold venture with intense concern. The outside pressure of a common enemy being removed, the thirteen colonies felt for the first time the full meaning of their individual independence and sovereignty. The experience of a few years very clearly demonstrated that the "Articles of Confederation" were not sufficient as a bond of government between the States. The army had been disbanded, Congress was powerless to execute its regulations, and sectional jealousies were rife. It was a critical period, and strong men trembled as they looked into the future. But behind the cloud the hand of an all-wise Providence was steadily guiding the destinies of the American people. On the 14th of May, 1787, a convention of all the States was assembled in Philadelphia, to construct a better and more satisfactory government, which should effectually secure to the people their rights and liberties, and create a stronger bond of union. It was a sublime spectacle, the like of which had never filled any page of human history. The convention was a body of great and disinterested men, who fully realized the difficult and responsible task before them. Mr Curtis, in his able work on the Constitution, says, "There were men in that assembly, whom for genius of statesmanship, and for profound speculation in all that relates to the science of government, the world has never seen overmatched."<sup>1</sup>

Washington was unanimously made the President of the Convention, a position scarcely less important than that of commander

---

<sup>1</sup> *Curtis on the Constitution*, Vol. I., p. 387.



of the American armies. In accepting the position, he addressed a few words to the delegates with great candor and solemnity, urging integrity in the work before them, and closed with the impressive utterance: "The event is in the hands of God." The deliberations of the convention were continued consecutively until the 17th of September, a period of about four months, when that immortal instrument, the Constitution of the United States, was concluded, adopted, and sent to the several States for their ratification. The members were awe-struck at the result of their counsels—the Constitution was a nobler work than any one of them had believed it possible to devise. After a century's history we see the wonderful wisdom with which they builded. Mr. Gladstone, the great English statesman, speaking of the American Constitution, says, that it is "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Mr. Alexander Stephens, one of the profoundest writers on the American Government, speaking of the framers of the Constitution, refers to them as "the ablest body of jurists, legislators, and statesmen that has ever assembled on the continent of America." The constitution formed at this period is often spoken of as a compromise measure. This is true only in a certain sense. All were agreed that the new general government must have granted such powers as will give it efficiency and support; all else must be reserved to the States. The distribution and linking together in the best regulated form of these several powers were matters of compromise. In working out this difficult problem of constitutional government for the American people, men of Scotch-Irish blood bore a distinguished part, for they were well and ably represented in that body of intellectual giants. Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson and John Rutledge were of this people, and they were three of the most conspicuous leaders in the convention, their extraordinary abilities all lying in different directions. After an elaborate discussion of the principal matters which were in some way to be embodied in the constitution, Mr. Rutledge was appointed chairman of a committee of five to make the first draft of this wonderful instrument.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bancroft, speaking of this

---

<sup>1</sup> *Elliot's Debates*, pp. 216, 217.

important committee, the majority of which were of Scotch-Irish ancestry, takes occasion to say of Mr. Rutledge,<sup>1</sup> "that he was the foremost statesman of his time south of Virginia. He was the pride of his State, and always looked to whenever the aspect of affairs was the gravest. In the darkest hours he was intrepid, hopeful, inventive of resources, and resolute, so that timidity and wavering disappeared before him."<sup>2</sup> Patrick Henry pronounced him the most eloquent man in the Congress of 1774. The logical structure and frame-work of the Constitution is, in large degree, the work of Mr. Rutledge, giving immortal honor to his name and race. When shortly afterward the Constitution was before the State Convention of Pennsylvania for adoption,<sup>3</sup> Mr. Wilson, being a member of the body, made the most powerful and comprehensive analysis of its principles and powers that has ever yet been heard. It was Mr. Hamilton's brilliant abilities that won over New York to the adoption of the Constitution. The endorsement of Rutledge carried the matter before the convention of South Carolina.

Mr. Madison, who took such an active part in the construction of the Constitution, and was so closely allied with Mr. Hamilton in securing its adoption by the country, has been sometimes denominated a Scotch-Irishman by faith. He was most thoroughly imbued with the ideas and opinions of this people. To quote Mr. Bancroft again, he speaks repeatedly of Mr. Madison as being a thorough disciple of Dr. Witherspoon of Princeton, by whom he was educated. He is an illustration of the fact that the teacher sometimes reappears with conspicuous power in his pupil. Mr. Madison is not the only student who came away from Princeton having his whole being permeated by the instructions received from the master spirit presiding there. The profound principles of civil and religious liberty could almost be felt in the atmosphere of Princeton.

In April, 1789, the government of the United States was organized, and Washington, for the third time, was called to take the headship of the affairs of his country; and when Chancellor

<sup>1</sup> *Bancroft's History U. S.*, Vol. VI., p. 274.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Elliot's Debates*, Vol. II., pp., 418-529, inclusive.

Livingston administered the oath of office, and cried, "Long live George Washington, President of the United States," the earth shook with loud huzzas, and there flashed through the heavens the words of the Hebrew prophet, that "A nation shall be born at once." In that auspicious hour the principles of constitutional liberty lifted up their gorgeous structure to the gaze of an astounded world, and Freedom, putting aside her battle-rent garments, was peacefully wedded to the hearts of three millions of American freemen. It was a glorious day, full of thrilling interest and radiant with anticipations for the future; and yet there lurked in many hearts a tinge of anxiety, lest all might not go well, as the new "ship of state" loosed from her moorings.

But he whose hand was upon the helm chose wisely his counsellors. Mr. Jefferson was chosen Secretary of State; Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury; Henry Knox, Secretary of War; Randolph of Virginia, Attorney-General. Rutledge, Wilson, Blair and Iredell were appointed Associate Justices for the Supreme Court. Distinguished sons were they all of that noble race who, by their courageous lives for their country and their God, have made Scotland and Ireland famous forever.

On the assembling of the first Congress, in April, 1789, under the new Constitution, it was found that a large number of the States had proposed a series of amendments, and the first of these was to the effect that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion." The separation of Church and State is universally regarded as one of the most remarkable features of the government of the United States. This great triumph in favor of religious liberty was not secured without a fierce struggle. Some maintained the Christian religion should have the protection and support of the State. Others held to the conviction that the Protestant religion, in some of its forms, should be established by law. So soon as the separate colonies began organizing independent State governments, it was evident this question would have to be met.

In October, 1776, the Scotch-Irish people of Virginia brought this question in a clear, distinct issue before the Legislature of Virginia, in an able memorial to that body from the Presbytery

of Hanover. The paper had been prepared with care, and went straight to the mark. It produced a profound impression. It was the first meeting of the legislature as an independent State, and many foresaw that religious establishment was doomed. In April, 1777; May, 1784, October, 1784, and August, 1785, this Presbytery of Hanover presented additional memorials of great ability on the same subject. Mr. Jefferson, in 1779, presented to the legislature his famous bill, establishing religious freedom. It was a bold enunciation of a grand principle, important to Church and State alike. In what way the author reached his wonderful conclusions, he has not intimated. He had before him, however, the able memorials of the Hanover Presbytery, which discussed the whole question in the most exhaustive manner. On the 16th of January, 1786, the bill became a law, and the victory for religious freedom was won. Mr. Madison advocated the bill in a speech of great ability, and when it was passed, he said, "in Virginia was extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind."<sup>1</sup>

"The principle on which religious liberty was settled in Virginia prevailed at once in Maryland. In every other State oppressive statutes concerning religion fell into disuse, and were gradually repealed. This statute of Virginia, translated into French and Italian, was widely circulated through Europe."<sup>2</sup>

The demand on the first Congress for an amendment, prohibiting any establishment of religion, was a result brought about by the protracted and fierce struggle in the Virginia legislature. To the Scotch-Irish people is due the distinguished honor of engrafting the profound principle into the government of the United States, *free Church within a free State*.

As far back as 1729 they demanded that all expressions in the constitution of their church, referring to the exercise of powers by the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical affairs, should be stricken out. And when the colonies threw off their allegiance to the British crown, they raised the question at once, that religion should not be established by the state in any form, leaving every one free to worship the Divine Being in any manner or way he choose.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft's *History United States*, Vol. 6, p. 158. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

It was a glorious achievement, and it seems impossible to realize the magnitude of the blessings which it conveys.

In estimating the influence of the Scotch-Irish race in the formation of the government of the United States, there can be but one conclusion arrived at by a careful study of the history of that period, and that is, that it was paramount to any other.

At the beginning of the American Revolution the blood of this race had a far wider distribution in this country than is generally supposed. Intermarriage gave a rapid intermingling with other classes of people, and when events began to foreshadow the formation of a new government by the colonies, well nigh half the population had this blood flowing through their veins. As a class, this people were very largely Presbyterians in their religious opinions, and thereby they became embodied into a compact and powerful organization, giving tremendous force and intensity to their influence. On the great questions of the day they were virtually an organized unit, converged into a burning focus, and it is not surprising that their influence was felt everywhere, giving form and character to public opinion on all these issues. Their ecclesiastical government extended into most, if not all, of the colonies, and their assemblies, coming together year by year, taught the lesson and exhibited the advantages of a strong organized unity. Far across the waters the British Crown and Parliament saw what must be the inevitable out-working of these Presbyterian Synods. It was very manifest this powerful ecclesiastical organization was rapidly educating the public mind to see the great benefits to be derived from a compact political body in resisting all encroachments upon their civil liberties. The Scotch-Irish people thoroughly understood the advantages of their Presbyterian system, and the disjointed elements of the Revolutionary period felt and recognized its unifying power. There can be no question as to the fact that the American commonwealth is the outgrowth of that Presbyterian polity, which was so thoroughly interwoven into the lives and convictions of the people who constructed it. If there was any one thing more obnoxious than another to the Stuarts and the Georges, who sat upon the British throne, it was Pres-

byterianism. To them it was the embodiment of all that was dangerous to the high prerogatives of kings. It was a fierce lion in the way, when royal authority disregarded the rights and liberties of the people.

No people have ever enjoyed to a greater extent the blessings of constitutional liberty than have the people of this country; but it must not be forgotten that this blessed heritage cannot become a permanent possession, if the principles which underlie the American government are allowed to slip from the mind. It is still true that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The success of the government of the United States has immeasurably overleaped the boundaries anticipated by those who laid its foundations with a trusting but trembling hand. The principles which were ready for the using came to their hands battle-scarred with the conflicts of centuries, but never yet had they been built up into a great constitutional government, guaranteeing to millions of freemen their rights and liberties under law. This grand and immortal work was accomplished by our fathers, and blessed be their memories to the latest generation.

It is a surprising fact that no elaborate and exhaustive work has yet been written upon the American government, although it is the great wonder of the nations. The works of Mr. Curtis, Mr. Frothingham, and Professor Johnston, while useful and attractive, are mainly historical. The learned work of Judge Story has the nature of a legal interpretation of the constitution as the fundamental law of the land. By far the ablest and most comprehensive treatise on the constitution and government of the United States is written by Mr. Calhoun. No man gave more profound thought to the principles and genius of the government of this country, and it is greatly to be regretted he did not live to revise his work for publication himself. DeTocqueville, the eminent French statesman and political philosopher, in his *Democracy in America*, has produced a very able work on American government and institutions. He has shown a very keen and philosophic preception of the varied characteristics of the government, and its workings with the people. He saw, as by intuition, the deep rootings of some of its fundamental principles, as is seen in the following utterances:

“The most profound and capacious minds of Rome and Greece were never able to reach the idea, at once so general and so simple, of the common likeness of men and of the common birthright of each to freedom”; he also said, “The advent of Jesus Christ upon earth was required to teach that all the members of the human race are by nature equal and alike.”<sup>1</sup>

The American government is generally believed to be a legitimate outgrowth of the English government in its general features, only such changes being made as were required to give it a republican form. That the constitution and the government of the United State owe much to “Magna Charta” and the “Bill of Rights” is certainly true, but the profound principles of this wonderful structure are much older than this. They have the strength and vigor of centuries, and find their first announcement from Mount Sinai, where the great Hebrew commonwealth was framed and given to the Hebrew people as a direct revelation from God himself. That was the only civil government which the Divine Being has ever formed for the human family. He gave the Ten Commandments as a written constitution and gave, besides, a code of specific laws to govern the daily life. It was a perfect government,—needed no amendments; nothing was to be repealed, nothing was to be added. The people immediately organized under it, and all went well. The Hebrews had a population of about two millions; the American people had about the same. The Hebrews were divided into twelve tribes, each with a definite territory and a specific government. The Americans were divided into thirteen tribes or colonies, each with a definite territory and a specific government. The twelve tribes formed a federal government, known as the Hebrew commonwealth; the thirteen colonies formed a federal government, known as the American commonwealth. These are the only two governments in human history which came into existence at once, and under a written constitution. They are the two best governments the race has ever enjoyed. Moses was the first head of the one; Washington was the first head of the other, and the Divine Being the recognized Head and Author of both. It would seem that there is

---

<sup>1</sup> DeTocqueville's *Democracy in America*, Vol. II., p. 15.

here something more than similarity. The principles which enter into the structure of the one, enter into the structure of the other. They are both republics.

This wonderful Hebrew commonwealth was located by the Divine Being at the confluence of three continents, and was set upon a hill to be the light of the world for all time. The nations which came in contact with the Hebrews borrowed from them in many things. Gale, in his celebrated work, *The Court of the Gentiles*, shows conclusively how liberally the Greeks borrowed from Moses, both as to laws and philosophy. Solon and Plato were evidently conversant with the writings of Moses.

The Twelve Tables of the Romans were confessedly borrowed from the Grecian legislation. Both ancient and modern writers of Roman history state that the individuals commissioned by the senate and tribunes to form the Twelve Tables were directed to examine the laws of Athens and the Grecian cities. Such a procedure was but natural, that the written laws of older nations should be examined in framing a new code of laws for the Roman government. Sismondi, in his *History of the Fall of the Roman Empire*, mentions the fact, that "when Alfred the Great ordered a re-publication of the Saxon laws, he had inserted several laws taken from the Judaical ritual into his statutes." The same author states "that one of the first acts of the clergy under Pepin and Charlemagne of France, was to introduce into the legislation of the Franks several of the Mosaic laws found in the books of the Pentateuch." The learned Michaelis, Professor of Law in the University of Göttingen, remarks, "that a man who considers laws philosophically—who would survey them with the eye of a Montesquieu—would never overlook the laws of Moses." The able historian, Millman, in his *History of the Jews*, speaking of Moses and the wide acquaintance with his writings among other nations, affirms, "that the Hebrew law-giver has exercised a more extensive and permanent influence over the destinies of mankind than any other individual in the annals of the world." That the succeeding ages, as well as those that were contemporaneous, were deeply indebted to Mosaic institutions, is unquestionably true. Moses himself foresaw this, and labored to impress the thought



upon his countrymen, as a powerful motive for the careful observance of their institutions. "Keep them, therefore," said he, "and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear of all these statutes and say, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.'" The distinguished writers of every country, who have written elaborately of the fundamental laws of society, which secure individual rights and protect the personal interest of all parties, refer, almost without exception, to the Hebrew government and its institutions as the original source of all such laws. Beyond all question, the Hebrew commonwealth is the background out of which has been brought the greatest and most perfect human structure the world has ever seen—the *American commonwealth*.

The American people obtained their ideas of liberty and right directly from the Word of God; they knew there was no mistake in the teaching, and this made them courageous and determined in the struggle for their liberties.

The framers of the American government often in their writings speak of the natural right which belongs to all men, and were possibly unconscious of the sources of the great idea. Gratian, the distinguished Puritan writer, in defining natural right, says, "He termeth it that which the books of the Law and the Gospel do contain." The people who founded the government of the United States were thoroughly conversant with the Word of God, and they thoroughly understood its infallible teachings as to the rights of men. The Bible is the original and true foundation of our American government. People in other lands have made this important discovery; Montesquieu has said, "Christianity is a stranger to despotic power;" De Tocqueville, another brilliant and instructive writer, says of the religion of the gospel, "It is the companion of liberty in all its battles and all its conflicts; the cradle of its infancy, and the divine source of its claims."

The people of Scotch-Irish blood, who wielded such a powerful influence in the formation of the government of the United States, were a people whose lives and being were permeated with the teachings of the Word of God. From that divine source they gathered the profound principles of civil and religious liberty,

which they were determined to assert and maintain at any and every cost. The blessings and privileges which are enjoyed under the administration of the constitutional government of our country teach in a most conspicuous way the value of the principles which enter into its structure. But when it is seen that these principles of human right and liberty are grounded in the word of God; that they are in reality a direct revelation from the divine mind, they take on a value and measure of excellence which can only be measured by the purposes of the great God himself.

With what watchfulness and care should the citadel of American liberties be guarded. Here, in this heaven favored land, shines the light, the glorious light, of constitutional liberty, which is to lighten the world.

Never, never to the latest day, can America forget the precious blood of Ulster's sons. In the conflict for freedom they were conspicuous for unfaltering fidelity, and indomitable courage. In that critical hour when a constitutional government was to be formed, the genius and spirit of this wonderful people led the way, and when the amazing structure was complete, Providence wrote the words upon the pages of human history that Scotch-Irish men had come to America for such a time as this.

*Huntsville, Ala.*

J. H. BRYSON.

## VII. NOTES.

---

### AN ANALYSIS OF THE APOCALYPSE OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The Lord Jesus Christ gave two systematic prophecies called apocalypses. Each covers the entire history of his church, from the beginning of his own coming to the end of the world.

The first was given in the hearing of probably all his disciples, but the other was given only to the apostle John, and about half a century after the first.

The first, too, is very brief as compared with the second, yet the more salient outlines of the conflict of the church with the world are drawn in the boldest colors.

The first is recorded in the three synoptic Gospels, whose writers give it mainly in chapter xxiv. 4-31 of Matthew; xiii. 5-27 of Mark, and xxi. 8-28 of Luke; but in Matthew x. 16-23; xxiv. 32-41, and Luke xvii. 20-37, special features are given.

In proceeding to an analysis and the outline of an interpretation of this apocalypse we shall not pass upon it in textual criticism. The Lord himself gave a key to both apocalypses in the words of the angel to the Apostle John (Rev. xix. 10). "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." By this we understand that the reciprocal relations of Jesus, while his flesh was upon the earth, with the world, and the exercise of his entire ministry up to his resurrection and ascension, were a type or shadow of the career of his church with respect to the world, to the end of time.

Taking the apocalypse of Matthew, chapter xxiv., and noticing wherein the other synoptists differ from his account, we find that it was given in answer to three questions which Jesus' disciples asked him after that he had told them of the temple, how that there should not be left one stone of it upon another that should not be thrown down. They asked him, "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world." (Matthew xxiv. 3.) Neither Mark nor Luke records the last two questions, yet the answers of Jesus imply them, as in Matthew, and show the reciprocal relation of their subjects.

The last question, "what shall be the sign of the end of the world?" was the first to be answered. "Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying I am Christ, and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled, for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows."

"Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted and shall kill you, and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and *then shall the end come.*" (Matt. xxiv. 4-14.)

Mark's record (chapter xiii. 5-13) is similar to this, except that there is added in verse 11, "But when they shall lead, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye, for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Luke's account (chapter xxi. 8-19) is similar to these, adding only, in verse 8, "the time draweth near," and verse 19, "In your patience possess ye your souls."

Now all this is an apocalypse of itself, covering the entire Christian era to the end of the world. In all three synoptics the record has special reference to the end of the world.

The forces that were then at work would continue until the end, and they are the key to the prophecy. There is announced, first, the reign of anti-Christ, with the warning to beware. Secondly, we have the commotions of the sinful world. Then, thirdly, the bitter and universal persecution of the church by the world is prophesied. But, fourthly, the faithful are assured of the presence with them of the Spirit of power, and of their final salvation.

With all this, the gospel would be preached in all the world, and "then shall the end come."

Jesus then replied directly to the leading question, as in Matthew xxiv. 15-22: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desola-

tion spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth let him understand), then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains; let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house, neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day. For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

Mark's record, chapter xiii. 14-20, is essentially the same as the above; but Luke's, while omitting the injunction to flee when Jerusalem should be destroyed, adds this, verse 22, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled;" and verse 24, "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This is a second apocalypse, covering, though more briefly, the same period as the former. It begins with the setting aside of the Mosaic economy by its fulfilment in Christ and the overthrow of Jerusalem, according to the prophecy of Daniel ix. 26-27, and viii. 11-12, and closes by continuing the name of the holy city upon the elect, in saying, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," that is, until "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come," Matt. xxiv. 14. The common features of these two apocalypses are the judgments upon the wicked, beginning with Jerusalem. See also Luke xxiii. 29-31, and the tribulation of the elect, Matt. xxiv. 22. Both these conditions of things appear to be terminated by the end of the world, Matt. xxiv. 14; Luke xxi. 24.

Jesus answered the most important question last. The disciples had asked, though not as the leading question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?" The answer was (Matt. xxiv. 23-31), "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For as the light-

ning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

Mark's record (chapter xiii. 21-27) presents nothing additional. In Luke's record (chapter xxi. 25-28) we have this in addition, (verse 28), "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh."

In connection with this may be taken the answer made by Jesus to a question of the Pharisees on a previous occasion (Luke xvii. 20-25) in regard to the time when the kingdom of God should come.

This third part, as given by the three synoptics, is also an apocalypse covering the same period of time as the other two. It begins with language similar to the prophecy of Joel cited by Peter on the day of Pentecost describing the overthrow of Satan. Three things are prominent in this part, the coming of the Son of man, the defeat of Satan, and the gathering together into the kingdom of heaven of the elect by the saints, who are the "angels" here spoken of, for all this threefold apocalypse will be fulfilled before the judgment day. For no mention whatever is made of the last judgment in this apocalypse, though the subject is brought in at the close of this conference with the disciples on the Mount of Olives. (Matt. xxv. 31-46.)

The Lord taught that his coming would be immediate. "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." (Matt. xxiv. 34.) And again, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. xvi. 28.) "But first he must suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation." (Luke xvii. 25.)

Jesus, after he had entered into heaven in the flesh, with his own blood as our high priest, remained there in the flesh, but came again in spirit, really and personally, to remain with the faithful and to gather together his elect. (Matt. xxviii. 20; John xiv. 3; xvi. 16; Matt. xxiv. 31.)

The overthrow of the powers of darkness, as symbolized by the darkening of the heavenly luminaries, is spoken of as "*immediately after*" the tribulation of the saints, because that the victory of Christ followed his sufferings, and this is true of all who are in him. Yet both the tribulation and the victory occur at the same time in the world, but will not be fully accomplished until the end of the world.

Neither nature of the theanthropic person is limited by the other, and his comings, whether in the flesh or in the spirit, are the real acts of the one and the same person. His coming "in the clouds of heaven" describes both his spiritual coming throughout the ages, and also his coming in the flesh at the last day. But the Christian era is the era both of the Holy Spirit and the coming of the Son of man, the persecution of the saints, and the overthrow of the powers of this world, all are simultaneous in their occurrence. The mourning of "the tribes of the earth" and "men fainting for fear" describe the spiritual overthrow of the world before the "stone which was cut out of the mountain without hands." In view of this, the Lord enjoins his disciples that "when these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh." (Luke xxi. 28.) See also Romans viii. 23.

The gathering of the elect is into the kingdom of heaven, and will go on until "the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (John xi. 52; Eph. i. 10.) This is not the gathering at the judgment day, which some expect, for that will be a gathering of both the righteous and the wicked.

Thus, in a threefold apocalypse, Jesus shows how and when the effete economy of Moses would be done away, and the end of the world brought about by his coming with the Holy Spirit of power. Then, by a series of parables, he shows how the faithful may be assured of his presence, and the great importance of watching by obeying his commandments. It is, of course, not meant, in Mark xiii. 32, that the Son is ignorant of the time of his own coming and of the other events here prophesied, but that in the order of the divine activity the divine purpose proceeds primarily from the Father. (John viii. 28.) It were also a reflection on the divine wisdom and goodness to suppose that Jesus enjoined the disciples to watch so carefully for his return in the flesh, when he did not intend so to come for at least nearly nineteen centuries.

This threefold apocalypse of the synoptics is an outline of the one given to the Apostle John. There is the same doctrine in both, the same powers, the same kingdoms, and the same respec-

tive career for each. The prophecies of the Old Testament, which refer to the same subject are much more brief than this of the synoptics. This analysis can be easily shown to be in accord with the general tenor of the Scriptures. The interpretation seems both natural and conservative, and by being wrought out by further study would have a tendency to dissipate many of the unwarrantable conclusions drawn by many writers upon the apocalypses of the New Testament.

*Oakdale, Neb.*

H. WILSON.

### THE UNIFYING DOCTRINE IN THEOLOGY.

On this subject in the QUARTERLY (Vol. iv. No. 2), Dr. Primrose claims for fellowship what Thornwell claimed for justification, as the unifying doctrine in theology. It might amount to but little, practically, that a learned divine should fail to establish this claim for any particular doctrine or element in the plan of salvation: but if, in the effort, he should make havoc of other doctrines, it becomes a serious matter. If we mistake not, this is the serious matter with this effort in the QUARTERLY. Certainly, the Scripture doctrine of fellowship is very seriously crippled if we exclude the idea of communion in the sense of "converse with God"—rational intercourse of spirit with spirit. Fellowship with God in this last sense, in the status of a son, is the consummation of human felicity. This is that "fruition of God" referred to in the Confession of Faith as having been provided for "by way of covenant." This idea of fellowship, therefore, which Dr. Primrose excludes altogether, would come much nearer unifying the doctrines of theology than that which he claims to be the only idea included in the word fellowship.

It is very true that the dominant idea of the word fellowship is partnership, or participation in something common to the parties participating; but the nature of the fellowship, communion or partnership depends upon the parties participating, and the objects or things participated in. Moreover, the word carries the idea of sympathy between the parties, and also the idea of association. The parties being Christ and his people, the association amounts to union—fellowship *with* Christ in the Spirit; or, fellowship *with* Christ by means of the fellowship *of* the Spirit. This last seems to be Dr. Primrose's exclusive sense of the word fellowship. His new doctrine of fellowship, therefore, simply amounts to the old doctrine of union with Christ, or union to Christ. This old doctrine of union with Christ, by the indwell-



ing of the Spirit and faith, does determine and give shape to much in theology. Hence the plausibility of Dr. Primrose's new idea. This plausibility is reached by narrowing down the word fellowship so as to include only what is generally meant by union with Christ, excluding the idea of communion in the sense of mutual, sympathetic interchange of thought and feeling between us and God. The Scriptures, indeed, do not distinguish the words fellowship and communion as common usage has, but if the Scriptures recognize the idea that God admits his people to converse with him, then the idea of this converse is properly expressed by the word communion, or fellowship. For the converse of God with his people, or of his people with God, involves the idea of partnership, or participation in something common to each, and this something common to each is the thought and feeling expressed and reciprocated, or mutually and sympathetically interchanged. So that when it is said that "our fellowship is with the Father and with his son Jesus Christ," who shall dare to say that the word fellowship in this connection excludes the idea of converse with God—partnership with God in thought and feeling? In what other sense have we fellowship with the Father? To what purpose is the communion of saints, except to exalt God's name together? And how exalt his name together except in the expression by us, and reciprocation by him, of the sentiment of praise? To what purpose shall we sit together in heavenly places with Christ, if we are to sit as Egyptian mummies, with no converse with him? We are to be holy as God is holy. The standard of right thought and feeling in us is the thought and feeling of God towards the same object. And the interchange of these thoughts and feelings between us and God in heaven is our highest ideal of human felicity; and the ordinances of worship are the divinely appointed means of carrying on this converse with God in this world. But we must pass on to touch another point.

To show how the doctrine of fellowship in his sense of the word marshals all the other doctrines of theology into line, Dr. Primrose instances the divinity of Christ. But, in order to make his theory work, he finds it necessary to make such destructive statements as, "Had it been possible for man to deserve God's favor, then God would not have resorted to the scheme of salvation by fellowship." This statement loses sight of the fact that the scheme of justification by fellowship had already been resorted to in the covenant with Adam in the garden of Eden and destroys Paul's parallel between the first and the second Adam. Further he says, "even though it were possible for a man to

ground eternal life for himself in a perfect righteousness, it were still inconceivable that others could be admitted to partnership therein with himself." If this statement were only true it would prove the necessity of the divinity of Christ. But if it be true, it makes shipwreck of the covenant with Adam in the garden of Eden. For that covenant puts Adam's posterity into partnership with himself in the moral status that should be won by him under that covenant. So that we all were and are admitted to partnership with a man in death, and if it is inconceivable that we should have been admitted to partnership with him in eternal life, had he grounded eternal life for himself, then it is inconceivable that the covenant, in its nature (in consequence of its head being a man), admitted of anything but death. The necessity of the divinity of Christ, as the second head of the covenant, is not to ground the possibility of partnership in his righteousness, but to ground the possibility of working out the righteousness demanded for the justification of a human *sinner*.

Still further, Dr. Primrose applies his new-found key to the unlocking of the difficulty of the sufferings and sorrows even unto the temporal death of God's justified believers in this world. The key says "that Christ suffered as a partner." Verily, this is poor consolation. If Christ only shared with us in our sufferings, without taking them away, that is, without taking away our obligation to bear them, then the help afforded is summed up in sympathy. But even supposing that Christ's *suffering* and *death* were not vicarious, but only the *merit* of them, this leaves the old difficulty of our suffering in this world unexplained. For the merit is certainly applicable as soon as our partnership with Christ takes place by the indwelling of the Spirit and faith, but the fact that it is not applied to the full until the death of the body, is certainly not explained by saying that Christ was only a partner with us in these sufferings. If he was only a partner in our sufferings in this world, how do we know he is to be anything more in the world to come? For this difficulty, the old key that we had before was much better. The old key says that the atonement is of such a nature as to admit of the exercise of sovereignty in the application of its benefits. So that, if God sees fit, he may delay our full deliverance from sin and suffering to the death of the body. This leaves room for prayer for deliverance, subject to God's wisdom and goodness. So also the old explanation of the use of our good works is consistent with the analogy of faith. But to say that good works are binding upon us because Jesus did not take away our obligation to fulfil all

righteousness, but only shared it with us, is poor indeed—ghastly poor. If Christ only shared our obedience, then was his obedience only in fulfilment of a rule of duty for himself, and not as a condition of life for us? The old explanation here is simple and satisfactory, and opens no flood-gate to error. The other new positions are subject to similar criticism, especially in regard to the indwelling of the Spirit and regeneration, and the distinction between the Spirit *with* us and the Spirit *in* us, but this may suffice to put us on our guard.

K. M. McINTYRE.

---

### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1891.

It might have been wiser on the part of the management of the QUARTERLY to have selected some one who was not a member of the Assembly to write its history, as it is difficult for those who take part in affairs to write impartially concerning them. This difficulty is increased when the writer is unfortunate enough to have been generally found with the minority on most questions where there was serious division of opinion. But if such a person gives his testimony to the high character and earnestness of purpose of the members, and to the general excellence of the work done, his testimony will have more weight, perhaps, than that either of a mere spectator or of a member of the majority.

Many eyes were turned anxiously to this Assembly. It was composed largely of men comparatively unknown. The old leaders were nearly all absent. There was not a member present who had ever sat in the moderator's chair, the retiring moderator, of course, excepted. Of those that were known to the church at large, there were a considerable number—like Bryan, Molloy, McElroy, Boyd, Rose and Chester—who could “neither attempt to palliate nor deny” the “atrocious crime” of being young men—at least as the church counts young men. Then, too, there were measures before the Assembly that some feared as “revolutionary” and others regarded with grave doubt. Moreover, the Assembly was to meet in a “live” town—one of the most marvelous outgrowths of the new South, and perhaps some feared that the ozone of all this new, pushing aggressive life might enter into the Assembly, and cause it to run away with our dignified old church.

Well, none of these fears were realized. The ozone was there, the

life was there, the aggressive spirit was there; but if the Assembly erred anywhere, the most uncompromising conservative will not allege that it was on the side of indiscreet progressiveness. In fact, youth is not necessarily a pledge of aggressiveness. There is no more conservative member of any body than a man who is still too young to do his own independent thinking.

But it must not be imagined that this Assembly was composed entirely of young men. Dr. McIlwaine, of Hampden Sydney College, took a leading part in the Assembly, and was the chairman of one of its most important committees. Dr. Price, of Southwestern University, impressed many as being, probably, the ablest member of the Assembly. The presence of the venerable Dr. Marshall, of Texas, who attended his first Assembly in 1835, was a benediction to the body from beginning to end. Just where to classify Dr. Pitzer we do not know, as his white hairs and youthful spirits presented such a marked contrast.

The ruling eldership was very ably represented. Judge Martin, of Arkansas, an able jurist and charming speaker, was always heard with great interest. Col. Candler, of Georgia, whenever he spoke, made you feel the power of a man used to great public bodies. Judge Grat-tan, of Virginia, spoke always with a zeal and enthusiasm that commanded attention. Prof. Fulton, of Mississippi, one of the youngest ruling elders present, treated ecclesiastical questions with a thorough familiarity that made some of the brethren express the opinion that "he ought to have been a preacher."

The opening sermon presented a theme peculiarly timely—the unseen defences of the church, from 2 Kings vi. 16: "Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them." It set forth to the eye of faith the power of Jehovah on the side of the church, whether it was contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, or whether it was pushing forward its aggressive warfare to conquer the world for Christ. In this last respect it struck the keynote of the whole Assembly; with no differences to settle, with no controversies to allay, the great work before us was, How to do the Lord's work. There were, necessarily, differences of opinion about this, but this was the ruling desire in all hearts, and all were alike disposed to look to God for guidance in the doing of God's work.

The election of a moderator was in the same direction. The Assembly sought to honor—and thereby honored itself—one who was conspicuous by reason of the work he had done. It desired to honor, not merely a man who had done noble service on one of the outposts,

but to honor and emphasize that great department of the work of the church.

Dr. DuBose made not exactly a model moderator, according to the ordinary standard, but he was better than that. As he freely stated, the nature of his work prevented his having great familiarity with parliamentary law, and sometimes, when the rights of minorities depended on parliamentary questions, his decisions worked some hardship. But this was more than compensated for by the devotional spirit which he constantly maintained and the devotional attitude in which he constantly kept the Assembly. This is a precedent which all subsequent moderators will do well to follow. It was largely due to his influence and example that throughout the whole Assembly "the peace of God kept our hearts and minds."

The Assembly got to work with unusual rapidity. Instead of taking recess the first afternoon, as usual, to allow the moderator time to appoint his committees, the moderator was excused from attendance, and the Assembly heard the reports of the executive committees, which were all referred that afternoon to the appropriate committees, to be announced the next morning. This desire to facilitate business was further manifested by the appointment of an order of the day for Friday to hear the report of the *ad interim* committee on the Revised Directory for Worship, which was taken up the next morning after the standing committees had been announced, and the various overtures, reports, records and communications read and referred. There were a few questions of reference raised, as when it was moved to refer the overtures on the qualifications for licensure and ordination to the Committee on Education, and the overture on the Robinson case to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, but the latter committee properly got the former overtures, while the latter overture was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

There were, by the way, some eminently appropriate appointments in the chairmanship of committees. Dr. Park had bills and overtures as a matter of course. The Education committee was placed under the leadership of the president of one of our most important colleges, Dr. McIlwaine. The appointment of Rev. W. S. P. Bryan to Foreign Missions was a deserved recognition of his eminent services as agent of that cause in the Synod of North Carolina, as well as the remarkable point of development to which he has led his church in recently assuming the support of the whole African Mission. Judge Martin, of Arkansas, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was the right man

in the right place. Some doubted the propriety of placing a man with the extreme views on "organic union" of Dr. Pitzer at the head of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, but time—or Dr. Briggs—has wrought a great change in his views, and he proved in the end to be more rankly conservative on those questions than the Assembly itself.

The Directory for Worship was presented in admirable form, but it seemed at first as if it would take the whole session of the Assembly to go through with it. On the second paragraph an amendment was suggested, and what with the amendment and the debate upon it, and the amendment to the amendment, and the substitute for the whole, it looked as if we would never get beyond the question of posture in prayer. A running fire of amendments was kept up for some time until it was found that they were always voted down, and then the brethren became discouraged and rapid progress was made. There was no change made until the optional form for marriage was reached, where the questions were all, "Do you?" and the answers were all, "I will." This had been recognized by the members of the committee as an error, and the chairman sent a message suggesting one form of amendment, and the secretary suggested another, but the lawyers and judges present gave their judgment in favor of "Do you?" and "I do" throughout, and it was so amended. The committee was thanked for their valuable labors, and the Directory sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption or rejection. It is to be hoped that after the next Assembly it will become a part of our organic law, and the Revised Book be at last complete.

The first of the standing committees to get in their report was that on Education. It was read at the popular meeting in the interest of that cause Saturday evening, and taken up and discussed on Monday. It was a most important paper and was taken up by the Assembly with great enthusiasm. Vigorous speeches were made when the clause came up recommending the employment of a secretary for his whole time, and there was a little skirmish of the picket line on the coming battle about the qualifications for licensure and ordination. Those in favor of change were anxious to show that they were in favor of *every other* method of increasing the supply of the ministry, as well as the proposed constitutional change; while those opposed to the change expressed themselves in favor of this as obviating the necessity of such "revolutionary" measures. The vote by which this clause was adopted was like a whirlwind. This settled also the question of consolidating Education with Publication. When the question of the amount to be

raised came up, an enthusiastic brother proposed \$40,000, instead of the committee's recommendation of \$30,000, but more prudent counsels prevailed, and the amount remained as reported. The day of prayer for colleges was set for the fourth Thursday of February, as heretofore. The recommendation enjoining Presbyteries to see that, ordinarily, their candidates go to our own Theological Seminaries, awakened considerable discussion. The amendment was adopted limiting it to candidates "receiving aid," and as another amendment was pending, the debate was complicated by points of order; but when that difficulty was removed, it became evident that, on sober second thought, the Assembly would vote down the whole section rather than settle a question of principle on a pecuniary basis. The amendment was at last reconsidered, and the recommendation adopted as it came from the committee. In answer to the overture from the Presbytery of St. Louis, recommendations were adopted looking to a laying of the claims of the ministry before our youth, from the pulpit, by parents, and by those in charge of our schools and colleges; and also laying it upon the consciences of our "ruling elders, deacons, and other Christian workers, who may possess the scriptural qualifications for the work of the ministry," to consider prayerfully its claims. The unanimous vote on this clause really granted the principle that some were contending for in the matter of constitutional change, but consistency is not always the controlling influence in Assemblies. On a subsequent day the election of a secretary and committee was taken up, and Dr. Richardson and the Memphis Committee reelected. It is due both to Dr. Richardson and to the brethren who suggested a change, to state that no reflection on the administration of that most faithful and excellent officer was intended, but that, the sphere of his duties having been so much enlarged, the new department of his labors—the visiting of colleges and schools, to lay the claims of the ministry before young men—was thought by some to demand an amount of activity—not to say versatility—that was hardly to be expected in one of his advanced years. A question of this delicate nature was never discussed with better feeling.

On Tuesday, Foreign Missions had the floor. Chairman Bryan presented the results of the unremitting labors of the committee, which had sat continuously through all the sittings of the Assembly. The report recognized gratefully the prosperity of the work, the increasing liberality of the church towards it, and the increasing number of young men and young women who are giving their lives to it. It re-

commends the raising of \$150,000 for this cause during the current year; recommends the arrangements for a general observance of the "simultaneous meetings," which have been successfully inaugurated in North Carolina and elsewhere; urges prayer for missions regularly and fervently, especially at the Monthly Concert; sets apart the last Sabbath of May as Children's Day; removes the publication of *The Missionary* to Nashville; divides the office of Assistant Secretary and Treasurer, leaving it to the committee to choose the treasurer; re-elects the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, and the former committee. With regard to the questions about the Greek Mission, concerning which there has been a painful agitation lately in the papers, the reply to the Greek Evangelical Church reciprocates their expressions of Christian fellowship, and informs these brethren of our fixed determination to confine our labors to the Greeks of European Turkey. It further directs the Executive Committee to acquire all possible information with regard to the expediency of continuing our mission to the Greeks, and take such action as may be necessary. In answer to the overtures from St. Louis Presbytery, the request to establish a mission to Jews in Palestine was regretfully declined, and the matter of special reinforcement of the Brazilian Mission was left to the discretion of the Executive Committee. The recommendation of a field secretary for Foreign Missions was stricken from the report. Perhaps this was wise in view of the fact that the man was not in sight, and that the force had already been increased by one officer. But it was not done on wise grounds. The chief difficulty seemed to be that it was a return to the old system of agents, and that it would disorganize our present plan of systematic beneficence, whereas, in fact, the functions of the proposed office were very different from those of the old agents, and the last Assembly did not hesitate to appoint a field secretary for colored evangelization, and this Assembly assigned field duties to the Secretary of Education.

On the whole, this great cause was never more ably handled than at this Assembly. The amount asked, while a large increase on last year, is not extravagant, in view of the awakening of our churches on this subject, the introduction of more systematic methods of raising money, the increasing number of churches that are offering to support missionaries, and especially in view of the principle that when the Lord puts it into the hearts of men to *go*, he will put it into the heart of the church to *send*. The division of the office of assistant secretary and treasurer does not involve the increased expense that would at first



appear, as it has been absolutely necessary to employ office help at almost equal cost.

Home missions did not receive the usual amount of attention from the Assembly. The report of the committee called forth no discussion, and consequently the attention of the Assembly was not concentrated on this work. Earnest appeals, however, were made for increased contributions, especially to the Evangelistic and Invalid Funds. It was expected that the relations of the general work to the Synodical and Presbyterian work would come up in some form, but there was only the usual recommendation to the Presbyteries, to "co-operate." It would appear that before long some system must be devised by which the older Synods would see entirely to their own destitutions, while the strength of the church as a whole would be concentrated on the more pressing demands of new fields. The apparent indifference to this cause (comparatively speaking) impressed us as due to the fact that a general work diffused throughout the weaker and stronger Presbyteries and Synods cannot appeal to the church with the same distinctness as the synodical work that is drawing so largely the sympathies of our people. But if the Assembly's Home Mission work were differentiated from the work in the older and stronger Synods, it would appeal to the heart of our people with the same imperativeness as the Foreign Mission work.

But in one department of the Home Mission work decided and hopeful progress was made. That was the Colored Evangelistic Work. The report of the field secretary and his memorial, together with several overtures relating to this cause, were referred to a special committee, that reported recommending the establishment of an Executive Committee of Colored Evangelization. Birmingham was chosen for the location of the committee, and Rev. A. L. Phillips was made secretary. This committee will appoint directors for Tuskalooza Institute, and its secretary will visit the colored Presbyteries and churches, with a view to their organization into an independent church. If only our Northern friends could see their way clear to work to the same end, and both Assemblies, through their proper agencies, work for the encouragement and support of one independent colored church, this vexed question could be in a fair way towards permanent and satisfactory settlement. As it is, it looks as if our church was addressing itself to a solution of the problem with a vigor never before manifested.

The important cause of Publication received especial attention at the hands of this Assembly. The Executive Committee made it plain

that if the Assembly desired the work of colportage to go on, the church must be aroused to action, and that it could no more continue to take the profits of the business department for the benevolent work of the church, but must use them in the publication department, and only do such benevolent work as the actual contributions of the church justified. To meet this urgent need the Assembly calls for \$20,000.

Dr. Stacy presented an elaborate report on the Sabbath, which, with other papers bearing on the subject, was referred to a special committee. In response, the Assembly united with the great body of petitioners who are demanding that the gates of the Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday. A committee was also appointed to prepare a pastoral letter to our people with regard to the Sabbath.

On Temperance the Assembly reaffirmed the decision of former Assemblies, and urged our members to use all proper means looking to the abatement of the liquor traffic, and recommended abstinence from the use of intoxicating drinks.

The Bible Cause was made one of our regular causes of systematic beneficence. Collections were taken this year amounting to nearly \$4,000. The Assembly had the pleasure of listening to Dr. McLean, the honored Secretary of the American Bible Society, who visited the Assembly fourteen years ago, not to ask our help as now, but to ask how they might help us.

The report of the Committee on Sabbath-schools declined to accede to the request of the Woman's National Christian Temperance Union (non-partisan), that special temperance lessons be given monthly in our schools, and also, for lack of means, answered negatively the overture for a General Superintendent of Sabbath-schools.

Fraternal greetings were exchanged with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Reformed Episcopal Church, and the delegate from the Presbyterian Church of Brazil, Rev. J. Rockwell Smith, D. D., was received and heard with profound interest. The Assembly declined to appoint delegates to a National Temperance Convention, but made arrangements for continued concert of action with other churches with regard to arbitration as a substitute for war. The Committee of Foreign Correspondence reported, recommending that we sever our connection with the Alliance of the Reformed Churches. The difficulty was partly financial, and partly fear of the movement for a consensus creed. The former difficulty was removed and the latter felt to be unreal, and so a substitute was adopted arranging for the appointment of delegates to Toronto, but declining

to appoint representatives on a committee to prepare a consensus creed.

Two Presbyteries were transferred—Indian, to the Synod of Texas, and Savannah, to the Synod of Georgia. In consequence of this latter change, the name of the Synod of South Georgia and Florida was changed to Florida.

In answer to an overture, a strong position was taken on the matter of women speaking in promiscuous religious assemblies; but their right to hold meetings among themselves was acknowledged. There were only two dissenting votes. One member explained that he was in favor of women speaking in the small assemblies of the Christian Endeavor Societies, and the other that he thought it proper for a returned female missionary to tell of her work to a general audience.

The report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures on the various papers placed in their hands, with regard to licensure and ordination, was taken up Wednesday afternoon. There were two papers, each signed by four ministers and four elders. Paper No. 1 advocated the sending down to the Presbyteries a series of amendments that would secure two results, (1), the regular and ordinary entrance into our ministry of men without classical training, on the basis of those qualifications that the Scripture demanded. As a matter of fact, it demanded of them at ordination everything now demanded, except the knowledge of the original languages of Scripture. Special emphasis, at the same time, was laid on the duty of Presbyteries to secure for those candidates whose early training was in their hands every form of preparation that could promote their efficiency. These provisions were to take the place of our perfectly indefinite provision for "extraordinary cases." (2), Such a re-adjustment of the relation of licensure and ordination that licensure might take place after one year's study, and on such acquirements as could be obtained in that time, while ordination could only be after two years' further study and trial, and on an examination that embraced all the topics now required, and in addition the heavier parts of trial now demanded at licensure.

Paper No. 2 declined to send down the proposed amendments, (1), because the matter had been sufficiently agitated in former Assemblies; (2), because it was not an expedient time to lower our standard; (3), because the use of other means would yield a sufficient supply of ministers in the future, and, (4), because the constitution amply provided for the entrance of the class of ministers that these overtures sought to provide for, in its provision for "extraordinary cases."

The points made by the advocates of paper No. 1 may be thus summarized:

All the reasons given for not sending down in paper No. 2 are either false or defective: The *first*, because, as shown by letters read, former Assemblies refused to discuss the matter, and the only way to stop the agitation was to let the Presbyteries decide the question. The *second*, because the changes proposed do not lower the standard. The present standard cannot be lowered, as the provision for "extraordinary cases," as now interpreted, destroyed all standard; it was proposed to *define* the class that we wanted, that they might be invited and others deterred who can now get in. The *third*, because while all these means are important, the Scriptural plan requires us to provide for the *present*, and these provisions only look to the "days to come." That was not the Saviour's way of raising up a ministry. It was, "Go ye." The *fourth*, because this class are not amply provided for in the constitution. There is a provision for extraordinary licensure, but none for extraordinary ordination. And this provision, while so indefinite as to break down all the proper safeguards to the entrance into our ministry, was of such a nature as to deter humble and modest men from making use of it, except when unusual pressure was brought to bear upon them. Then, the paper erred by defect in taking no notice of the urgent demand for a readjustment of the relations of licensure to ordination.

With regard to the first point secured by Paper No. 1, the regular and ordinary entrance into our ministry of men without classical training, the simple question is, "Do we want them?" The answer to that is given by the exhortation of the report of the Committee on Education to our elders, deacons, and Christian workers; and by Paper No. 2, which directs Presbyteries "prudently to encourage" them. But it is feared that if this change was made they would come in too large numbers, and that there are some risks about having too many of them. These risks are supposed to be—

(1), Inability to defend the faith; the workman must be one who needeth not to be ashamed. But this ability is only relative after all. The argument carried to its logical results leads to absurdity. We could ordain none who were not the equal in culture of any conceivable foe. We must rely on the sword of the Spirit, and that can be wielded effectively oftentimes by the plainest man in whom the Spirit dwells. The church will always have great apologetes, but we cannot require this standard of all. We do not now, and never will.

(2), Unsoundness in doctrine. It is said, "An illiterate ministry will become an unsound ministry." But these changes cannot lead to an illiterate ministry. They require an intelligent ministry, though not necessarily a classically educated ministry. Is it meant that knowledge of the original languages is necessary to insure sound doctrine? But (a), our theologies and commentaries are now intelligible to the English reader; (b), the "Cumberland" argument is against them, for the unsoundness of the illiterate candidates was allowed to pass by the educated Presbytery, proving it unsound. (c), History is against them, for from Origen, Arius and Pelagius, down to a case now agitating our sister Assembly, heretical teaching has come in from the learned. (d), Facts are against them now, for the most conservative branch in our church courts is the ruling eldership, who are not learned in the original, and they would hardly become unsound by being ordained to the ministry.

But the great question is, are there men scripturally qualified? Settling that will settle everything else. On this point it was argued: (a), Knowledge of the original tongues is nowhere mentioned in Scripture among the qualifications necessary. The Bible is our charter. (b), It does not follow from the contemporary knowledge of Greek, for the Scriptures from which it was proved that Jesus was the Christ were in a language that was not vernacular even in Palestine; (c), our church has already settled the question. It of course could not approve in any case the ordination of a single person without the Scriptural qualifications; but (1), It has established Tuskalooosa Institute, where neither Greek nor Hebrew is taught, as the only preparation for our colored ministry; (2), Not one of our foreign missions adopts the standard of the home church; (3), This Assembly has decided the question by its exhortation to our elders and deacons "who may have the Scriptural qualifications for the work of the ministry." Surely the committee was not wasting the time of the Assembly by talking about our elders and deacons who know Greek and Hebrew!

But the point may be made that this argument cuts too deep—that according to it, we have no right to require Greek and Hebrew of any. The answer is that there is a broad distinction between what the church may exact as a *sine qua non* for entering the ministry and what course it may require its candidates to pursue for their highest efficiency. In the former respect it can have no "policy;" it has no authority to exact anything that Christ has not exacted; in the latter, as a wise parent or guardian, it is bound to aim at the best possible

results. The standard of highest efficiency cannot, however, be made the standard of entrance.

With regard to the other point secured by paper No. 1, it was argued that it was illogical to demand the same standard for licensure as for ordination. A man should be allowed to try his gifts before he had acquired all that was necessary for entrance into the office. Our present system violated a natural law, and so had adjusted itself, the constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. Licensure had become practically equivalent to ordination, and the examination for ordination a mere form, which informal licensure had become the prevalent practice of our Presbyteries, with the authority of the General Assembly.

The increase of the ministry was the great need of the church. This increase would be operative in that direction in two ways. The first provision would make a plain path for efficient men into our ministry, who could only now enter under a provision that was brought into disrepute by the abuse of it; the second provision would encourage men of all classes by giving them an earlier opportunity to try their gifts and make their calling sure.

But above even this question was the question whether ours was to remain a constitutional church. Brethren were very zealous for the constitution when it came to amending it in a constitutional manner, but were willing to run a ploughshare right through it when it came to observing it. The church should have the courage either to amend its constitution or change its practice. We will be more impressed with the seriousness of those who oppose the former when we see them propose the latter.

The argument on the other side was as follows: <sup>1</sup>

“It is claimed by the advocates of the paper for which the substitute has been offered, that the qualifications for licensure and ordination prescribed by our Book of Church Order, are such as to exclude from our ministry many men who are abundantly qualified by nature and grace, and it is proposed to send down for the adoption of the Presbyteries such amendments of the Book of Church Order as will remove those restrictions.

“The object is to increase the number of our ministers, an end greatly to be desired. But with a strange inconsistency, it is claimed that the proposed amendments do not lower the standard of qualifications for the ministry, but that the end is to be attained by subjecting to a more clearly defined and severer examination those extraordinary cases which are already provided for in our Book. It would seem to be a self-evident proposition that if it is the high character of these

---

<sup>1</sup>To insure absolute fairness in the presentation of this argument we have copied entire the excellent report of Dr. Price's speech in the *Central Presbyterian*.

qualifications that keeps men out of the ministry, the only way to relieve the difficulty is to remove the cause; in other words, to lower the qualifications.

"We have had, therefore, an elaborate argument to prove that these qualifications are unscriptural and unnecessary, while all the time it is being claimed that the proposed changes will not lower the standard of qualifications for the ministry.

"I am obliged to assume that this is the purpose of the overture, and it is in fact assumed by all its advocates. The bars are already down, fourteen out of the twenty-four panels of the fence are down, and it is proposed to throw down the remaining ten. If this is not the object of the overture it is unmeaning. Our church has been working under this rule, which it is sought to change, from the beginning; it is only of late that it has been discovered to be a source of weakness, an impediment to our success. The advocates of a change are obliged to show the strongest possible reasons before they would be justifiable in reversing the traditional policy of the church, under which she has achieved all her success.

"How is it, then, that we can afford to abandon our policy and lower the standard of qualifications for the ministry? First, Is it because the age and state of society in which we live require a lower grade of intelligence in the ministry? Second, Is it because it requires a less fully equipped ministry to defend the doctrines of Christianity? On the contrary, religion is attacked on all hands by the weapons of science and learning. Third, Is it because the other denominations with which we coöperate, and in one sense compete, are lowering their standard of education? Fourth, Is it because there is an increasing unwillingness upon the part of young men to prosecute the course of study required? Never in our history have there been so many candidates. Fifth, Is it because the difficulties of procuring an education are greater than formerly? Sixth, Is it because it is more difficult to raise means for their education? No one denomination can expect to do the whole work. Our part seems to be to conserve and teach the truth. If we abdicate our proper seat our right to exist as a separate denomination ceases."

When each side had presented its case, and the general debate had fairly begun, it was suddenly ended by the call of the question. The manner of its accomplishment was not such as our judgment can approve, and it is fortunate that the painful impression it produced was modified by the willingness of its movers to reconsider the vote of the forenoon when the Assembly convened in the afternoon. The facts were these. The moderator announced that the hour for a recess had come. A member asked leave to make a "motion." The moderator ruled motions out of order. He asked unanimous consent, but objection was made. Some member then moved he have permission to make his motion. The point was made that if motions were out of order, a motion could not make it in order; nothing but unanimous consent would suffice. The point was overruled, however, and the motion to give leave was put and carried by a majority vote. The "motion" was then made and proved to be the call for the question. Many members supposed the motion had no reference to the subject in hand,

and others that it had reference to procedure in the debate. It was generally felt that if a member intended to call the question, he should have said so, and that the call of the question was not properly a "motion." The question, nevertheless, was put and carried, and, on an aye and no vote, the substitute was adopted by a vote of 97 to 42. This substitute, however, was not Paper No. 2, but another paper, proposing the same action, but omitting the reasons. Of course, this action was not legally the action of the Assembly, as it was taken during recess, and without the unanimous consent that alone could make it regular,<sup>1</sup> but it expressed the sentiments of the members, and will, therefore, some day be of historical interest as a milestone to measure the progress of ideas.

The next day the Assembly voted down the amendment unanimously reported by the Committee of Bills and Overtures, providing for an examination for ruling elders and deacons elect. It only established a mode of procedure for the exercise of a right now given by the Constitution (Chap. VI. sec. 1, Art. 3), but the Assembly was as much opposed to raising the standard of eldership as to "lowering" that of the ministry. It is safe to say that if either of the proposed changes

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be further noted that the only question voted upon was not the question properly before the Assembly. According to all parliamentary authority, according to the uniform usage of our own Assembly, and according to all common sense, the adoption of a substitute for a substitute only places the third paper in the position of the second, and the vote has then to be taken between the third and the first. If then adopted it is still before the house and may be amended before it is adopted as the sense of the house. But the positiveness of the brother who was just then engineering the forces of the majority secured from the Moderator the decision, that if the third paper was carried on the first vote it ended the matter, and although every member of the Assembly who was in the habit of attending our church courts ought to have known better, this decision, revolutionizing all parliamentary usage, was sustained on appeal. The effect of the decision was to bring the Assembly to an immediate choice between the third and first papers. Paper No. 2 was practically ruled out, and it was the friends of that paper that should have complained. But after all the elaborate arguments that were made for it, not one voice was raised asking that it be given a chance. It was incontinently abandoned even by the committee that brought it forth. But if the third paper had been of a tenor friendly to the first (proposing, say, to send down the amendments for *discussion* and *criticism*, not for action), then the palpable absurdity of the decision would have been patent to all. The friends of 1 would have voted for 3 to destroy 2, but that would not mean that, if given another vote, they would not have voted for 1 as a stronger measure than 3. But the point is too well settled to need argument, if the action of the Assembly had not given it importance.



had been now in the Book, and it had been sought to change that, the Assembly would have been as decidedly opposed to change as in the cases before us.

After an animated discussion, Hot Springs, Arkansas, was chosen as the next place of meeting, over New Orleans.

The closing exercises of the Assembly were made solemn and tender by the words of Dr. Marshall, especially as he contrasted the spirit of the Assembly with the bitterness he had sometimes seen, and spoke words of encouragement as to the future of the church, drawn from his observation of the young men who were coming to the front in the work of the church. At Mr. Bryan's request, he led the Assembly in prayer in behalf of the moderator, who is soon to return to his work in China. The moderator, when the vote of thanks was adopted, asked Dr. J. R. Wilson to lead in prayer in behalf of the Birmingham churches, which had not only done so much for the comfort of the Assembly, but had met in special prayer in its behalf before it convened. Rev. Dr. Handley, of the Central church, responded appropriately. The Assembly was then dissolved in the usual manner.

We think, on the whole, that the Assembly was above the average. Of the three we have witnessed, or attended, it made far the best impression. Its spirit was admirable. The impressions it left on the community were all for good. It did many wise things. It left the work of the church better advanced than it found it. If it left some things for subsequent assemblies to do, it but obeyed the universal law of history.

PEYTON H. HOGE.

---

### THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Not since the days of 1837 has the meeting of this body been looked forward to with more interest and concern. The interest was universal. The papers of every denomination, and of no denomination, were full of it. The pulpits in all our churches, and in many of our sister churches, were resounding with the special theme that was to be discussed. Scores of Presbyteries were overturing the body on the great question of the day. And no wonder. The matter involved was vital to revealed religion. The issues were of greater moment than those of 1837, for they lay at the very foundation of our faith and involved the integrity of the word of God itself, and related to matters upon which, in all the conflicts of past years, the Presbyterian Church has been agreed.

The evidence of this interest and concern were evident in the roll of the Assembly. It was a body of "picked men." An unusual number of ex-moderators, theological professors, presidents, eminent pastors and leaders, widely-known and able ruling elders, were commissioners. The body, always distinguished, was never more so than on this occasion. The Presbyteries sent their choicest men. The presence among the commissioners of such men as Professor Henry Preserved Smith, Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst and others, also indicated that the selection of commissioners had been fair and impartial, so far as the great issue of the Assembly was concerned. That this issue was before every mind readily appeared. As the commissioners assembled on the journey to Detroit, at the church, in the lobbies, in the streets, at the homes, in the hotels—everywhere, one theme predominated. It was as if the body had met for no other purpose than to consider that.

The arrangements for the Assembly's comfort were perfect. Dr. Radcliffe, the pastor of the Fort-street church of Detroit, and his able coadjutors, a leader among whom was General Alger, provided everything that was needful and convenient, not only for the transaction of the Assembly's business, but also for the comfort of its members and visitors. The beautiful church afforded ample accommodation for every immediate purpose. We like to see the Assembly in so stately a church, rather than in a hall or tabernacle. It is a court at which the Head of the church is asked to preside, where his Spirit is continually invoked, and it is seemly that it be held with the most sacred and impressive surroundings and be invested with the utmost solemnity and dignity. For this reason, we deprecate that constantly increasing habit of applause which seems to have fastened itself upon these meetings, and which Elder George Junkin wisely rebuked when he asked that it be dispensed with when he was speaking, and that he would rather they would use their heads than their feet! In a body as immense as this Assembly, it is almost impossible to avoid certain difficulties. One of the chief of these is the ceasing to be a deliberative body and becoming nothing more than a very orderly, handsomely-dressed, well-behaved "mob." This tendency seemed to be less prevalent than usual, however, at this meeting. The gravity of the business before it appeared to have a most wholesome effect upon the multitude assembled within the church's walls.

It was a happy augury when Dr. William Henry Green, of Princeton, was nominated and elected, without opposition, to the moderator's chair. Dr. Charles A. Dickey, of Philadelphia, a director also of

Union Seminary in New York, who had been prominently suggested for the same place, was never more noble, with all his nobility, than when he proposed the name of Dr. Green; and when Dr. Hays moved that nominations be closed and the vote be taken by rising, he voiced the wish of the entire Assembly. This choice was a decisive expression of the Assembly's loyalty to the fundamental principles of orthodoxy, and was at the same time a loving tribute to the moderator-elect. The learning and ability of Professor Green, and his life-long and distinguished work for the church, made him worthy of the high distinction; but it was not so much these as his well-known gentleness of spirit, fairness, impartiality, and conservatism that brought to him the honor. He is a man who enjoys in a remarkable degree the confidence of the entire church. His administration of the trust was fair and wise. We have no sympathy with a certain amount of clamor that has arisen from the ranks of the minority in the Briggs' case, that he was partial in his appointment of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, to which was intrusted, in regular course, the shaping of the great question of the meeting, and that he was too much influenced by the Stated Clerk in his appointments, or rulings and recognitions. He is too keenly sensitive a man in his ideas of justice, even to an opponent, and of too independent a mind and character to be unduly influenced in anything, much less in such an office as the moderatorship. All honor to him and shame to those who would in any manner detract from his well-earned and deserved reputation.

The business of the Assembly was conducted with unusual dispatch. This was due in some measure, perhaps, to the predominance of the one great question of the meeting over all others. It was worthy of remark, however, that there was no slurring over of any of the work or that any interests that claimed attention were slighted. We will endeavor to recite briefly those items in which the readers of the QUARTERLY naturally feel greatest interest.

*The Concensus Creed.* At the last meeting of the Assembly a committee was appointed "to invite the co-operation of the Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System, to prepare a short creed containing the essential articles of the Westminster Confession, to be used as a common creed of these churches; not as a substitute for the creed of any particular denomination, but to supplement it for the common work of the church, especially in mission fields." This committee reported its work, which, from the necessities of the case, involving correspondence with about eighty supreme

judicatories, many of which are yet to meet, was incomplete, and the committee was continued. Meanwhile, it has been engaged in preparing a draft of a creed, to be submitted as a suggestion or basis for the interchange of opinion. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which was admitted to fellowship in the Alliance in Belfast, did, while the Detroit Assembly was in session, most emphatically repudiate "the essential articles of the Westminster Confession," and decline to take part in any consensus creed in which they would be embodied. This fact is a practical justification of the opposition which was made at the Belfast Council to the recognition of this body as holding to the consensus of the Reformed Churches, and the reference by the Cumberland Church of this matter, for further recommendation, to a committee, with Dr. Burney as its chairman, well indicates its theological temperament.

Of a kindred nature with the consensus creed is the subject of *Church Unity*. After long consideration of the questions involved in the propositions of the Episcopal House of Bishops, it appears that the conviction of Presbyterians generally is that they are not ready for an outward unity which will make Episcopalians of us all, and accordingly the recommendation of the committee on this subject, after amendment, was adopted by a very large majority, viz.: that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subjects of inter-denominational comity and church unity, and that the committee shall hereafter be the Committee on the Federation of the Protestant Denominations of the United States. This wisely provides for anything looking towards proper coöperation in work or testimony, while, at the same time, it declares the uselessness of negotiation with a sect so arrogant as to suppose that it alone is "the church," and that requires, as a prerequisite to unity, that we all regard ourselves as "laymen" and begin aright by taking ordination at its hands. Dr. Morgan Dix's late utterance on this subject evidently expresses the Assembly's, as well as his own convictions, and it has joined him in pricking what he regards as the hopeless "bubble." The speeches on this subject were among the brightest and most interesting to which the Assembly listened.

*Proof-texts of the Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism.* The committee on this matter was continued, in view of the revision of the Confession and other circumstances that make it impossible to treat the revision of the proof-texts as a completed work at present.

*Deaconesses.* The proposed amendments of the Form of Government providing for the election of Deaconesses, were found to have

been lost in the Presbyteries. The subject was referred again to the committee.

On the *Method of Amending or Altering the Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Directory for Worship*, it appeared that an overwhelming majority of the Presbyteries had answered the Assembly's overture, as to the incorporation of the new chapter on amendments, in the affirmative. The new provision will, therefore, after the written approval of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, be incorporated in the law of the church.

*The Christian Endeavor Society* appeared before the Assembly in presbyterial overtures asking for a more direct connection between the church and this movement. Resolutions were adopted recognizing the interest manifested in the formation of these societies, and commending them to the oversight of Presbyteries by a permanent committee of coöperation in each Presbytery. A further resolution, that a special committee be appointed to take the whole matter under consideration, to report to the next General Assembly, was, after some sharp discussion, lost. This discussion reveals the fact that this movement, in its present form, is not above suspicion, or rather that it needs to be most carefully guarded against attendant evils. The views of Dr. McKibbin, who advocated the appointment of the committee on this subject, have been ably presented in papers read before the Cincinnati Ministerial Association, and published in a former number of the QUARTERLY. He was ably seconded in his efforts by Rev. Mr. Sinclair, of Massachusetts.

*The Condition of the Foreign and Home Mission Boards.* Last year a painful fact was the indebtedness of these two leading boards of the church. Happily this state of things is not now so bad. The Foreign Missions Board reported itself as practically out of debt. The Home Mission Board, however, has an increase of debt, so that as against \$64,000 as last year, it now owes \$98,000. This lamentable state of affairs arises mainly from the fact that there has been a diminution during the closing year as compared with the preceding year of about \$100,000 in the amount derived from legacies. The churches actually increased their offerings \$34 000. But for the economy exercised the debt would have been much greater. But this economy has entailed great suffering, as well as inconvenience. Appropriations to laborers in the Home Mission work, already low enough, have been brought to such a point that in many cases it has been something more like martyrdom than self-denial that some of the devoted la-

borers have had to endure. The appeal is made to the church to raise one million dollars for this work during the coming year.

*The Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work* came up, as usual, for examination and discussion. It has been subjected to seven "investigations," we believe, within ten years. This time two committees reported on it, one being that of which Mr. H. E. Simmons was chairman, and which was continued from the last Assembly, and the second being a committee of seven, to which had been referred last year's report of Mr. Simmons' committee, together with the answer of the Board's "Business Committee" to the several matters alleged against its management of the Board's business by the Simmons committee. With this multiplication of committees and reports, it is wonderful that no entanglement was experienced. The principal outcome of the investigations, examinations, reports, recommendations, etc., was the adoption of the recommendations of the committee of seven, to the effect that for the present it is not expedient for the Board to purchase a complete manufacturing outfit; that the Board is invited, if at any time it may appear proper to them to consider fully the matter, to prepare a complete report with reference to the exhibit and expense of the outfit, its cost, the proper place for its location, etc.; that the Board make a subdivision of its business department with a manufacturing branch and a publishing and distributing branch; and that it continue the competitive method of contracts for its work. The Simmons committee complained that it had not been given the opportunity it wished to appear before the committee of seven, Judge Hand chairman. Both committees were discharged, with the Assembly's thanks. Let us hope that the work of Publication will now be allowed a little time to rest, and to recover from the evil, especially loss of popular confidence, which these renewed cries for investigation produce.

*The Revision of the Confession* was the all-absorbing question last year. It continued to fill the mind of the church until the new question of Briggsism arose. But for the latter, it would doubtless have occupied a larger share of the recent Assembly's attention. As it was, however, it proved one of the tainest matters considered. It evoked but two or three speeches, and even these were explanatory rather than argumentative. The report of the Committee on Revision, through its chairman, Dr. W. C. Roberts, was accepted as a report of progress, and it was ordered that it be printed and sent down to the presbyteries for consideration, criticism, or amendments, with the request that they forward their criticisms and amendments by December 1st, 1891,

to the secretary of the committee, and the committee was instructed to consider these communications and prepare its final report for adoption, modification or rejection by the General Assembly of 1892. The report is prefaced by an elaborate introduction describing the committee's meetings, methods and work. It appears from the report, and from President Patton's speech, that the great harmony of which the public has heard so much was not in agreement in the changes proposed, but in the spirit of the meetings. The somewhat fulsome and "sophomorical" allusions to themselves in the account of "the glittering of the polished steel of the professor," "the clear-cut analysis made by the skilled dialectician," "the pathetic appeals of the shepherd to let down the tender grass of the Word sufficiently low to afford the lambs of the flock," etc., may be readily pardoned in such a report, in the knowledge that all must have of the need which the members of the committee had for something to offset the solemnity and seriousness of their work and the natural dryness of its details.

The alterations, amendments and additions submitted by the committee are as follows, the changes proposed to be made in the text of the Confession being indicated in italics in the revised text, which we give :

CHAPTER I.—OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.—V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture. And *the truthfulness of the history, the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle,* the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God ; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word, in our hearts.

CHAP. III.—(As amended.)—Sections I. and II. unchanged. Sections III. and IV. stricken out; and Section V. amended so that Section III. will read :

III. God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath predestinated some of mankind unto life, and hath particularly and unchangeably chosen them in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

Section VI. remains unchanged and becomes Section IV. Section VII. is amended, and becomes Section V., and is as follows :

V. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, *not*

to elect unto everlasting life, but to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice; yet so as thereby neither is any limitation put upon the offer of salvation to all, upon condition of faith in Christ; nor is restraint laid upon the freedom of any one to hinder his acceptance of this offer.

VI. Section VIII. remains unchanged and becomes Section VI.

CHAP. IV.—OF CREATION.—I. It pleased God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning to create of nothing, *the universe*, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, and all very good. *The heavens and the earth, with all that they contain, were made by him in six creative days.*

CHAP. VI.—OF THE FALL OF MAN, OF SIN, AND OF THE PUNISHMENT THEREOF.—IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all *that is spiritually* good, and wholly inclined to evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. *Nevertheless the Providence of God, and the common operations of His Spirit, restrain unregenerate men from much that is evil, and lead them to exercise many social and civil virtues.*

CHAP. VII.—OF GOD'S COVENANT WITH MAN.—III. Man, by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace; wherein he freely offereth *by his Word and Spirit* unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.

IV. This covenant of grace is frequently set forth in the Scripture by the name of a testament, in reference to the death of Jesus Christ, the testator, and to the everlasting inheritance, with all things belonging to it, therein bequeathed.

Section IV. was stricken out; Section V. becomes Section IV. The words in the last line, "*and is called the Old Testament,*" were stricken out.

IV. This covenant was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel: under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all fore-signifying Christ to come, which were, for that time, sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation.

Section VI. becomes Section V. In line nine, the words, "*and is called the New Testament,*" were stricken out.

V. Under the gospel, when Christ, the substance, was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed are the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper; which though few in number, and administered with more simplicity and less outward glory, yet in them it is held forth in more fulness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles. There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations.

CHAP. VIII.—OF CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.—V. The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied *Divine* justice, and purchased, not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.



The Chapter "Of the Work of the Holy Spirit," becomes Chapter IX.

CHAP. IX.—OF THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.—I. The Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, the same in substance with the Father and the Son, and equal in power and glory, is, together with the Father and the Son, to be believed in, loved, obeyed, and worshipped throughout all ages.

II. The Holy Spirit, who of old revealed to men in various ways the mind and will of God, hath fully and authoritatively made known this mind and will in all things pertaining to life and salvation in the sacred Scriptures, holy men of God speaking therein as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and these Scriptures, being so inspired, are the infallible Word of God, the supreme rule of faith and duty.

III. The Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, is everywhere present among men, confirming the teachings of nature and the law of God written on the heart, restraining from evil and inciting to good; and is the source of all the wisdom, virtue, and reverence for God found in men, and of all the peace and good order in society; thus preparing the way for the gospel wherever it is preached. He everywhere accompanies the gospel with his persuasive energy, and urges its message upon the unregenerate, enlightening their minds concerning divine things, quickening their consciences, and drawing them by his grace, so that they who reject the merciful offer of the gospel are not only without excuse, but are also guilty of resisting the Holy Spirit.

IV. The Holy Spirit is the only efficient agent in applying and communicating redemption. He effectually calls sinners to a new life in Christ Jesus, regenerating them by his almighty grace, freeing them from the bondage of sin and death, and persuading and enabling them to embrace Jesus Christ by faith. He dwells in all believers as their Comforter and Sanctifier, and as the Spirit of adoption and of supplication, leading them into all the truth, making the means of grace efficacious in their edification, strengthening them in all duty, and sustaining them in all affliction, and performing all other gracious offices by which they are sanctified, sealed, and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

V. By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit all believers are vitally united to Christ, who is the Head, and are thus united to one another in the church, which is his body. He calls and anoints ministers for their holy office. He also calls and qualifies all other officers in the church for their special work, and imparts various gifts and graces to its members. He gives efficacy to the Word and to the ordinances of the gospel; keeps the church from apostasy, revives it in times of declension, and enables it to bear effectual testimony to the truth. By him the church has been and will be preserved, increased, and purified, until it shall cover the earth, and at last be presented to Christ a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.

CHAP. (IX.) X.—OF FREE WILL.—III. Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether *indisposed* to that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself or to prepare himself thereunto. *Yet is his responsibility as a free moral agent not thereby impaired.*

The Chapter "Of the Universal Offer of the Gospel," becomes Chapter XI, and the number of all succeeding chapters is increased by two.

CHAP. XI.—OF THE UNIVERSAL OFFER OF THE GOSPEL.—I. God so loved the

world that he provided in the covenant of grace through the mediation and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, a way of life and salvation sufficient for and adapted to the whole lost race of man; and he doth freely offer this salvation to all men in the gospel.

II. The gospel declares the love of God for the world, and his desire for the salvation of all men. It sets forth fully and clearly the only way of salvation, which is through Christ alone; promises that all who truly repent and believe in him shall be saved; commands, exhorts, and invites all to embrace the offered mercy; and urges every motive to induce men to accept its gracious invitations. This free and universal offer of the gospel is accompanied by the Holy Spirit, striving with and entreating men to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

III. It is the duty and privilege of every one who hears the gospel immediately to accept its merciful provisions. Great guilt and danger are incurred by delay and neglect. And they who continue to disobey the gospel perish by their own fault and are wholly without excuse, because they have resisted the Holy Spirit and rejected God's gracious offer of eternal life.

IV. As there is no other way of salvation than that revealed in the gospel, and as in the divinely established and ordinary method of grace faith cometh by hearing the Word of God, Christ hath given to his church the written word, the sacraments and the ministry; endowed her with the Holy Spirit, and commissioned her to go with his gospel into all the world and to make disciples of all nations. It is, therefore, the duty and privilege of all believers to sustain the means of grace where they are already established, and to contribute by their prayers, gifts, and personal efforts to the extension of the kingdom of Christ throughout the whole earth.

CHAP. (X.) XII.—OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.—II. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive *in the act of regeneration, wherein* being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is enabled to answer *God's* call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.

III. *All* infants dying in infancy, and all other persons who, *from birth to death*, are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word, *are redeemed* by Christ *and regenerated by the Spirit*, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth.

IV. Others, not elected, although they may be called to the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet *inasmuch as they never truly come to Christ, they cannot be saved; neither is there salvation in any other way than by Christ, through the Spirit, however diligent men may be in framing their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess.*

CHAP. (XI.) XIII.—OF JUSTIFICATION.—I. Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins; and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, which faith (they have, not of themselves, it) is the gift of God.

The words in parenthesis were stricken out so as to read *which faith is the gift of God.*

III. Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to *Divine* justice in their behalf. Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners.

In line four, *Divine* is substituted for "his Father's justice."

CHAP. (XIV.) XVI.—OF SAVING FAITH.—I. The grace of faith, whereby *sinner*s are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word; by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.

CHAP. (XVI.) XVIII.—OF GOOD WORKS.—VII. Works done by unregenerate men, although they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; *and while their neglect of such things is sinful and displeasing unto God*, yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the Word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore *not free from sin*, and cannot be *accepted of God*, or make a man meet to receive grace from God.

CHAP. (XXI ) XXIII.—OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP AND THE SABBATH DAY.—IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful; *for the forgiveness of all sins, except the sin unto death*; and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead.

CHAP. (XXII.) XXIV. ——OF LAWFUL OATHS AND VOWS.—VII. No man may vow to do anything forbidden in the Word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise or ability from God. In which respects, popish monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience, are so far from being degrees of higher perfection, that they are superstitious and sinful snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.

The word *popish*, in line five, was stricken out, so as to read "monastical vows," etc.

CHAP. (XXIII.) XXV.—OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.—III. Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith. Yet, as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law or any commonwealth should interfere with, let or hinder the due exercise thereof among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suf-

ferred, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.

The words, "*as nursing fathers,*" were stricken out.

CHAP. (XXIV.) XXVI.—OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.—III. It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent, yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And, therefore, such as profess the true religion should not marry with infidels, *nor with the adherents of false religions*, neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life.

CHAP. (XXV.) XXVII.—OF THE CHURCH.—VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the claim of the Pope of Rome to be the vicar of Christ, and the head of the church universal, is without warrant in Scripture or in fact; and is an usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ.*

CHAP. (XXIX.) XXXI.—OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.—II. In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to his Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all, for remission of sins of the quick or dead; but only a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself upon the cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same: so that the *Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice for sin.*

VIII. Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation. Wherefore all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table, and cannot, without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, or be admitted thereunto.

For damnation, line five, *condemnation* was substituted.

CHAP. (XXX.) XXXII.—OF CHURCH CENSURES.—II. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have *ministerial and declarative* power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the Word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.

It will be noted that the Assembly was careful to send down this revision to the presbyteries simply as a report of progress, and not with action of any kind upon it. The effect of this will be to make the work more deliberate in every way, and it points to the fact that several years are likely to elapse before its completion. If revision must come, this is greatly to be desired and insures a better result. Meanwhile, it may appear, as we think not unlikely, that the whole work may be dismissed. The disastrous departures from the faith in some quarters cannot be dissociated altogether from the urgency with which many have contended for this revision. The move-

ment has unquestionably been badly wounded in the house of its friends. As to the changes proposed, President Patton classified them as, in his judgment, changes that he could make *con amore*; changes not called for by the theological exigency of the day, yet not objectionable; changes which are demanded by the church, and which ought to be made, but not in the way which the committee proposes; and changes that are not needed and which he hoped would not stand. So far as the actual merits of the revision are concerned, the chief value lies in the addition to the Confession of the proposed new chapters OF THE WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST, and OF THE UNIVERSAL OFFER OF THE GOSPEL. While the changes are unnecessary, we yet see that our Arminian friends receive far less of comfort from them than they had anticipated; and as the work goes on we expect to see them less and less comforted.

Turn we now to *the Briggs' case*. The preliminaries of this are already doubtless very familiar to the QUARTERLY'S readers: the endowment of the chair of Biblical Theology in Union Seminary, New York; the transfer to that chair of Dr. C. A. Briggs; the inauguration of Dr. Briggs without waiting for action on the matter by the Assembly, according to the compact of 1870; the famous inaugural address of Dr. Briggs; the overtures of not fewer than one-third (79 out of 216) of the presbyteries of the church; the instituting of an inquiry and regular process by the Presbytery of New York, of which Dr. Briggs is a member; the paper signed by a large number of the Alumni of Union Seminary; the Faculty's statement; the categorical questions of the Board of Directors, etc. The Assembly's rights in the matter are expressed in the following statement, taken from page 390 of the new Digest:

"1. That the Board of Directors of each Theological Seminary shall be authorized to appoint all professors for the same.

"2. That all such appointments shall be reported to the General Assembly, and no such appointment of professor shall be considered as a complete election if disapproved by a majority vote of the Assembly.

"And further, be it resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York, persuaded that the plan proposed in the memorial will meet the cordial approval of the patrons, donors and friends of all these seminaries, and contribute to the peace and prosperity of the church, do hereby agree, if the said plan shall be adopted by the General Assembly, that they will agree to conform to the same, the Union Theological Seminary in New York being in this respect on the same ground with other theological seminaries of the Presbyterian Church. [1870. pp. 148, 149.]

"The Assembly complied with this request. [See Minutes, pp. 60-64.]

“That the Assembly declare that the true meaning of the act subjecting the election of a professor to the veto of the Assembly is that such election be reported to the next General Assembly thereafter, and if not vetoed by that Assembly the election shall be regarded as complete according to the plan ratified by the Assembly of 1870.” [See Minutes, pp. 60-65, 1870; 1871, p. 581,]

The report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, to which this matter was referred, was listened to with breathless interest by the multitude that filled the house. It recited the fact that many overtures had been placed in the committee's hands recommending specific action on the part of the Assembly in the case, or asking in general terms for such action as the Assembly in its wisdom should deem best; it commended these presbyteries for their vigilant regard for the purity of their church; it recited the action of the directors of the Seminary, as duly reported to the Assembly, and gave the facts in the case; it expressed the conviction that the interests of the Seminary should be most carefully considered and that great regard should be had for the judgment of those who, as directors and as members of its faculty, are administering its affairs; it further affirmed that while the Assembly had no official information that Dr. Briggs' presbytery had taken steps looking to his prosecution on the charge of heresy, this well-known fact should be so far recognized as to secure from the Assembly the protection of the good name of Dr. Briggs in the discussion of the question which properly came before the Assembly, and prevent any expression of opinion that could be justly regarded as a prejudgment of the case that will soon assume the form of a judicial process; it asked special attention to the fact that the question before the Assembly was not whether Dr. Briggs, as a Presbyterian minister, had so far contravened the teachings of the Westminster Confession as to have made himself liable to judicial censure, but whether, in view of the utterances contained in the inaugural address, and the disturbing effect they produced throughout the church, the election of Dr. Briggs to the chair of Biblical Theology should be disapproved; it then stated the law in the case, as we have given above; it showed its recognition of the fact that a distinction might exist between the original election of a professor and the appointment of one already a professor to the work of a certain department, but expressed the opinion that the Assembly would, and should, not admit that the right of disapproval was restricted to the former; and it then recommended the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That in the exercise of its right to veto the appointment of professors in the Union Theological Seminary, the General Assembly hereby disapproves

of the appointment of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., to the Edward Robinson professorship of Biblical Theology in that seminary by transfer from another chair in the same seminary.

2. *Resolved*, That a committee, consisting of eight ministers and seven ruling elders, be appointed by this Assembly to confer with the directors of the Union Theological Seminary in regard to the relations of the said seminary to the General Assembly, and to report to the next General Assembly.

The discussion of these resolutions began on Thursday, May 28. Dr. Patton, the chairman of the committee, made a few remarks by way of explanation, and the floor was taken by Professor Henry P. Smith, of Lane Seminary. Professor Smith was already known as a friend of Dr. Briggs, he, with Professor Evans, having recently issued a vigorous defence of his position, in a pamphlet entitled *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*, which has received wide-spread attention. The substance of his present speech was that, if the action proposed was taken, the usefulness of a minister in good standing would be terminated, and a great institution crippled; that the Assembly was incompetent to judge of the qualifications of a professor, save as to his soundness in doctrine; that Dr. Briggs was no stranger to the church, but had served it seventeen years, with growing acceptability and earnestness; that the misunderstanding of Dr. Briggs' position, influenced largely by the press, and growing out of the criticisms of a synopsis or syllabus of his address, rather than the whole of it, was not a reason for judging a professor; that the allegation made, that Dr. Briggs' address was not in harmony with our Confession of Faith, was not true; that his position in regard to James Martineau was not worthy of condemnation; that his making Reason and the Bible and the Church coördinate sources of religious knowledge was not, in a certain sense, wrong; that the charge of "bibliolatry" was justified in many cases; that the inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture is not a doctrine of the Confession, and if it were, that inerrant transmission of the documents is equally a doctrine of the Confession; that Dr. Briggs' doctrine of "progressive sanctification" (which, by the way, the speaker declared he did not altogether understand) had not yet been thoroughly worked out, and hence was not yet a proper subject for condemnation.

At this point, Dr. Logan proposed an amendment to the first resolution, by the insertion of the words, "for the present," after "disapproves," and advocated its adoption.

Dr. Dickey, a director of the seminary, spoke next, expressing his desire for unity; declaring his willingness to sustain the report, with

the single change proposed by Dr. Logan; deprecating the dividing of God's ministers into ranks, and calling them by names of men, as "Briggs men" and "anti-Briggs men"; stating that he could not, in justice, make any defence for the spirit of the inaugural address; pleading, on the ground of expediency, that the Assembly wait a little while and take any other risk than to make haste; urging that another Assembly might make a different construction from this Assembly of the law in the case, and that the veto power would not lapse with this meeting, and that the directors of the seminary would be placed in an uncomfortable position by immediate action, and should be trusted for a year.

Dr. Bartlett opposed the amendment in a short speech, rightly characterizing the presumption and affected superiority of the whole school of higher critics, declaring that the heretic was hurting the church and not the church the heretic, and urging that the interests of the seminary and of the church be regarded as paramount.

Dr. Patton next spoke. He would eliminate the personal element entirely. He was Dr. Briggs' friend. He recognized his learning, industry, piety. The action proposed by the committee could not be looked upon as a reflection upon the directors. As a party to the contract with the seminary, the Assembly has a right to interpret the compact, and difference of interpretation on the part of the board of directors is provided for without resort to civil proceedings, in the appointment of the proposed committee of conference. The veto power, if exercised under the terms of the compact, must be in the terms of the compact, which would exclude "for the present." The responsibility rests upon the Assembly in the case. The position was such that to neglect action would be *particeps criminis*. The question is here. He would not urge the use of the veto power upon the ground of Dr. Briggs not having made himself understood. He does not place it on the ground of heresy, for that would be to put a weapon into the hands of the Committee of Prosecution in New York Presbytery. He would like to wait, but we cannot wait. The well-known fact is that Dr. Briggs' position with regard to some matters in the sphere of dogmatic theology is so uncertain that numerous presbyteries have asked the Assembly to inquire into them. The question is, whether a man whose utterance has awakened such distrust is a man who, when you are obliged to vote, and when you must either sanction or disapprove, you are ready to say ought to be sanctioned for a position of official theological teaching. It is a fact, not judicially known, it is



true, but the light of which cannot be shut out of conscience when a conscientious arbitrament of the question comes, that his own presbytery has initiated orderly proceedings, looking to a trial for heresy; so that if there is so much doubt as to what he believes that his presbytery has taken this duty upon itself, can there be any doubt that, pending its decision, the Assembly ought not to say he is the right man to teach Biblical Theology? Dr. Briggs is in an uncertain position; that is, the church does not know what he believes; he has left an impression upon the minds of his readers that is altogether in the direction of an apologetic interpretation of the worst enemies of the Christian faith; if he holds to the doctrine of progressive sanctification, which is the natural and obvious inference from the address, he ought not to be confirmed, for that doctrine is one that ought not to be taught in our theological seminaries; if he does not hold to that doctrine, it is impossible to find out what he does believe, and pending an inquiry as to what he does believe, the obvious thing to do is to disapprove. If the Assembly does not veto now, it sanctions Dr. Briggs and puts its imprimatur, given under the most solemn conditions, upon the broad church, comprehension principle. The veto takes cognizance of facts in the past. Should a new state of facts emerge, and it were found that the Assembly had been in the fault, and Dr. Briggs was only partially in fault, the Assembly would not wait for the question to be put as to whether it had a right to confirm, it would, by a rising vote, reaffirm, with gratitude to God, its confidence in Dr. Briggs as a teacher of our students in theology.

The speech of Judge Breckenridge, so tragically concluded by his sudden death, was a discussion of the legal aspects of the case, showing that the power to disapprove, if not immediately exercised, is abandoned and abdicated, and dealing with the question of transfer from one chair to another. After several speeches on both sides of the question, Dr. J. H. Worcester, Jr., obtained the floor and offered the following amendment, which was intended as a substitute for the entire report of the committee:

The Assembly recognizes that the present relations of our theological seminaries to the General Assembly were brought about through the voluntary and generous concession by Union Seminary of a portion of its independence, in the interest of a better adjustment for all, and it recognizes that in the recent transfer of Professor Briggs to the chair of Biblical Theology, the directors of Union Seminary acted in perfect good faith, upon a possible construction of their powers under the

*Resolved,* That a committee be appointed by this Assembly, consisting of eight ministers and seven ruling elders, for the following purposes, to wit:

act defining those relations. It recognizes also that the present widespread uneasiness and agitation in the church has grown out of utterances of Professor Briggs subsequent to that transfer. At the same time, it regards these utterances as certainly ill-advised, and as having seriously disturbed the peace of the church and led to a situation full of difficulty and complication; yet the Assembly desires to act in the spirit of the largest charity and forbearance consistent with fidelity to its trust, and of the most generous confidence in the directors of Union Seminary. Therefore,

1. To confer with the directors of Union Theological Seminary in regard to the relations of the said seminary to the General Assembly, and report thereon to the General Assembly.

2. To request the directors of Union Seminary to reconsider the action by which Dr. Briggs was transferred to the chair of Biblical Theology.

3. To advise that in any case Professor Briggs be not allowed to give instruction during the year previous to the meeting of the next Assembly.

This substitute Dr. Worcester urged as in the interests of unity and peace, and as a means of calming the agitated church and allaying threatened bitterness of strife. He objected to Dr. Patton's report, because it proposed an extreme course, and because it was arbitrary, disapproving an appointment without giving reasons. The substitute avoids prejudicing Dr. Briggs before his Presbytery, relieves the prosecutors in the case of much of its delicacy, conciliates the directors of the seminary, and gives time for calm and due consideration of the case.

The further debate was most able, especially the speech of Dr. McKibbin; but the limit assigned to this paper forbids giving a synopsis of it. Dr. Worcester's substitute was lost by a vote of 106 to 360, the amendment of Dr. Logan was voted down, and, on a call of the roll, on the motion to adopt the committee's resolution, the vote stood 447 to 60.

Thus ended one of the most memorable debates of the church's history. The conclusion reached was unquestionably foreseen, but the overwhelming character of the majority was scarcely expected. It set the church upon a high plane, and published to the world that she will abide there. That the decision reached has been, and will continue to be, criticised, especially where the personal relations of Dr. Briggs are most felt, and that the seminary to a chair of which he was appointed will resent it goes without saying. The very hurried action of the directory, within a few days of the rising of the Assembly, indicates a certain spirit of resistance which, it is to be hoped, time will allay. The action taken by the directors is of a peculiar nature, which they cannot after awhile agree to stand by. It makes it appear that they esteem a technical, legal right above a moral obligation, and

that they prefer to let the latter yield to the former. It further looks as if the placing of Union Seminary in relation to the Assembly was intended merely to obtain the latter's influence, and the benefit of its association, as long as the Assembly would let the Board of Directors do as it pleased. For twenty years it allowed the relation to be unquestioned, and received approval after approval of its elections; but, lo, upon the first disapproval, it declares that the relation is unlawful and violation of the charter.

---

### THE FEDERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

THE Synods of the Reformed Church of America and the Reformed Church in the United States, popularly known as the Dutch Reformed Church and the German Reformed Church, have lately concluded most important sessions. The first named meets annually; the last named triennially. In the case of the last named, the session just held was *special*, the first of its kind, and brought together by the importance of the matter before it. The chief business before these bodies was the consideration of the report of their joint commission on Union, and the completion of an effort inaugurated five years ago. Friday, June 5, was "Union Day" in both Synods. The report of the joint commission was received. It recommended a Federal Union, submitted a basis or constitution for the same, and witnessed the hardly-to-be-expected unanimous adoption by both Synods of the constitution. The measure has only to be submitted to the classes, to carry the Union into full effect. That their approval will be given no one now doubts.

This is the third effort made to unite these kindred bodies, the first having been made to unite the two in a "confederal union," about forty years ago; the second, an attempt at organic union, twenty years ago. The plan just adopted is more of the nature of a coöperative, or federated alliance, than of a direct union. It contemplates the maintenance of the separate identity of each denomination, in name, cultus, discipline and property, but a union in work and testimony. It looks, however, towards closer relations. In the words of the joint commission, "It is believed that if a union be formed, which gives but little authority or power to the judicatory at the beginning, the union will grow closer by trial, and the Federal judicatory will gradually more and more win the confidence and affection of the churches. If this Federal judicatory should prove to be a decided advantage to the

growth and prosperity of the churches it represents, greater power may be given to it from time to time. Even if it should never possess more than advisory powers or functions, yet if it should serve to promote closer coöperation between the two churches in the Union; or, in addition, open the way for an alliance of all the Reformed Churches of this country, the experiment will not be in vain. Considering the repeated efforts to bring about this union, though former ones failed, it would seem that the desire for union is so deep-rooted that it will not be satisfied until a fair trial be made."

The following is the proposed CONSTITUTION OF THE FEDERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA AND THE REFORMED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES :

PREAMBLE.

For the glory of God, and for the greater unity and advancement of the Church of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head, the following Articles of Constitution and Federal Union between the Reformed Church in America and the Reformed Church of the United States are adopted :

ARTICLE I.

Each denomination entering into this Union shall retain its distinct individuality, as well as every power, jurisdiction and right which is not by this Constitution expressly delegated to the body hereby constituted.

ARTICLE II.

Full faith and credit shall be given by each of these denominations to the acts, proceedings and records of the duly constituted authorities of the other denominations.

ARTICLE III.

For the management of certain common interests of these federated Churches, an Ecclesiastical Assembly is hereby constituted, which shall be known by the name and style of THE FEDERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

ARTICLE IV.

The Federal Synod shall consist of sixteen ministers and sixteen elders from each of the constituent denominations, who shall be chosen with *secundi* under the direction of their respective General Synods, in such manner as these Synods shall respectively determine. At the first election of delegates to the Federal Synod by each denomination, the whole number, viz. : sixteen ministers and sixteen elders, shall be divided into four classes, of four ministers and four elders in each. The first class shall serve for one year, the second class for two years, the third class for three years, and the fourth class for four years. After the first election four ministers and four elders shall be elected or appointed annually for four years by each denomination, which shall also have power to fill vacancies for unexpired terms. But in case of a General Synod that does not meet annually, it shall, at its stated meetings, regulate its election of delegates according to the general principle here stated, as it may deem proper.

## ARTICLE V.

To the Federal Synod shall be committed powers relating to Missions, Domestic and Foreign; to new educational enterprises common to both denominations; to the general superintendence of Sunday-school interests and literature, and to other ecclesiastical matters, such as shall be determined by the concurrent action of the constituent General Synods.

## ARTICLE VI.

The Federal Synod may advise and recommend in all matters pertaining to the general welfare of the Kingdom of Christ, but shall not exercise authority except such as is expressly given it under this Constitution. Whenever anything recommended by the Federal Synod shall have received the assent of each of the General Synods, it shall have the force of law in both denominations.

## ARTICLE VII.

The Federal Synod shall have the power of opening and maintaining a friendly correspondence with the highest assemblies of other religious denominations, for the purpose of promoting union and concert of action in general or common interests.

## ARTICLE VIII.

The Federal Synod shall not interfere with the creed, cultus, or government of either denomination. Also, all matters of discipline shall be left to the exclusive and final judgment of the ecclesiastical authorities of the denomination in which the same may arise.

## ARTICLE IX.

All conflicting interests between the two denominations shall be arbitrated by such executive agencies as may be created by the Federal Synod, under this Constitution, with the right of appeal to the Federal Synod for final adjudication.

## ARTICLE X.

The officers of the Federal Synod shall be a President, Vice-President, Stated Clerk and Treasurer.

## ARTICLE XI.

The Federal Synod shall meet annually, at such time and place as may be determined.

## ARTICLE XII.

The contingent expenses of the Federal Synod shall be divided equally between the denominations.

## ARTICLE XIII.

Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by the Federal Synod, or by either of the General Synods, but the concurrent action of the two General Synods shall be necessary for their adoption.

The commission also recommended that, even before the Federal Synod is fully organized, conference be held between the Home and Foreign Mission Board of both bodies for consultation. These recommendations were heartily agreed to in both bodies. In the German Synod, in view of the fact that it meets only once in three years, and in anticipation of approval by the classes, representatives were elected to the Federal Synod, it being left to the President of Synod, in con-

junction with the Dutch brethren, to designate the time and place of the Federal Synod's meeting.

Dr. Good, of the German body, calls attention to two very remarkable coincidences. The first is that his Synod met and consummated this union in its most historic church, the First of Philadelphia, which was for sixty-four years under the control of the Classis of Amsterdam; and the second and most striking was, that his Synod unconsciously observed the centennial of the separation from the mother church in Holland. The German Reformed Church separated from the Classis of Amsterdam in 1791, and now, in 1891, again unites with the Dutch brethren in this country.

## VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### DR. DABNEY'S DISCUSSIONS.

DISCUSSIONS by *R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas, and for many years Professor of Theology in Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.* Edited by C. R. Vaughan, D. D., pastor of the Presbyterian Church of New Providence, Va. Vol. I. *Theological and Evangelical.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1890.

Dr. Dabney may justly be regarded as a great preacher. He was eminently successful as a pastor. His name in the only congregation he ever served in that capacity is yet as an "ointment poured forth." But his fame will mainly rest on his labors as a thinker, a writer, and a teacher. For this reason the church is to be congratulated on the republication in permanent form of that large body of his writings which has appeared on the pages of Reviews and in fugitive pamphlets and tracts.

The volume announced above is the first of a series of four; three of which are to be issued under the auspices of our Southern Presbyterian Church; while for the fourth, which will contain "Discussions Secular," the church will assume no responsibility whatever. This first volume appeared just before the January number of the *QUARTERLY* went to press. That number contained a brief notice of it and a promise of a more extended review, which is now to be fulfilled.

The discussions are preceded by a biographical sketch of Dr. Dabney, written by the editor, the Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D. This sketch contains a brief outline of Dr. Dabney's life, and a more extended description and estimate of his mental powers, of his moral and spiritual character and of his labors. It is admirable in diction and tone. Dr. Vaughan is evidently a warm personal friend and an ardent admirer of Dr. Dabney, yet his estimate of his friend's character and work is eminently just. He admits imperfections, acknowledges that his author is a man of war, and that he has waged it with error as "Coeur de Lion waged among the ranks of the Saracens;" that his "keen expression of moral indignation sometimes jarred on the nerves of timid people;" that he "was accused of indulging in unlawful passion;" that it is altogether probable that his ardent temper sometimes "passed over into some excess." But he acquits him of malice towards persons, defends him from unjust strictures, and claims that all these defects are "literally nothing" in comparison with the value of his life and labors.

Other people besides Dr. Vaughan have come to this same conclusion. The unbiassed reader of this sketch and of the discussions which it introduces will be likely to admit that Dr. Dabney is a greater man and a better man than he has

been thought to be by some who have formed their opinions of him from a narrower induction than that which Dr. Vaughan has made.

The volume itself gives a fair view of the range of Dr. Dabney's learning within the theological and evangelical departments to which it is confined, of his methods of treating subjects, of his mental abilities and his rhetorical style. It consists of thirty-two discussions. Eleven are sermons or expositions of Scripture passages, originally delivered or printed as such. Eleven are reviews of books or systems. Nine are original discussions more or less extended of important topics. One is a beautiful story designed to exhibit the light of a holy example. Among the reviews are those of Breckinridge, of Hodge, of Alexander Campbell. Among the doctrines discussed are God's vindicatory justice, original sin, endless punishment, regeneration and imputation. Besides questions pertaining to Biblical criticism, both the lower and the higher, which are elaborately discussed, we have such practical topics as the Sabbath, prayer, the principles of Christian economy, revivals, missions, meditation, parental responsibility, and the duties of a Christian towards his enemies.

The one thing which distinguishes these discussions above everything else is *thought*; thought expressed for the most part in language exceedingly clear and cogent; thought presented so as to secure cumulative effects. The reader is rarely, if ever, in doubt as to what the author means, or as to his logical, or rhetorical, or practical aim. Dr. Dabney does not fire random shots. One of his favorite figures to describe a sermon is that of an ancient war-ship, every part of which was so arranged as to give penetrating power to the iron beak which armed the prow. His discussions, whenever he is free to choose his own method, are arranged on this plan. He has his opponent always in mind, as he thinks, as he plans, as he writes. To strike, to strike hard, to overwhelm, is the one object never lost sight of. Even when this agonistic figure is inappropriate to describe it, Dr. Dabney's method is always characterized by unity and cumulative effect. This may be observed in the narrative told to illustrate Matthew v. 16, in the delicately tender and pathetic sermon entitled "Our Comfort in Dying" (Acts vii. 59), as well as in the terrific discourse on "The Sin of the Tempter" (Heb. ii. 15). It is this wealth of thought, and this method of presenting it, which make these discussions so valuable.

It will be quite impossible to notice in detail within the limits assigned to this review all of these discussions. A selection of a few will be made for special remark in order to vindicate the general opinion expressed as to their value, and to evince the truth that the reviewer is not bestowing heedless and indiscriminate praise.

Dr. Dabney's treatment of Dr. Breckinridge is courteous, fair, and if at times severe, is justly so. His prediction that the work would add nothing to Dr. Breckinridge's fame has been verified.

In his review of Dr. Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, and in the article entitled "Original Sin," which is a review of a posthumous work by the Rev. Dr. R. W. Landis, we have his views respecting imputation set forth and defended. Dr. Dabney, as is well known to his students, refuses to distinguish between mediate and immediate imputation. He regards this distinction, though made by many able Calvinistic theologians, as "ill starred," and their acceptance of the



doctrine of immediate imputation due to "their love of system and symmetry of statement and over confidence in their own logic." He says, "They became wise above that which is written, they added no light to the mystery of the decree, but they misrepresented the moral attributes of God, and provoked a crowd of natural cavils and objections." In this class he puts Dr. Hodge.

While we are inclined to accept Dr. Dabney's views on this extremely difficult subject as on the whole more scriptural than those he opposes, and while we greatly admire the skill and force with which he attacks his opponents' position and defends his own, we doubt somewhat the justice of the strictures he makes on those who hold the theory of immediate imputation. In the last resort they have the same reply to the "natural cavils and objections" as he, and the reply is as good in their hands as it is in his. According to Dr. Dabney the immediate imputationist is compelled to regard each descendant of Adam as having, at least for a moment at the beginning of his life, a separate, independent and holy or innocent existence. To this descendant guilt is imputed in virtue of his federal connection with Adam, and their depravity is inflicted as a punishment for guilt. The difficulty here is to vindicate the justice of God in imputing guilt to those who in fact as well as in theory are personally innocent. Dr. Dabney states the case substantially as follows: In virtue of their federal connection with Adam, his descendants enter upon their separate and individual existence both guilty and depraved. That is, they begin their life precisely in that condition in which Adam by his sin brought himself. Guilt is not the procuring cause of depravity, nor depravity the procuring cause of guilt, but both together characterize Adam's descendants in virtue of their natural and federal relations to him. Dr. Dabney tells us that reason, while it may not be able to explain or to account for this scheme, cannot convict it, as he states it, of injustice, because it is a unique scheme. Reason takes cognizance only of those cases in which the parties to whom guilt is imputed have a previous, separate, holy, existence. In the case under consideration these conditions are not found. There is no previous, holy, separate existence in the case of any child of Adam.

Let all this be admitted, and still the question arises: How are we to vindicate the justice and goodness of God in ordaining a scheme which involves such direful consequences to persons who otherwise would not have come into existence at all, or who, if they came into existence, would have begun that existence holy, or at least innocent? Dr. Dabney would reply: these direful consequences come in virtue of the federal connection with Adam, which, all things considered, is a beneficent and righteous arrangement on God's part. Similarly Dr. Hodge says: Guilt is justly imparted to Adam's descendants because of their federal connection with him; that connection is the righteous ground of the imputation, which is, all things considered, a beneficent arrangement.

Dr. Dabney's statement sheds no more light on the real mystery involved, the mystery of God's decree in the premises, than his opponents' statement. It is as justly chargeable with misrepresenting the moral attributes of God and provoking natural cavil and objections as that of Dr. Hodge. For it is as difficult to explain how God could ordain a scheme in which certain persons, who otherwise would have been innocent, or else non-existent, should actually be both guilty and depraved in virtue of another's sin, as it is to explain how God could ordain a scheme

in which certain persons, who otherwise would have been innocent, are regarded as guilty in virtue of another's sin, and then made actually depraved on account of their guilt. In both cases the stress of the difficulty is to be found in the arrangement which made Adam the federal head and representative of his posterity. And the only answer is, that this arrangement is unique; it has no parallel save in the relation which Christ sustains to his people, for which the arrangement with Adam prepares the way. Reason cannot convict it of essential injustice because it has no law by which to judge it, nor cases with which to compare it. Undevout, infidel reason will cavil at any truthful account which may be given of it. Devout reason sees that this arrangement is on the whole a beneficent one for man. But in the last analysis we must accept it because God—the holy, just and good God—has ordained it. “Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

In his review of the Theology of the Plymouth Brethren, Dr. Dabney defends with great ability the biblical and confessional theology against the extremes of the Plymouth Brethren. At the same time he frankly concedes the work they are doing in defending the truth against the legalist.

The most unsatisfactory part of this discussion is his criticism of their views respecting the pre-millennial advent of Christ. Here he does not fully state, but clearly indicates, his own position. He is apparently an extreme post-millenarian, and is committed to the exegesis and conclusions of that school. He says: Pre-Adventism “requires us to do violence to many predictions of events yet to be fulfilled before Christ's return, and it cannot be necessary to the highest edification and ‘love of the Lord's appearing’ for us, in our day, to expect the advent rather than our death, because Paul, Augustine, Calvin, could not have done so. Had they cherished that hope, time has now stubbornly proved that they would have erred. Was *delusion* then, a desirable means of Christian edification? Again: “The hope of us common Christians is to meet our glorified Lord very certainly and very soon (when our bodies die) in the other world. It passes our wits to see how a less certain hope of meeting him in this world (a worse one) can evince more ‘love for his appearing.’” Accordingly we find him interpreting Matthew xxiv, 42, as an exhortation to watch for the day of our death. See sermon entitled “Our Comfort in Dying” page 602. At the close of his review of the Plymouth Theology he says: “Pre-adventism is directly against our standards. So far as we can now remember, the word millennium does not occur in them; and, on the question whether the whole race of men will be converted in the latter day, they observe a wise silence. But they distinctly teach one resurrection, and the only remaining advent of our Lord at the judgment day.”

In this last quotation Dr. Dabney points towards the truth as to this subject, and it is greatly to be regretted that he has not used his great learning and skill in debate to expound fully the true scriptural and confessional view, in order to lead the church back to it. Many of our ministers in their just opposition to the extreme views of the pre-millenarians have allowed themselves almost wholly to ignore in their preaching and their pastoral work the doctrine of the Second Advent. They are not post-millenarians and yet, practically, they have followed these brethren in allowing the event of death to usurp the coming of the Lord as the object of the believers thought and hope. Pre-millenarianism, except in its contention that the Lord's return is ever to be expected and desired is, for the most part,

contra-scriptural and contra-confessional. Post-millenarianism, except in its contention that the Lord's personal return has the effect to put an end to the application of redemption so far as saving sinners is concerned, is likewise extra if not contra-scriptural and contra-confessional. The Scriptural and the confessional position is that the Lord is coming again to the earth personally, in power and great glory to establish not a millennial but his everlasting kingdom ; that this great event, with the evangelization of the nations and the salvation of the elect, not the believer's personal death nor the conversion of the world, is the object of the hope, prayers, and labors of the church. Holy living, gospel preaching, self-denial, renunciation of the world, every Christian grace and duty are promoted in the New Testament by the presentation of this great event. Then the work of saving men will cease, then all must give account of their deeds. Then will the righteous be rewarded, and the wicked receive the full penalty of their sins. It is very desirable that the appeals which the Scriptures make to the hearts and consciences of men, believers as well as unbelievers, should be employed by the preachers and teachers of the gospel, rather than those which are suggested by their own notions as to what will be most effective.

Recent events in the American theological world will serve to give fresh interest to Dr. Dabney's "Refutation of Prof. W. Robertson Smith." In this discussion there is a great deal of information ready furnished for those who wish to be fortified against the conclusions of the higher critics. Dr. Dabney clearly states the difference between the right of free thought, and expression, and the right to use the church's endorsement, authority, official position and money to pull down the church's doctrines. He exposes the arrogance which assumes that all the scholarship, all the industry, all the painstaking exegesis, all the honesty of opinion, are to be found among the higher critics of the destructive school, and that all the indolence, all the dogmatism, are to be found among those who maintain the traditional and confessional views. He very ably defends the Hebrew text against the attempts made to belittle it, based on the variations between it and the Septuagint as represented in the Vatican Codex. He replies with great force to the argument presented to prove the late date assigned to some of the Psalms, and to much of the Pentateuch. The entire discussion is commended to any one who may be disposed to surrender bag and baggage to the enemy.

The review of Alexander Campbell's system will be found valuable to those brethren whose geographical position brings them in contact with Campbellism. It is altogether impossible to judge of the opinions of the preachers of this sect as a whole, for there is very little in common among them except their belief in the immersion theory of baptism, their so-called rejection of creeds, and their apparent denial of the office and work of the Holy Spirit. But there is a sort of *consensus* of view—a "Campbellite usage" analogous to that known as "Baptist usage." Acquaintance with this usage will serve to confirm the impression made by Dr. Dabney's discussion. It is that the Campbellite gospel is not the gospel of Jesus Christ.

As might be expected, Dr. Dabney argues in favor of the *Textus Receptus* as against the text prepared by the critics, and for the old version of the New Testament against the Anglo-American Revision. Here we have as usual a great array of skilfully marshalled facts and arguments, but these will not serve to stay the

tide in favor of the new as against the old. It took some time for the old to become "received" and "authorized." The new cannot expect a more favorable reception—but the time will come when Wescott and Hort's, or a better text, will be the *Textus Receptus*, and the Anglo-American Revision, or a better one, will be the "authorized" version. Calvinists and Presbyterians should be the last to deplore these results.

In the sermons and practical discussions there is much that our young ministers, especially those who have not been Dr. Dabney's students, will find worthy of careful study—much that is instructive as to matter and style, much that is stimulating to mental effort. The exposition of 1 Corinthians iii. 10-16, the discussion of the Gospel Idea of Preaching, the brief article on a Phase of Religious Selfishness, are valuable and timely in view of the impulse now given to evangelistic effort. The sermon on Parental Responsibilities is a powerful discussion of a subject that needs to be constantly presented in pastoral work. The discussion of the principles of Christian Economy, of our Secular Prosperity, will prove useful in view of the vast and rapid increase of wealth in the hands of American Christians.

But time and space fail to enumerate all the excellencies of these discussions. The book is worth purchasing even by those who have most of them in the form in which they originally appeared. To anyone who does not have them, we are disposed to say, as was said by a reviewer of Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom" to his impecunious brethren when those three volumes were first published, "let him sell his garment and buy one."

E. C. GORDON.

*Lexington, Mo.*

#### ROW'S CHRISTIAN THEISM.

CHRISTIAN THEISM. A brief and popular survey of the evidence upon which it rests: and the objections urged against it, considered and refuted. *By the Rev. C. A. Row, M. A. Oxon, Honorary D. D., of the University of the South, United States, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, and Bampton Lecturer for 1877.* New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 Bible House.

The aim and effort of this book are both excellent. A popular and, at the same time, thorough going treatise of just these dimensions on the contemporary aspect of Christian Theism, has for some time been distinctly needed. It must be thirty odd years ago that the somewhat smaller works of Wharton and Tulloch appeared, and they were both unsatisfactory in their doctrinal attitude. Many later disquisitions have come out from time to time in English on this prolific subject, but no one of them has exactly met the demand that has been referred to. Professor Flint's two ponderous tomes were masterly and, as to essentials, unexceptionable and exhaustive; they were also in an unusual degree original and authoritative: but they took a higher range, and were not intended to be studiously popular.

One of the most striking presentations of "The Theistic Argument" is that of the lamented Dr. Diman of Brown University. It is of moderate compass too, and sufficiently intelligible to a reasonably well instructed reader. It deals however only with certain selected phases of the comprehensive subject. The same remark holds good in a measure of Professor Fisher's well-known work on "The Grounds of Theistic Belief." Only a portion of the book indeed is taken up with

the discussion of those matters which are usually considered in works nominally devoted to theistic apologetics. The remainder would come in very properly in an advanced course in a theological seminary. Dr. Fisher's exceedingly able disquisition, though on other grounds perhaps the best for general purposes that exists in our language, is often hardly intelligible to a plain reader.

At first we were delighted with what seemed to us to be Dr. Row's complete success in meeting the requisitions of the case. The book covered fairly well the whole ground commonly debated, and contained little that was not germane to that discussion. It was sufficiently up to the times as to the questions that have been recently mooted, or that have lately "come to the fore," and yet was not encumbered with an ostentatious and confusing array of proper names. The author refers oftener to groups of men than to individuals, and in the exceptional case prefers to do so by description rather than by appellation. He struck us as being popular in other ways. Where his sentences were not over long it was nearly always easy to tell what he meant, and he appeared to possess a decided felicity in the use of taking expository illustrations. One of these, (that of the loaded dice), although not new, was extremely well put, and is reverted to again and again, and effectively, in the subsequent progress of the argument. As the chances are large against aces turning up a hundred times hand-running, so the probabilities are simply incalculable that the harmonious intricacies, and the unity pervading the creation are not to be ascribed to the fortuitous concurrence and correlation of its atomic elements. Another happy illustration of the same point is drawn from a library of catalogued volumes; and still another from a pile of loose, but accurately-paged, and regularly ordered sheets, that have been blown topsy-turvy and hither and thither by the wind, and afterwards replaced by the servant in their original relative positions. The true idea of a cause is similarly illustrated by the case of a night-watchman who, in going his rounds, has accidentally dropped a lighted match into a heap of combustibles and thus set fire to a building. But as we pass on through the mazes of our author's argument we become gradually and painfully "disillusionized" as to the adequacy of his treatment of the great theme he had taken in hand, as well as in respect to his qualifications as a physiologist, as a writer of English, as an analytic thinker, as a logician, and as a scriptural theologian. We mention these points of shortcoming in the order in which we made discovery of them.

But the patient reader of this critique is entitled to know more about the drift and contents of this luxuriously printed volume. After a presentation of its general scope, the writer undertakes to unfold the nature of the evidence on which rests our belief in the being of a God. Agnosticism is then considered and refuted. The argument from causation is stated, and vindicated.

The validity of the proof is then maintained which "the adjustments, adaptations and correlations" of the universe furnish of the existence of an intelligent Creator. The anti-theistic theory of evolution is then considered and refuted. The course of reasoning bearing upon the last two points is illustrated by example. The existence of a God who is not a mere impersonal force, but a moral being, is argued from the existence of the moral nature of man. Certain popular objections are then taken up, and their value estimated. Special consideration is given to the objections which are urged against Christian Theism, because of the existence of moral evil and the results with which it is attended. The last topic to claim the

attention of our author is involved in the question, whether we have reason for believing that we shall survive the dissolution of our bodies. Consideration is also bestowed on the bearing that question has on the previous arguments.

Much of the work thus laid out is exceedingly well done. Some of the author's arguments are novel as well as cogent, and nearly all are freshly stated. Some of his logical retorts are keen as a rapier, and very neatly put. The general argument of the book is, from the nature of the case, as well as from the author's industry and acknowledged force, overwhelmingly decisive. An unbiased reader, whose mind was not made up in advance, could hardly peruse a moiety of these pages without being amply convinced of the truth of Christian Theism.

But the drawbacks are numerous and weighty. Our notice was first sharply directed to the grave blemishes which mar the symmetry and value of this volume, when we came to the part about the physiology of the ear. In saying just now that Dr. Row does not frequently mention other authors by name, we might have qualified that affirmation by stating that he is in the habit of quoting from other authors somewhat *in extenso*, and that in such cases his practice is to give the author's name distinctly. The authors thus quoted are chiefly Sir John Lubbock, the late John Stuart Mill, one Mr. Morrison, and Mr. Henry Martineau. His sole guide as to human and comparative physiology would seem to have been Sir John Lubbock. We have a shrewd suspicion that Dr. Row not only does not know any physiology himself, at first hand. (which would be no discredit to him unless he had pretended that he did), but that he does not fully understand the expositions of certain parts of that science by another and one admitted to be an expert, which he has undertaken to digest for the benefit of the readers of the present treatise. It may be due to the obscurity of the style, but one only has to compare with the labored sentences of Dr. Row, the clear, incisive statements of such men as Martin, or Huxley, or the more copious representations of such men as Carpenter, or Draper, or Flint, or Dunglison, or Sir John Lubbock (when his words are repeated), to appreciate the fact that lies at the basis of this criticism. It really looks as if the intellect of our Bampton lecturer, conscious of its own weakness, or lack of furniture, in the direction of one class of studies, or, it may be, of one particular study of that class, had actually nodded with obtrusive intimation of that circumstance, and taken a comfortable nap during a considerable part of two whole chapters. The teleological argument, which is nearly everywhere the author's main reliance, is, however, strongly and cogently presented throughout; and this remark applies in a good degree to these two chapters, as well as to the rest of the book.

It was whilst endeavoring to thread our way through the descriptions of the aural apparatus that we were first distinctly impressed with the writer's unfortunate way of using long, involved, awkward sentences, where short, compact, precise, unambiguous ones were most needed. We take an example of such sentences from another part of the volume. "Here again is ground for the rational exercise of faith, that He whose power and wisdom have built the universe, with all its wondrous adaptations, and whose goodness has provided sentient beings with such ample means of happiness and enjoyment—a happiness and enjoyment which would be all but complete if men would live in conformity with the principles of the moral law, as enunciated by Jesus Christ—has done, and will ultimately be proved to have done, all things in conformity with perfect holiness and benevolence, when

we are capable of taking a more enlarged view of his creative and providential plan." (p. 273.) Instances might be readily found where the notable Prependary of St. Paul's makes havoc of perspicuity by the ruthless manner in which he employs the word "it" The style is in some respects good, and Dr. Row has, on the whole, succeeded in clothing an abstract subject with the charm of interest. But the diction is diffuse and, as we have seen, labored; the book is full of needless repetition, and its statements are at times inadequate and even inaccurate. That the proof-reader is in part responsible for this, is undeniable. Dr. Row never could have asserted that the "internal ear" [*sic*] is of little importance in the case of man; but that a horse may be seen any time shaking it about.

It must also be a novelty to the medical profession to be told that "carbonic acid" [*sic*] is normally liberated from the lungs in the process of the aeration of the blood.

The author's defective analysis is again and again evinced by the unnecessarily large number of the recapitulatory heads under which he is wont to sum up an extended discussion. Thus he makes separate coördinate points of will-power and the power of originating action; also of conscience and the moral sense. It is conspicuous too in his treatment of the topic of "correlations," and of his tiresome reiteration of the words in which he continually reduces into one indiscriminate jumble what he is so fond of referring to as "the adjustments, adaptations, and correlations with which the universe abounds." In his definition our author confines the application of the term "correlation" to two classes, but describes without naming them, viz.: correlations of *forces*, and correlations of *adaptations*. The second of these classes may be either inorganic or organic, as the writer implies, but does not say. The organic correlations he finds an example in the human body, and might have found one of the inorganic in the steam-engine. With Dr. Row a "correlation" is in either case a group of correlated, but independent forces, or adaptations, meeting for the production of a common resultant effect which otherwise would not have occurred. He never makes mention of the familiar use of the term in its etymological sense, or of the technical sense in which it is so freely employed by Darwin and the other naturalists, and of which we have a signal example in the so-called "homologies of the vertebrate skeleton." Dr. Row seems to use the term once in the sense of a "correlation" of organs and their environment; where he speaks of the "correlation" of "the sun, the ether, the eye, the brain, and the mind" (p. 295), in the production of vision.

The unsatisfactory nature of the logic of portions of this book has been adverted to. The logical worth of the general argument is unimpeachable. The deceptive character of some of his ratiocination is strikingly signalized in his discussion of Pessimism considered in regard of the question as to the proofs of the divine benevolence that are to be seen in the works of creation. The particularly reverend disputant alleges that he will not at first bring in the consideration of a future state. He then proceeds to construct an argument, and a good one, the whole validity of which depends upon a subsequent introduction of the assumed fact of a future state of adjudication and recompense. The proof that there is on the whole more happiness than misery in the world is strongly and ingeniously built up and persuasively stated. But it is when discussing the great problems of free-will, moral evil, eternal punishment, and what the Christadelphians style "the

intrinsic immortality of the soul," that the author of the Bampton Lectures on "The Jesus of the Evangelists" and of the "Handbook of Christian Evidences" is most open to adverse criticism both as a logician and as a theologian.

The author first palpably begs the question by asserting point-blank that every determinism in form is nothing but another name for fatalism, being only a phase of the theory which reduces man to the condition of a machine or of an animal. Later on there is some pretence of reasoning out this proposition, but the process is only of the specious but frivolous sort which is based on the erroneous averments that have become so threadbare. Dr. Row is apparently a Pelagian, certainly a Restorationist, and possibly a Socinian. The unfathomable mystery of the origin of sin is dealt with in a manner as debonair and egotistical as it is superficial. It is manifest that the final theodicy has not yet been given to the world by Dr. Row. Our amiable, if oversanguine, author boldly takes the ground that "the existence" and "presence of moral evil" is one of the inevitable corollaries from the admitted existence of a moral system. This is, of course, the old, old delusion of the essential impreventibility of sin. The preacher of St. Paul's Cathedral also openly favors the scheme of posthumous probation. He urges impressively enough that God's work of repair traverses, not only innumerable peopled worlds, but innumerable progressive ages. The acme of absurdity is, however, reached when he surmises that some of the "many mansions" of the invisible universe may be "mansions of purification"! A friend near us suggests that in that great house not made with hands there must be "spiritual bath-rooms"! We part from our entertaining, but in some cardinal points, sadly untrustworthy mentor with a genuine respect for his moderation of temper, his talents, his exploits, and his good intentions; and with a clear recognition of the fact that his most serious departures from orthodoxy are no doubt due to the sinister fascination of the brilliant scholar, and audacious rhetorician and orator, who still preaches at St. Margaret's and Westminster Abbey.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

#### STEARNS' EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE: *By Lewis French Stearns*, Professor of Christian Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary: Pp. 473. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890.

This handsome treatise consists of a series of lectures given by Professor Stearns, of Bangor, Me., on the Ely foundation in Union Seminary, New York city. With a great theme, an able thinker, a ripe scholar, and a fine writer, we are prepared to find these lectures of much interest and great practical value. After reading them, we are better able to understand why Union Seminary called Professor Stearns to succeed Dr. Shedd, in its chair of Theology, and why Bangor Seminary should rejoice that Dr. Stearns did not accept the call. A more stimulating book we have not read for some time. If enthusiasm for his theme sometimes leads him to what we must consider one-sided views, yet the warm glow of that enthusiasm, coming from a heart burning with devotion to the glorified Redeemer, at once stimulates the mind and refreshes the heart. The course consists of ten compact and scholarly lectures. The following *résumé* of them may give our readers some idea of what they contain, though it can do them but scanty justice.



In the first lecture our author sets forth what may be termed the *status* of the Evidences at the present day, and defines carefully his theme—The Evidence of Christian Experience.

The refutation of the deism of the last century, at the hands of Butler, Paley and others, is well described, though it is perhaps going too far to allow that the methods of Butler are not effective for the apologetic needs of the present day. With fine skill, our author shows how subtle pantheism has taken the place of deism and how scientific progress has led to agnosticism and materialism. Following a hint given by Ebrard, in his *Apologetics*, he says that the present situation calls for a system of Apologetics which shall be "a positive system of proofs adapted to all times and circumstances, by which we may not only meet attacks, but forestall them and carry them into the enemy's country." (P. 19.) He thinks, too, that progress has been made in this direction in recent years. He is convinced that a truer perception of what Christianity is has been attained, and a more profound view of its defences has now been reached. We rejoice with him that such is the case. "Christianity," he says, "is the whole redemptive activity of God in Christ. It is God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." (P. 20.) It will be observed that this definition describes only what may be called the subjective or dynamic aspect of Christianity. This, of course, is every word of it true; yet, unless the objective or formal gospel scheme be at the same time clearly pre-supposed, the definition is at least one-sided.

That our author makes this pre-supposition is evident, as he approaches his theme, when he draws the distinction between: (1). The saving grace connected historically with a series of redemptive facts culminating in the advent of Christ, and: (2). The divine truth represented by the doctrines of revelation. (Pp. 23-24.) He also makes the somewhat popular modern distinction, signalized by Professor Mead, in his *Supernatural Revelation*, between the facts and doctrines of revelation and the *record* of them. The redemptive revelation is one thing, but its record in the Bible is another thing. In a qualified sense, there may be ground for this distinction, but great care must be taken not to push it too far. The Bible is not a merely human record of a divine redemptive revelation. The record is divine as well as the revelation. For while many things contained in the Bible were not at first divine revelations to those who wrote them, yet, as this so-called record of a divine revelation comes to us, stamped as divine and infallible by the fact of inspiration, may it not, by men of the present day, be regarded in all its parts as a divine revelation? Thus even the history and poetry of the Bible are different from all other history and poetry; and the divine revelation and its divine record are for us of the present age practically identical.

Our author rightly looks upon Christianity not merely as a redemptive revelation completed nearly two thousand years ago, but also as a system of redemptive agencies brought into the world to stay, so that Christianity is a living reality in all the ages. He deserves much credit for giving this point prominence.

Then in defining his subject our author classifies the evidences from the standpoint above indicated in a threefold way, as historical, rational and redemptive. Christianity is historically true, it is philosophically sound, and it is a working power in the world to-day. The last is the sphere in which the evidence of Christian experience lies. By this evidence Dr. Stearns does not mean the general ar-

gument from the effects of Christianity, nor that from its present influence upon men, nor even that drawn from the *outwardly* changed lives of its professors, but rather that which is "derived from the manifestation to the believer himself, in his own inward spiritual life, of the presence and power of God and the Christian realities," P. 28. There is a definiteness and clearness in the manner in which our author marks out his subject worthy of all praise.

The second and third lectures deal with the theistic and anthropological pre-suppositions upon which the evidence of Christian experience, and in fact the whole fabric of Christianity, rest. Both of these lectures are exceedingly able, and on the whole satisfactory. That on the theistic discussion is specially fine, revealing at every turn at once the philosopher and the theologian, but there are some things in the anthropological exposition which in our judgment might have been stated with a little more care. See page 75.

The fourth lecture deals with the genesis of the evidence. It begins "when a man comes fairly under the redeeming activity of God in Christ." "*The initiative is known as coming from God*" (italics his), in what is described as the "divine call," P. 112. This call has "an external and internal aspect." Of the external the outward word and the witnessing church are the means. The internal aspect of the divine call consists in "an immediate and personal communication of God to the soul as the God of redemption," and this in a "crisis of the inner life." P. 119. This brings the man to the threshold of the Christian experience in question, but the actual experience is only attained by the free act of the human will accepting the gospel, which act, however, is only possible by divine grace. P. 126. This act of the soul has two factors—repentance and faith. Repentance is *choice* and faith is *volition*, and they are inseparable. Faith is the first executive act of the will issuing from the choice implied in repentance, and it consists in receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation. Further, repentance differs from penitence. The former is a matter of the will, the latter belongs to the sensibility. Faith, too, is not mere mental assent, nor is it simply a belief in the unseen, nor again is it a conviction of the reality of axiomatic truth; rather "it is an act of trust by which we yield to God's will, and accept Christ as he is offered to us in the gospel." This faith, further, "is instrumental and appropriates God's grace." "It is receptive rather than productive." It results in the "conscious experience of the revelation of a new life to the soul." This new experience testifies to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and this Spirit bears witness to the fact of union with Christ, of God's fatherly relation, of the forgiveness of sins, of the communion of saints, and of final blessedness. P. 127-130.

There is much fine analysis in this lecture of which the above summary gives no proper idea, and in it there is much which is to our liking. Did space permit, we would like to make some remarks on the philosophy of the will implied, and on the theology of repentance and faith involved, in our author's analysis. Omitting such remarks, there is a statement made on page 114 which in itself puzzles us, and which does not seem to be made plain by the context. In speaking of the relation between the general religious experience of all men, including heathen who have never heard of Christ, and the peculiar experience of the Christian, he says: "It seems to me not unreasonable to suppose not only that in some instances the germ of divine life may exist in heathen hearts (that, I hope, is often the case),

but also that it may arrive at a certain degree of maturity in this life, though, of course, it could never be what it might have been under consciously recognized Christian influences." . . . "Nor should we expect to see such a person" (a heathen who had never heard of Christ) "make any high attainments in the religious life as judged by the Christian standard. In a word, his experience would not be, in any adequate sense of the term, a Christian experience." Here we are puzzled and prompted to ask several questions. Is this "germ of divine life" such as shall result in salvation? If not sufficiently mature in this life to secure salvation, shall it go on unto maturity and bring salvation in some stage beyond death? Is this germ ever implanted in any adult soul who has never heard of Christ? Does not the teaching of Scripture seem to be that in the case of adults a knowledge of the objective gospel is necessary to those subjective experiences that are really Christian, wherein the germ of divine life results in salvation? On such very delicate ground our author, it seems to us, would have been wise to have written more cautiously.

In the fifth lecture, the growth of the evidence is described. Here the advancing growth of sanctification is considered, and the way in which this growth furnishes an increasing knowledge of the reality of the divine causes at work is ably sketched. Then the trinitarian nature of this experience as it relates to the Father, to the Christ, and to the Holy Spirit is outlined. All along the progress of sanctification there comes increasing inward assurance of the truth of Christianity. The force of the evidence runs side by side with this growth.

In the sixth lecture, this evidence is verified in a discussion which, though marked by ability, seems at times to be somewhat forced and unreal. The author here raises the question, "Is the evidence of Christian experience capable of scientific or philosophical verification?" This question is answered in the affirmative, and he then goes on to show that, by a definitely scientific method, our probable knowledge of the truth of Christianity, based on the outward evidences, is transformed into real knowledge by the experiment of accepting the gospel offer. Until this Christian experience begins, a man can have only a probable knowledge of Christianity, but after he has responded by faith to the divine call, this probable knowledge is changed into real or certain knowledge which supplies the highest kind of evidence in favor of Christianity.

This is a brief statement of what is wrought out at length in this lecture. It is a rather technical sketch of the argument from the experience of the power of the gospel in a man's soul. For the man who is its subject, it is overpowering, but for others without this experience, it can have no greater force than any other good evidence based on testimony.

The seventh lecture, in order further to confirm the scientific nature of this evidence, considers certain philosophical objections. Eight objections are taken up and disposed of in a most effective manner. The objection raised by the positivist, agnostic and materialist against the possibility of this experience is most thoroughly refuted. The objection that the Bible determines Christian experience, and so that experience cannot be taken to prove the truth of the Bible, seems to give our author most difficulty from his point of view.

The eighth lecture deals with a number of theological objections, some from the opponents of evangelical truth, and some from its friends. Here the systems of

Kant, Ritschl and Schleiermacher are discussed with fine discrimination, and real ability. Yet some would hesitate to agree with all he says in regard to the services rendered by the last named to Christianity.

Towards the close of this lecture, a point of some importance is touched upon: That is, the distinction between the evidence of Christian experience and that derived from the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Our author says that they are to be carefully distinguished, and yet he seems to be in some confusion at this point. If the Holy Spirit be the agency in the divine call and in the work of sanctification, which provide the very conditions under which the evidence of Christian experience comes into existence, it is not easy to see in what respect they are essentially distinct. If this experience witnesses to the truth of Christianity, it also certainly testifies to the divine causes which underlie it. Our author seems to admit this in Lecture V. Pp. 166-170. It is, perhaps, best not to push distinctions so far as our author does in making the discrimination above noted. In a genuine Christian experience the agency of the Divine Spirit, and the results of that agency in the soul, are surely so blended that it is not wise to attempt to distinguish them. It is, perhaps, of more importance to make sure that the experience is determined by the outward Word, as well as produced by the inward Spirit, and at the same time to consider carefully whether the experience is capable of being interpreted by the Word.

The remaining lectures discuss at length the relation of the evidence of Christian experience to the other evidences of Christianity. Throughout, our author argues forcibly for giving this evidence a supreme place in the organism of Christian proofs. "It is the vital member of this organism." "It is the keystone of the arch of the evidences" (P. 311.) He indicates the relation of a Christian man and of one who is not a Christian to this evidence, and ventures the statement that the latter, so long as he remains outside of the sphere of the Christian realities, cannot have complete proof of the truth of Christianity. His only way to obtain it is to become a Christian. This unqualified statement may be questioned, for it seems to us that a man who is fully convinced of the truth of Christianity on intellectual grounds, may reject it for reasons which are moral in their nature. At the same time, all must admit that in order to know the full power of the truth of Christianity, it is necessary to experience its divine power in the soul.

Our author first considers the evidence of Christian experience in its relation to the historical evidences for the authenticity, genuineness, credibility and inspiration of the Scriptures. Much that is sound and good is here stated, yet it seems to us that some undue concessions are made to advanced modern criticism, on pp. 320-321. Next the relation of this evidence to the miracle is considered. It is insisted that the argument from miracles must be reconstructed. Accordingly, the miracle is to be regarded not so much as an attestation of {a divine revelation, as a part of the revelation itself. We are not fully prepared to give our approval to this view, which puts the evidential function of the miracle in a secondary place. That the miracle, as one phase of the manifestation of the supernatural, is a part of divine revelation so far as its causality is concerned may be admitted, yet the way in which the Scriptures, and our Lord himself therein, set forth the purpose of the miracle compels us to give the evidential element a foremost place in the doctrine of the miracle, as it comes before us in the Bible. The relation of this evidence to prop-

ecy is not discussed at any length, but its relation to the person and work of Christ is more fully treated. A stronger doctrinal basis would have rendered this discussion more satisfactory.

The exposition of the relation of this evidence to the rational and practical branches of the Christian evidence concludes the discussion. Here the antecedent probability of a divine revelation, the reasonableness and inherent excellence of Christianity, the adequacy of the Christian philosophy of existence, the outcome of the study of comparative religion, and the benign effects of Christianity on the world, are expounded to good purpose. It must be confessed, however, that the relation of these branches of evidence to that of Christian experience does not always seem to be very clearly brought out.

Some interesting notes, and a useful index, complete the volume, which, in its mechanical make up, leaves nothing to be desired.

We have taken up so much space with the exposition of the important contents of this able treatise that only a few concluding remarks can be made:

1. Taken as a whole, this course of lectures is one of marked ability, and has many fine features. It does not ignore metaphysics, nor make any side-thrusts at systematic theology. It is keenly alive to the recent movements of modern religious thought; and it is marked throughout by a calm, judicial temper, sometimes absent in such writings. We can earnestly commend it as a book worthy of careful study, even where hearty agreement with its positions is not possible.

2. Dr. Stearns has rendered excellent service to apologetics in this treatise, in insisting on the importance of the evidence of Christian experience at the present time. While this branch of evidence is not new, for Owen and Baxter, as well as other writers, have dwelt upon it, still the time is opportune to have a restatement of the argument in this excellent form. And while, perhaps, our author claims too much for this evidence, when he gives it the place of supremacy, there can be no doubt that it is the culminating point of all the evidences. As already hinted, it is irresistible for the individual who has it; but our author does not seem fully to appreciate the fact that, for those without it, other evidences may be of prime importance in clearing the way.

3. Having indicated that there is so much of value in these lectures, we may be pardoned for pointing out what strikes us as a serious defect in them. A lecture on the doctrinal or theological presuppositions, following these excellent lectures on the theistic and anthropological presuppositions, would have given our author substantial aid in his subsequent expositions. If the doctrinal outlines of the objective gospel, setting forth the leading contents of the scheme of redemptive truth, had been given in a separate lecture, much would have been gained. Our conviction is that between the doctrines and the experiences there is constant correlation; and the experiences are to be framed according to, as well as understood by, the doctrines. Few men are better qualified than Dr. Stearns to have done this, in addition to the excellent work he has done in these lectures. But we thank him most sincerely for these lectures, which have been perused with pleasure, and which have served to stimulate us so much.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

## DEWITT'S "THE PSALMS."

THE PSALMS: A New Translation, with Introductory Essay, and Notes. *By John De Witt, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D.* Pp. 361. Price \$2. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1891.

This is not a book which needs, as some might, words of commendation from us or from others. Its author, Dr. DeWitt, Professor in the Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church at New Brunswick, N. J., has been long and favorably known in the world of letters. The book itself, in a somewhat different form, has stood at "the dread tribunal" of authors and received a favorable verdict. "The Praise Songs of Israel," of which the present volume is practically a revised and enlarged edition, was issued in 1884. It passed to a second edition in 1889, having received words of kindly approval from such competent scholars as Professor Cheyne, Professor A. H. Sayce, and very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D. D., of England, and Rev. Drs. Howard Crosby, Charles A. Briggs and T. W. Chambers, of our own country, and from others equally competent, both in this country and in England.

The mechanical execution of the book is creditable. The paper is of an admirable quality and so is the letter-press. The binding is tasteful, but, it seems to us, might properly have been rather more substantial.

Passing to the contents we notice, first, that the characteristic features of the work as now offered to the public are an introductory essay and exegetical notes. We ought also to add, in the words of the author, that "the text has been so thoroughly rewrought that it may fairly be considered a new translation."

The aim of the book may be gathered from the following statement: "Often by a delicate touch here and there a psalm may be illuminated, and its beauty, as well as its clearness and power, immeasurably enhanced. The effect may be produced by bringing out an emphatic pronoun, by the change of a connective particle, . . . or by other like changes not affecting the substance of the psalm. Singly they may seem of little consequence, but unitedly they often produce a wonderful transformation . . . . Why should not individual scholarship and taste be laid under contribution to perform for David and other masters of Hebrew song what so many gifted minds have done for the poetry of Homer? Many such translations might be made for private use, or in the interests of Bible study, with the greatest benefit."

The introductory essay is a vigorous discussion of a number of interesting questions connected with the psalms. The author handles these under two heads, viz.: First, questions relating to the *contents* of the Psalter; and, second, those relating to the *mode of its production*. Passing by much here that might be profitable it may be well to glance at his mode of treating the old question of the so-called imprecatory psalms. We cannot follow him at every point in his attempted solution of this oft-discussed problem. But it seems to us that he touches the difficulty at its core when he emphasizes the fact that these psalms are not mere expressions of the mind and feelings of David, or of their other human authors, but of the mind of God. He also seems to us to have laid his hand upon the most probable and satisfactory solution in calling attention to the fact that the term imprecatory is a misnomer. These psalms are minatory rather than imprecatory. They are not *precative*, if we may coin a word, but *predictive* of evil.

The translation shows that the author has an ear for rythm, a rich vocabulary and a nice appreciation of the force of words. At times it is very felicitous. There are times, however, when he fails to recognize the distinction between a translation and a paraphrase, and occasionally there occur expressions which sound just slightly stilted—as when we read Psalm lxxii. 1.—

Give thy justice, O God, to the king,  
To *the royal by birth* thy righteousness give.

We have indicated by italics the expression to which we take exception. The Hebrew is לָבָן מְלֶכֶךְ. The Revisers render with more literalness and more effectively—

Give the king thy judgments, O God,  
And thy righteousness to the king's son.

There is, as Dr. DeWitt points out, a slight ambiguity here. But might not this have been avoided and the elegant simplicity of the original retained? The weakest point in the translation is the handling of the tenses of the Hebrew verb. This however is a point of great difficulty and one where some differences of judgment and taste are no doubt inevitable. One of the strong points is the recognition of nice shades of distinction between different Hebrew words of kindred meaning. The notes are valuable. We emphasize this by adding that they are too brief. We might cite many examples to sustain our judgment as to their worth, but lack of space forbids. It is only fair to add that, here also, we must occasionally dissent from the positions taken. For instance, the author seems to have nodded when he speaks of וְאִישׁ נָרָא (Psa. iii. 6.) as a cohortative and as virtually throwing back its cohortative force upon the preceding form.

Pastors who pore over the Psalms before going into the pulpit in order to awaken devotional sentiments, and to enrich their devotional vocabulary, and all who use the Psalter as a book of worship in private or public will derive pleasure and benefit from a reading and study of Dr. DeWitt's book.

*Columbia Seminary, S. C.*

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

#### MUSICK'S GENESIS OF NATURE.

THE GENESIS OF NATURE: Considered in the Light of Mr. Spencer's Philosophy, as based upon the Persistence of Energy: *By Thomas H. Musick.* Pp. 377. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

Under a rather striking title, we have in this treatise an elaborate critique of the fundamental principles of H. Spencer's philosophy, centering in the doctrine of the Persistence of Energy. The author shows wide acquaintance with the writings of leading physicists, and a good deal of acuteness in discussing them. It cannot be said that in every case his reasonings carry conviction, still his analysis of several generally received views in physical science counsels to caution in regard to their unquestioned acceptance.

Through twenty-three chapters, the author pursues his discussion, and a list of the writers whose views are noticed shows how diligent a student he has been. In chapter II., the evolutionary doctrines held by Spencer, Darwin, Lamark, Cope,

Bastian and Hinton are sketched. In chapters IV. and V. the theories of the persistence of force and energy, set forth by Grove, Helmholtz, Merriman, Carpenter, Grant Allen, Poinier, Thurston, Taylor, Stewart and Tait, Crocker, Stallo, Balfour Stewart, and H. Spencer are noticed. The last, of course, receives chief attention. Later on in the discussion, the names of Mayer, Newton, Faraday, Croll, Proctor, Guillemin, Tyndall, Silliman, Deschanel, Pascal, Cooke, and Carnot appear.

In chapters IX. and X. there are some exceedingly acute remarks made upon Gravitation, and upon the Laws of Force and Motion; and in chapter XVI. the topic of Potential Energy is discussed with no little ability. We make no attempt to reproduce the reasonings upon these subjects.

The aim of the author, all through, is to show that the great principle of the Conservation of Energy, as held by H. Spencer, is by no means so well founded as physicists generally take it to be; and it must be admitted that our author's criticisms are, in some instances, forcible, if not irrefutable. These criticisms, if heeded, will certainly lead to greater care in accepting any scientific opinions merely on the *authority* of any great name. In this connection it is instructive to note the readiness with which many who deny *authority* in matters of religion submit to *authority* in the realm of science. Credulity, so called, is certainly not peculiar to those who adhere to the verities of the Christian system.

Towards the close of his discussion our author lays siege to Spencer's system, and, with a good deal of success, shows how insufficient it is to provide a philosophy of "the genesis of nature." Spencer's attempt to correlate all forms of force and make them transmutable is shown to be utterly futile. Chapter XIX has a capital treatment of Spencer's elaborate effort to correlate physical, vital and mental forces, and even sociological forces. The result of the criticism, as well as that in the chapter on science and religion, is highly satisfactory to those who hold by a well defined theistic theory of the universe, and are not enamoured with speculations that rest on a basis of mechanical materialism, and which lead to necessitarian and atheistic results.

In conclusion, it need only be added, that the questions discussed in this treatise are of vital interest at the present day. There is a tendency on the side of science to make too much of the doctrine of the persistence of force or conservation of energy, which has by no means been made out in regard to the various forms of physical force. On the other, hand there is a tendency on the side of philosophy to ignore the spiritual elements which must have a place in every true system. A treatise such as this, which at least calls a halt, is welcome, and cannot fail to be useful. It deserves to have many readers.

*Columbia, S. C.*

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

#### CORSON'S INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SHAKESPEARE. *By Professor Hiram Corson, LL. D., Professor of English Literature, Cornell University, New York.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

The book before us makes no pretense to exhaustiveness. It aims merely to suggest a few hints as to the best method of securing the best results from a loving, intimate study of the great dramatist. Any criticism, therefore, that condemns



the work as incomplete is idle. Professor Corson's trenchant style, refreshing manliness, and luminous common sense awaken a regret that he has only touched upon some of the important points disputed by Shakespearian scholars. We cannot blame him for dismissing the Baconians summarily as "bumptious quidnuncs;" nor for refusing to rethresh all the chaff about Shakespeare's life in order to garner therefrom a few additional grains of truth and interest. Mr. Halliwell-Phillips has left few gleanings here for the reaper in Shakespearian fields.

Two omissions, however, we cannot fail to regret deeply—a discussion of the time-analysis of the plays, and of the technique of Shakespeare's dramatic art in the construction of his plots. It is true that the first has been handled by Messrs. Halpin and Daniel, and the second by Mr. Moulton in his admirable book, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, but in the latter book only five plays are analyzed, and Mr. Furness' suggestive and dramatic Time-Analysis of the "Merchant of Venice" constrains us to believe that this subject, at least on its æsthetic side, has not been exhausted by Mr. Daniel.

In the language of the book before us, "There is certainly no art feature of the plays more deeply interesting or more worthy of careful study." As is well known, the classic unities of time and place restricted the action to one day and to one place, or to places not more than a day's journey apart. Shakespeare, however, observes a much more subtle law of time. As the stage time was about three hours and the events portrayed often required three or more years, the Elizabethan dramatist was confronted by the difficult task of making his events succeed each other with such rapidity as to cheat the audience into the belief that no time intervened between one event and its successor; and yet interject incidental remarks, and use mechanical and other contrivances in such a way as to increase the verisimilitude. In other words, he ran on fast time to suit dramatic, and on slow, to suit literary and psychologic requirements. Nothing but a careful study of one of the best constructed plays, such as the "Merchant of Venice," will convince the skeptic how successfully Shakespeare "hurls his dazzling spells into the spongy air" in order to produce this double illusion of fast and slow time in consonance with unity of action, historic realities, and the development of character and passion.

The other omission is more singular, especially as the object of Professor Corson's work is to introduce the student "to the study of the plays, as plays." Now certainly such a study must involve a study of plot. Yet plot is, in the main, ignored, tho' we have some fine studies of motif, character, passion and the general dramatic purport of a play. It was long customary to think that the great dramatist was as weak in the construction of plot as he was strong in the delineation of character. No student of Mr. Moulton's work, however much he may object to the author's mechanical methods, can fail to admire the ingenuity of the five plots which he subjects to his searching, critical analysis. This, too, is a comparatively new field of investigation, and opens new avenues for the appreciation of Shakespeare's keen dramatic insight.

It is the study of dramatic power that Professor Corson insists upon with forceful iteration. "Shakespeare is not a moralist in the small sense of the word," says he. "His direct purpose is always a dramatic one." In every play examined, this thought is luminously presented. Minute analysts go to Shakespeare to prove

him a printer, an embryonic theologian, a sailor before the mast, a lawyer, an archæologist, a doctor, a Roman Catholic, a Protestant. Isn't this evidence enough that he was all, and none, of these? If "all the world's a stage," what a motley crew must tread the boards in the theatre of life. With what an array of discordant ideas must they befuddle the brain of the ingenious theorist who wishes to label them, each and every one, with the trade-mark of his own peculiar patent-right. No: Let us take them as we find them, delightfully concrete as they are, and not reduce each to a metaphysical abstraction. For example, Bernardo says: "What, is Horatio here?" To which Horatio answers (in a semi-jocular vein, of course): "A piece of him." Hear Tschischwitz, who possesses critical insight—"that God-given power vouchsafed to us Germans alone, before all other nations" (quoted from *Corson*, p. 169): "The philosophical Horatio conceives the personality of man, in its outward manifestation merely, as only a piece of himself." Hear Moltke, who belongs to the same favored nation: "Horatio, by his answer, implies that, owing to his incredulity, he is not wholly present; that he is not there with his body and soul, but that he had undertaken to share the watch with the corporeal part of his entire individuality." (Both extracts quoted from Furness' *Hamlet*, Vol. I, p. 6.)

It is plain from these samples, which are only the *reductio ad absurdum* of the prevailing mode in such Shakespearian criticism, that we must read Shakespeare into ourselves, and not ourselves into Shakespeare, if we would reap the best results from the study of the *dramatist*—not the preacher, nor the lawyer, nor the metaphysician, nor the Roman Catholic, nor the Protestant.

Professor Corson's dramatic criticisms of six great plays are fresh and vigorous. He not only does not yield "otiose assent" to such kings of thought as Coleridge and Gervinus, but does not hesitate to speak dyslogistically of their comments on Shakespeare. Generally, his strictures are entirely just, for they are based upon a sound induction from obvious, common sense interpretations of the text.

Besides the examination of these plays, evidently the *raison d'être* of the book, several other interesting themes are handled. The best of these miscellaneous chapters is the one on Shakespeare's verse. Here, in a nutshell, is the development of his blank verse: "It may be stated, in a general way, that the development of Shakespeare's blank verse proceeds from the *recitative* to the *spontaneous*, and in accordance with this development, it at first moves obediently within metrical limits, gradually gaining in melody and grace until it reaches the highest possible freedom of movement within those limits, and realizes its fullest dramatic capabilities; it then gradually transgresses them more and more until, in the latest plays, *The Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Tempest*, it is often but slightly other than rhythmical prose—an unbroken pentameter measure, not being returned to sufficiently often to be felt as a standard."

It is not possible, in this brief paper, to note any more of the many interesting topics in this suggestive volume. It is not a *vade-mecum*, but a stimulus and an incentive to better methods of study. For this reason, we warmly commend it to all Shakespearian students.

Davidson College, N. C.

W. S. CURRELL.

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW. Vol. 1. Pp. 714. A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York: 1890.

It is just a little embarrassing to attempt a notice of *The Presbyterian and*

*Reformed Review*, for the benefit of the readers of the QUARTERLY. It seems too much like undertaking to introduce Dr. Moses D. Hoge to the Presbyterians of Richmond, Va., or Dr. B. M. Palmer to those of New Orleans. Doubtless many, if not most, of the readers of the QUARTERLY have been constant and appreciative readers of this admirable *Review* from its inception. If it is not necessary to introduce *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* to our readers, it is at least very pleasant, and we trust will not be regarded as presumptuous, to try to voice their sentiment concerning it. Its mechanical execution satisfies our taste, its articles stimulate our minds, its book reviews guide us to much valuable material for our libraries and save us from some trash, its excellent index serves our convenience, its scholarship gratifies our family pride, the known ability and soundness of its editorial staff command our confidence, and its general excellence excites us to a generous and wholesome rivalry. In a word, *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* is, so far as we can judge, in every way the worthy successor of that long-time loyal standardbearer of the truth, *The Princeton Review*, of which it is the lineal descendant and lawful heir. We wish it Godspeed.

A word as to the form and contents of the first volume of the *Review* is now offered to the public, and we close.

First, as to form, the publishers have bound in cloth in a single volume the four issues of 1890. It makes a handsome book for the library. Those who were not so fortunate as to subscribe for the *Review* at the beginning would do well to get it.

Turning now for a moment to the contents, we notice first the article by President F. L. Patton on Preaching. It is very racy and strong, as is everything that we have seen from his pen. The article by Dr. A. H. Kellogg on the Egypticity of the Pentateuch is a very readable and valuable contribution to the defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The same is true of Dr. R. D. Wilson's article on the date of Genesis x. It shows extensive reading and is worthy of careful study. There are other articles of great merit that would deserve notice in an extended review, and, as a matter of course, there are some that could not be commended so highly. The book reviews are carefully prepared by competent hands.

It may be as well to remind our readers that by a reciprocal arrangement between the two publications, subscription for this *Review* in connection with our own QUARTERLY is only \$1.50. None of our ministers should be without it.

Columbia, S. C.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

## IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

THE SERVANT OF THE LORD IN ISAIAH XL.-LXVI. : Reclaimed to Isaiah as the Author from Argument, Structure and Date. *By John Forbes, D. D., LL. D., Emeritus Professor of Oriental Languages, Aberdeen.* 8vo, pp. xiii., \$2.52. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890.

Though at the advanced age of eighty-seven years, and naturally living in memory in a period earlier than that in which we have had so large a development of critical studies and theories, the author shows great familiarity with the more recent movements, and deals ably with all the elements which have lately been so prominent in the study of Isaiah. His present work is an able, scholarly, critical study of the authorship of the latter part of Isaiah's prophecy. It consists of two parts, the first containing analyses and translations of the last twenty-seven chapters and arguments for the traditional view of their authorship. His arguments are derived from external testimony, from the improbabilities attending the critical view, as that the author of these chapters should have remained unknown, should have had such a pure diction, etc., from the unity of the writer's plan, which forbids the composite idea, and which can be accounted for much more readily by the acceptance of the older view, from the relation of this part of Isaiah to the rest of the book, from the use of proper names which belonged to the period of the true Isaiah, and the suggestions or implications of fact that the temple and Jerusalem were yet existing, etc. The second part of the book is of less value, though useful as a study in connection with the first part. It is a discussion of Isaiah vii.-xii.

THE INTERWOVEN GOSPELS AND GOSPEL HARMONY. The four histories of Jesus Christ blended into a complete and continuous narrative in the words of the Gospels, with a complete interleaved Harmony. *Compiled by Rev. William Pittenger, Author of "Oratory, Sacred and Secular," etc.* 12mo., pp. 245. Cloth, 50 cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1891.

A third and enlarged edition of a work already well known. The addition consists mainly in the introduction of a Harmony, accomplished by giving, in small type, on pages interleaved opposite the main account, which follows the leading account, from whatever Gospel it be, the other accounts and underlining the words that are peculiar to each account. This method enables the student to see at a glance, not only what each evangelist records, but what he records that others do not.

STUDIES IN OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. *By Rev. Jesse L. Hulbut, D. D.* Pp. 98. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1890.

A brief study of the history embraced within the scope of the International Lessons for the first half of the present year. It will be found useful, not only now but permanently.

STUDIES IN JOHN'S GOSPEL: The Gospel of Christ's Deity. *By David Gregg, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 348. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1891.

A series of twenty-four discourses on the salient features of John's Gospel, so presenting them as to show their convergence upon the one great theme of the book, the Lord's divinity. The work is sound, able and suggestive. It is commended to teachers and the older class of scholars for the half year of Sabbath-school study beginning with this month. Its special value to them will be found in the happy manner in which it unifies the thought of this Gospel and makes the study of it more philosophic and practical.

ISAAC AND JACOB: Their Lives and Times. *By George Rawlinson, M. A., F. R. G. S., Rector of All Hallows, Canon of Canterbury, etc.* 12mo, pp. viii. 186. \$1.00. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1891.

Canon Rawlinson has not here the same fine opportunity to display that special learning which has so splendidly fitted him for his work as in previous publications. He has, nevertheless, made large use of the progress of geographical and archæological research in his study of the lives of these patriarchs, and has given us a book of rare interest and instructiveness. This compact little volume belongs to the series of *Men of the Bible*, which we have before had occasion to heartily commend.

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN HISTORICAL SUCCESSION. *By Franz Delitzsch.* Translated by Samuel Ives Curtis, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. 12mo, pp. xii., 232. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891.

In this work, completed but a little while before his death, containing the substance of lectures delivered to his classes, and the publication of which grew out of the author's interest in the Jewish race, Professor Dilitzsch considers the Messianic prophecies in their historical order, and does not confine himself simply to prophecies in the narrower sense, but includes under the same idea promises and hopes relating to the future salvation. In his development of his theme, the author's devotion to Israel and desire for their salvation, his fervor and consecration, are no less manifest than the accuracy of his scholarship, the broadness of his learning. In dealing with some of the Messianic prophecies, his studies and expositions are based upon the results of the modern criticism, and that of the most advanced type. Indeed, he asserts that "the course of development of Christological expectations cannot be determined without the concurrence of literary and historical criticism."

THE EPIC OF SAUL. *By William Cleaver Wilkinson.* 8vo. pp. 386. Cloth \$2.50. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1891.

A poem in blank verse, of eight thousand lines, divided into fourteen books, and embodying the facts in Paul's life given in scripture, with such addition from imagination to that narrative as to complete an account of his career up to the time of his conversion. Parts of the work have appeared from time to time in va-

rious journals, and have been well received. A visit to Palestine during the time of the preparation of the volume aided the author in his effort to furnish a correct geographical and topographical setting to the poem.

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. *By William Ewart Gladstone.* Pp. 174. Cloth 35cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1891.

A cheap edition of the recent valuable work, the chapters of which first appeared in the *Sunday School Times*, noticed at length in our last number.

A DEFENCE OF JUDAISM VERSUS PROSELYTING CHRISTIANITY. *By Isaac M. Wise.* Svo. pp. 129. Cincinnati and Chicago: The American Israelite. 1889.

Rabbi Wise announces that this book was written and published as a response to that "missionary chieftain, who took a vulgar renegade from Judaism by his hand, and appointed him a missionary to the Jews," an act which he denounces as an insult to Judaism to be most bitterly resented. From this, as well as from the title, the reader may judge of the character of the book. The expectation excited by this, however, is in some respects happily unfulfilled. After the first chapter, the author leaves off vituperation and undertakes the discussion of the main question, why the Israelite cannot embrace Christianity. He writes from the standpoint of universal brotherhood, universal salvation and the supremacy of reason. He avows the highest respect for Judaism, Christianity, Islamism and every other religion "in harmony with the postulate of reason and the standard of conscience." He denies the doctrine of sin, and finds sinners only in "those exceptional persons who are possessed of the demon of folly," regarding sin in the same light as a defection of the mind. He agrees with Canon Taylor in the denunciation of general or special missionary work "among the so-called unconverted," as a work which has no other result in his judgment than the increase of hypocrisy, and the annual waste of millions of dollars. Coming directly to the point at issue, he discusses the following subjects: Rejecting the Evangelical Story from Historical Motives; the Testimony of Miracles is Inadmissible; the Doctrine of Divine Immortality; Universal Salvation without the Messiah; Mundane Happiness depends on Morality, not on Christology; on Intelligence, not on Christ; No Christology in Moses, in Isaiah, in Jeremiah, in Psalms, in Zechariah. As a "reformed Israelite" he argues for what he calls "denationalized Judaism," a principle already partly realized in Christianity, the Islam, the philosophemes of most prominent philosophers, the government of free nations, reign of freedom, etc., as the only religion that will secure man's present and eternal happiness. This, he argues, was what the prophets preached and predicted.

The book is valuable as being a bold, defiant, outspoken attack from an able enemy upon the outposts of Christianity, and it will be well for all to read it who would intelligently understand and appreciate the work of missions to the Jews and its special difficulties.

SEMITIC PHILOSOPHY: Showing the Ultimate, Social and Scientific Outcome of Original Christianity in its Conflict with Surviving Ancient Heathenism. *By Philip C. Friese.* Pp. 247. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Company. 1890. This is a curious book, hard to be understood. Its subject is the Semitic

Philosophy, and this is discussed and applied in six chapters. The first seeks to define this philosophy; the second, to show that it was man's original philosophy; the third deals with the doctrine and practice of the kingdom of God; the fourth sets forth the ideal written constitution; the fifth outlines the general social reformation to be effected by the Semitic Philosophy; and in the sixth, and concluding chapter, several interesting applications of this philosophy are made.

The whole is a curious mixture of ill-defined philosophy, of far-fetched social theories, and of utterly false religious tenets. The Semitic Philosophy claims to be an exposition of the kingdom of God, and this kingdom is explained to consist of the doctrines of Jesus. But the whole exposition is really too absurd for serious discussion. Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia* are quite as true, and much more romantic reading.

THE NEW INTERPRETATION; or the Scriptures Viewed in the Light of Christian Science. *By George B. Day, Pastor of the Church of Christ (Scientist), Chicago.* Second edition. Pp. 121. Cloth. 50 cents. Chicago: O. M. Parsons. 1889.

Eleven sermons, on "Robert Elsmere," "The Good is All," "Origin of Evil," "Death Abolished," "The True and the False I," and like themes. The author puts about as good a face on his theory as it is possible to give it, and our readers who desire to see as good a presentation as can be given to it would do well to read these discourses.

FAITH HEALING, A DEFENCE; or The Lord Thy Healer. *By Rev. R. L. Marsh, B. D.* New York: Fleming H. Revell. 1890.

An attempt to meet the leading philosophical and practical objections to the doctrine of "Divine Healing." It is well written, ingenious and, to the author, very satisfactory. It proves a great many general or universal laws by exceptional cases, and handles the Scriptures with a remarkably free exegetical, we should rather say, eisegetical, hand. It aptly displays the characteristics of the majority of the adherents of this notion, their zeal, earnestness, good intentions, combined with uncharitableness, narrow-mindedness, and delight in half truths.

DECLARATIONS AND LETTERS ON THE VATICAN DECREES, 1869-1887. *By Ignaz Von Dollinger.* Authorized translation. Pp. 178. \$1.25. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1891.

The reasons for Dr. Dollinger's leaving the Roman Catholic Church were well known, but the strenuous efforts which were made, by entreaties, solicitations, arguments, continued through many years, to bring him back into line, are not so familiar. The volume before us is an account of these, as well as a thorough vindication of his course. It forms a most interesting and instructive chapter in the history not only of the church, but of liberty of conscience. It strikingly manifests both the honesty and faithfulness of Dr. Dollinger and the dishonest arts of those who sought to make him return to the church which had excommunicated him.

DISCUSSION UPON THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES TO DISAPPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF DR. BRIGGS AS THE EDWARD ROBINSON PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN UNION SEMINARY. *Remarks of John J. McCook, a Commissioner from the Presbytery of New York.*

MEMORANDUM OF FACTS AND THE LAW CONTROLLING THE RELATIONS OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. *By John J. McCook, Commissioner from the Presbytery of New York.*

These pamphlets will be found very valuable in the study of the celebrated Briggs case, as it appeared before the Detroit Assembly. Mr. McCook is an elder in Dr. Hall's church, and an able lawyer. His speech in the Assembly was one of the strongest made, and doubtless influenced many minds, especially among the ruling elders, by its eminently judicial treatment of the question. The "Brief," or "Memorandum of Facts and the Law," printed in legal style, with authorities everywhere cited, presents an irrefragable argument for the Assembly's right of veto in the premises and of the perfect legality of the act of the Directors in conferring that power upon the Assembly, which now, upon its first exercise, these Directors so speedily repudiate. He is especially forcible in Point I., where he shows that the Directors' original action and the Assembly's subsequent action thereupon constituted a contract upon valid considerations, and in Point IV., where he shows that this relation has been formally recognized in other and similar institutions, and in Point VII., where he argues that the "transfer" of a professor is to be regarded as "the appointment of a professor." We heartily commend these pamphlets to our readers.

THE PLANTING OF THE KINGDOM. A synopsis of the Missionary Enterprise. *By Philo F. Leavens, D. D.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 48. Cloth. 40 cents. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1890.

A most comprehensive statement of the establishment and work of missions among the aborigines of North America, in the islands of Oceania, in India, in lands under Mohammedan rule, in China, in Japan, in West, South, East and Central Africa, in the Dutch East Indies, and in Spanish and Portuguese America. The little volume will be of special use in simultaneous meetings, monthly concerts, etc.

BITS OF PASTURE; or, Handfuls of Grass for the Lord's Hungry Sheep. Being selections from sermons of J. R. Miller. Arranged by Mary A. Butler. 16mo, pp. 255. 60 cents. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1891.

A happy selection of suggestions, helpful, comforting thoughts, one for each day of the year. An index of the subjects would have made this dainty little volume very useful for homiletic work, as well as of more practical benefit to Christians.

THE SEMI-CENTENNIAL CATALOGUE OF DAVIDSON COLLEGE. 1837-1887. Under the Auspices of the Alumni Association. *Edited by W. A. Withers, A. M.*, (class of 1883), assisted by J. H. Hill, A. M., (1854), W. S. Lacy, D. D., (1859), W. W. Moore, D. D., (1878), and H. L. Smith, A. M., (1881). 8vo, pp. 194. \$1. Raleigh: E. M. Uzzell. 1891.



A college catalogue rarely calls for special notice, but here is one, elegantly bound, elegantly printed, and edited with exceeding great care, that gathers up and presents the results of fifty years of college work. It is invaluable, not only to every alumnus of Davidson College, but to every one who would study intelligently the subject of denominational colleges, their necessity, their work, their results. A glance at this volume is enough to show clearly the value of such institutions. Planted in a secluded place, remote from large towns and railroads, in an agricultural region, hampered by want of funds in its earlier years, sadly crippled by the war and diminution of its endowment, it has yet gone on quietly in its work, and has sent hundreds of men into the various occupations of life, with a sound, Christian, liberal education; and, better equipped than ever in men and appliances, is now carrying on the same work. Of the five hundred and ninety-nine graduates, one hundred and eighty-one have become ministers, ninety-one teachers, sixteen college presidents and professors, eighty-one farmers and sixty-nine physicians. These facts, with many more that may be gleaned from this book, furnish an unanswerable argument for the enlarged support and increased patronage and endowment of such an institution. Church and Christian education must be provided, or the church will not do her Master's work.

A FEW THOUGHTS FOR A YOUNG MAN. *By Hon. Horace Mann.* A fine, large-type edition, in fine cloth binding. 25 cts. New York: John B. Alden. 1890.

One of the most eloquent and instructive lectures ever delivered from an American platform. It is a classic in its way. Tens of thousands of the foremost men of America gratefully acknowledge its inspiring influence upon their lives. The present edition is a beautiful one, worthy of the literary merit of the work, though half the price of any previous edition.

POWER AND WEAKNESS OF MONEY. *By J. H. Worcester, Jr., D. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. Price 50 cts.

This book is timely. The influence of money in these days is tremendous and is constantly growing. The preacher's voice ought to be heard amid the babble of worldly strifes. Dr. Worcester treats of money under six different topics—the power and weakness of money; the perils of money getting; the haste to be rich; the Christian law of trade; covetousness and retribution; and money as a test of character. The discussion is calm and logical. The author recognizes the value of money and its vast possible power for good when used as a sacred trust.

ALDEN'S MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA OF KNOWLEDGE AND LANGUAGE. With Illustrations. Vol. 26, *Newwines—Of*; vol. 27, *O'Fallon—Palmiped*; vol. 28, *Palmistry—Perseus*. Each volume cr. 8vo., about 600 pp. New York: John B. Alden. 1891.

Our frequent commendation of this work finds its justification in each succeeding volume. The twenty-eight now issued, drawing the series towards its close, embody a vast amount of information of a valuable character, accessible in no other work to those who have not a large sum to invest in the larger but not more popularly useful encyclopædias.

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 18.—OCTOBER, 1891.

---

I. CALVINISM AND CONFSSIONAL REVISION.<sup>1</sup>

OUR brethren in America cannot sufficiently realize to what an extent they have excited the interest of the Dutch Calvinists by their efforts to reach a revision of their ecclesiastical symbols. There are three causes to which this interest is due. First of all, the remembrance of the ever-memorable fact that the first Reformed Christians to set foot on American soil embarked for the New World from the Netherlands. On this account, Dutch Calvinists still feel a most intimate bond of sympathy with the Reformed in America, and thank God for each token of brotherly affection by which the latter country has so repeatedly strengthened this deep-rooted attachment. In the second place, the Dutch Calvinists have hailed with great enthusiasm the development of American church-life, as called forth by the principle of a *Free Church*, and emulate their brethren in America in their strenuous efforts to make this only true principle victorious in the Old World as well. To which must be thirdly added, that the Dutch Calvinists fully share the conviction of their American brethren, that the symbols of the sixteenth century were the product of a battle of spirits somewhat different from that in which the church is engaged at present, and cannot, consequently, inspire us with the same enthusiasm with which they stirred the race of our fathers. For such reasons, we feel ourselves closely allied with

---

<sup>1</sup> From *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, by permission. Published by special request.

our American brethren as fellow-members of the one great international Reformed Church, and when tidings of revision are being wafted across the sea, we cannot help reflecting prayerfully on what has become to us a matter of almost personal interest.

For the unity of this international Reformed Church does not lie in the fact that most of our churches are organized on the Presbyterian principle. Such an assumption would be a purely external and superficial judgment. Even Unitarians at times organize their society on Presbyterian lines, and still they have nothing in common with our Reformed Churches. On the other hand, there are Reformed Churches in Germany and elsewhere that are prevented by the civil power from fully exhibiting their Presbyterian character. And how could form of government ever determine the character of a church, when the latter's calling consists in "showing forth the excellencies of him who called us out of darkness into his marvellous light," while the *form* of the church is only one of the *means* by which it seeks to attain this end? On the battle field not those battalions fight on the same side that resemble one another in point of tactic formation; but such regiments, however differently formed, as have a common banner floating over their bayonets. But for the "hosts of the living God," and hence also for the Reformed Churches, what could this banner be but the common confession? For however much the French and the Swiss, the Dutch and the Scotch, the Bohemian and the Westminster Confessions may differ among themselves in form and arrangement, still it is one spirit, one deep-seated conviction, the consciousness of one sacred calling, that finds expression in all these creeds. They are branches of one tree, brooks issuing from one spring, and, in view of their forming one body, our fathers observed the excellent custom of publishing them as one *corpus* or *syntagma confessionum*. Often a church would send its creed for subscription to another church; and it was owing to this historic consciousness that, at the Synod of Dort, in 1618, foreign theologians were invited to meet with the Dutch delegates, and that, at Westminster, the foreign churches were asked for their judgment, in order that, as a single man, and as members of one

body, all might protest against the intrusion of Arminianism and Episcopalianism. The *catholicity* of the church was not to be surrendered to Rome. The Reformed Churches were not to be allowed to degenerate into petty national bodies. Wherever they arose, they presented no less a claim than that of being a manifestation of the one body of Christ. From this they derived their authority to preach *his* word, and to administer *his* sacraments, in the name of Christ, our common King. By renouncing these high claims at any time, or in any manner, they would have lowered themselves to the rank of private societies, founded, not on a divine, but on a purely human right.

On this account, even at the present day, no strong movement can be started in any part of the Reformed Churches without sending a thrill of sympathy through all the other members, and making all feel an equal interest in the results to which such a movement may lead. Among us, too, the needs that produce it are felt; the same impelling forces are at work in our midst; by us also the principles that should shape its course are recognized as authoritative and binding in a spiritual sense. As long as we remain fellow-members of this one Reformed Catholic international church, we have but one common fate in all that pertains to the confession of our churches. The common creed can be tampered with in no part of the world without the words "*Tua res agitur*" passing through all the ranks of the entire Reformed camp. Political divisions and the difference in language may prevent *official* coöperation between the other Reformed Churches and those of America, in the matter of agreeing upon one common line of action in this vital question; but the work undertaken in America still imposes a duty on the Reformed elsewhere. They will have to note the events in the New World in their bearing upon their own churches, and must make clear to their own minds to what conditions among themselves a revision of the common creed would be subject.

The following paper will be an attempt in this direction. In making it we shall presume that our American brethren may possibly be interested to learn to what terms the Reformed in the Netherlands would bind a revision of their creed. Our task will

be best performed by answering the following four questions: 1. Has a specific tendency, which, like Calvinism, leads to a separate church organization, a right to exist in the church of Christ? 2. What specific tendency does Calvinism represent in the Christian church? 3. In what manner has this tendency found its expression in the ecclesiastical symbols? 4. To what conditions is the revision of these symbols, in the case of a progressive development of Calvinism, to be bound?

### I.

The most deeply cherished ideal of God's people would be realized only if the church of Christ, being one and indivisible as the mystical body of her Lord, would also reveal herself in absolute external unity. One confession, one form of church government, one liturgy, one volume of sacred song, one tendency of mind, even one language in all the churches of Christ throughout the world! Such a condition were indeed heavenly, and can be realized in heaven alone.

Actual life, as we live it for the present on earth, excludes this ideal state. Whosoever, like Rome, tries to conjure up this vision and to clothe it with reality, may succeed in mechanically contriving some sort of ecclesiastical union, but no one will ever be able organically to evolve it from life. Of all such attempts the result will be to suppress the vigorous development of a true national spirit in a most objectionable manner. One need only compare Catholic South America with the United States, Spain with England, Catholic Austria with Prussia, to feel impressed with the fatal effect of such obtruded unity. We do not say that the ideal should ever be abandoned, nor do we deny that its inspiration should always make us respect the claims of Christian irenics. But we must submit to the decree of divine Providence, which positively excludes the realization of this ideal during our present dispensation. Nature itself displays a twofold unity. There is a unity of the uniform, as in the meadows, where every blade of grass has the same color, shape and size. But there is also a unity of the multiform, as in the flower-garden, where, notwithstanding the endless variety of hues in stem and leaf and

blossom, yet the harmony of what is dissimilar gives rise to a higher beauty. And though this latter unity may not reveal itself for the present, with the plants only half-grown and the blossoms in the bud, still the discerning eye will far prefer its hidden unity to the uniformity that the grass-plot can boast of at each stage of its development. The unity of the church for which we pray is of this higher nature. It too will prove to be a unity born of the harmonious multiformity of life. And in order to attain this glorious unity in its full-grown state, the church must begin with being dissimilar, heterogeneous and disproportionate in its parts. Harmony can only arise from contrast, and contrast requires diversity of nature. If it be objected that eighteen centuries ago the church commenced its career in absolute unity, we reply that this is a feature of the flower-garden as well. Diverse kinds of seed having been entrusted to the soil, the unity is at first complete in every respect. But no sooner does one grain after another begin to sprout, than a difference appears in respect to rapidity of growth and structure of stem. Even so it has been observed in the church of Christ. During the first joyous days of her existence she shone in undisturbed unity, but no sooner had she entered upon her pilgrimage through the world than Peter proved to be different from Paul and John unlike James.

The unity of the church is firmly rooted in the unity of the Holy Spirit, but in the spirits of men it will ramify. The facts of history show how the church manifests itself differently in different centuries; that it becomes modified in character in eastern as well as western countries; that it exhibits a specific type in each of the several regions of these countries; that it is differentiated into a variety of forms according to the habits of life and thought of individual men. Unto the Greek it becomes a Greek, unto the Jew a Jew, unto the Scythian a Scythian. It would be all unto all. Even with persons of one and the same city or village it speaks to the child in a child's language, addresses the man in manly tones, and with soft accents whispers its message into a woman's ear. Though our eye may not be able to discover the harmony in all this multiformity, still it is there. But for the present it must remain an object of faith: "I *believe* in a holy, catholic, Christian church."

We need not enlarge any further on the multiform garb in which the Christian church appears. The question only remains to be answered, whether this variety leaves room for specific *tendencies of thought*. Christian charity, adjusting and adapting itself to every age and rank in life, to every exigency and need, does not necessarily imply that the mental life of the church shall move in various currents. This pliability of mercy will rather have to reveal itself in the working of each local church, and a minister of the Word, who is an utter stranger to it, surely does not know the mystery of "serving love." Nor can this difference in tendency be derived from a difference in temperament and character, nor can it be explained from the diversity of currents, that have come to the surface of human life during successive ages. A tendency of thought based on principle has this peculiarity, that it takes hold of every temperament and character, and leaves its impress on the spirit of every age with which it comes into contact.

By "specific tendencies of thought" something else is meant, such as can arise only from the necessary disposition of *human consciousness*. They reach down to the very root of consciousness, and for this reason necessarily control every phenomenon of life springing from consciousness. Our grasp is so limited and the capacity of our consciousness is so universal, that never more than a part of its slumbering powers can be brought into action at a time. One man must supplement another, and by the very necessity of doing this no individual can avoid being one-sided in his range of thought. Thus the stupendous task which the human mind has to accomplish is naturally and almost imperceptibly divided among mankind. A single finger cannot play upon all the strings; only the ten fingers combined succeed in calling forth sweet harmony from the chords. In this manner, by "division of labor," we are protected from wasting our energies on what lies beyond our power. As in social life one ploughs, a second spins, and a third sails the sea, and out of the interaction of these divided labors the full rich life is born; even so it is in the world of thought. And this division is not left to arbitrary choice, but is effected by that inclination of our talents which of itself determines the bent of our mind. Furthermore, since such inclinations

possess continuity in each individual and produce a sort of spiritual kinship between several persons, the love and predisposition for a tendency of this character are transmitted from nation to nation, and from age to age, and in this manner a general tendency of spirit in human life originates. Thus in general human life there is a tendency directed towards the ideal, and another that in preference seeks the real. There is a tendency diving into the depths of mysticism, and another that loves the clearness of the surface. There is a practical and a theoretical tendency. And likewise a tendency reaching back into history, and one that prophetically stretches forward to catch glimpses of the future.

For the very reason, however, that this differentiation of our mental life lies within the general domain of human nature, it cannot give rise to any specific tendencies in the church of Christ. To be sure, like all that is human, these shades of difference will exert their influence upon the church also, and will develop in some a historical turn of mind, in others habits that are more practical and active, in still others more prophetic inclinations. But even this does not create a division into such tendencies of thought as are peculiar to the Christian church, and compel it to assume different organizations. In the church, as belonging to the sphere of religion, tendencies of thought, in order to be exponential of principle, must spring from the essence and nature of *religion*. That which makes Peter and Paul part ways is a difference in distinctness of view as to the divine law. James differs from Paul by emphasizing another side of the connection between faith and works. John and Matthew diverge, because each sees Christ under his own aspect. Thus it was in the beginning, and thus it has remained in the Christian church. Never on her territory has the parting of the one river Nile into the seven branches of its Delta proceeded upon other than religious lines. Temperament and character, climate and nationality may have exerted an indirect influence; but the main force that made these waters seek their own channels has for the Christian church always lain in the principle of religion.

This admits of even closer definition. The motive that compels the church to enter upon a division cannot be drawn from



religion in a general sense, but only from the *Christian religion* in particular. A single glance at the multiformity of church organizations, dividing the Greeks, Armenians, Romanists, Lutherans, Reformed, Baptists and others, will reveal the fact that these bodies did not separate owing to psychological or philosophical variations, but on account of some difference in their conception of the Christian religion. As long as not the Christian religion but religion in general is the principle of division, Pantheists, Atheists, Polytheists, Deists and Theists appear as coördinated groups. For the church, on the other hand, which stands or falls with its Trinitarian creed, to speak of a Deistic or Pantheistic tendency, is obviously out of place. Such tendencies may creep in temporarily as a matter of fact, but they will always betray their exotic origin; they never lead to a separate organization worthy of the name, and no sooner does the Spirit of the Lord come mightily upon his prophets than all these tendencies die out, and the Gideons break down the altar of Baal. Only tendencies which, though they view Christianity under some definite aspect, owing to the limited range of our human vision, still leave its essence intact, have right of existence in the Christian church. Concentrating upon this single aspect a flood of light, they are, on account of this very one-sidedness, unable to do equal justice to the remaining features. This does not include heresy, which always attacks the essence of Christianity; nor does it protect those paganistic, humanistic and philosophical currents that seek to adulterate Christianity by secularizing it. It embraces that group of tendencies only which, like a many-sided prism, intercept the clear light of Christianity and refract it into the manifold beauty of their colors.

Such a Christian religious tendency, therefore, does not owe its right of existence to anything in man or of this world, but to Christianity itself. Christianity being too rich, too many-sided, too universal to pour its divine fulness into a single channel of human life, has forced its waters into a number of channels. Hence a child of God may and must cherish the conviction of moving in that current which is relatively the most pure; but should never arrogate to himself the absolute in such a sense as

would shut off the remaining side channels, as if they were not branches of the main stream. It follows, from the nature of the case, that a tendency of this character will lead to a realization of the Christian religion under its own peculiar aspect in the entire sphere of human life, and will hence create not only a special church organization, a special form of worship, a special theology, but also special usages for political, social and domestic life. This cannot be otherwise, inasmuch as its channels are dug in those periods of history only when the religious principle has reached its highest degree of tension, and when, triumphing over all other motives, it causes human life as a whole to tremble at its very foundations, and dominates it in all its branches.

Now, it is a fact, established historically beyond all reasonable doubt, that Calvinism actually complies with these requirements. Calvinism is no surreptitious paganistic tendency, but is opposed on principle to all manner of paganism. It does not owe its origin to a humanistic effort to secularize the church, but it has carried out the contrast between Christ and the Kosmos with the greatest possible rigor. Nor has Calvinism issued from the philosophical camp, for the depravity of human reason, too, is the corner-stone of its system. Nor does its power reside in some psychological or national peculiarity. The former is to be excluded, since it counts among its adherents and promoters men of every character and temperament and of the most varied sympathies; while in reference to the latter it will be observed that Calvinism has not restricted itself to any one nationality, but has been as boldly professed by the Huguenots in the south of France as by the Celts in the Scottish Highlands. It has planted itself squarely on the basis of the Christian religion, and owes its origin exclusively to a specific conception of it. It arose in a period of history when the fate of Christianity shaped the destinies of states and nations. Calvinism was not the illusion of a single day, for as boldly and bravely as by the Gueux, Roundheads and Pilgrim fathers of yore, it is being professed to-day in Europe and America, and by the Boers in the Transvaal. It developed its own church organization, created its own form of worship, and stood resplendent in the lustre of its own theology.

To so great an extent has it set its stamp on political and social life as well, that it was it that freed the Netherlands from the Spanish yoke, gave a new form of life to the Scotch, and laid the foundation for the development of the United States. To appreciate its influence on domestic and social life, one need only wander for a few weeks in Romanist, Greek, or Lutheran countries. The free life of the free citizen, as it at present flourishes in America, and is making its way into the constitutional states of Europe, is not the fruit of the bloody orgies of the French Revolution, but of that energetic earnestness which Calvinism has infused into the life of its adherents.<sup>1</sup>

Our first question, therefore, admits of no other than an affirmative answer. Calvinism *does* represent a specific tendency of thought in the Christian church, which, being able to create his own church organization, has an indisputable right of existence.

## II.

This being the case, we must inquire in the second place: *Wherein does the specific character of this tendency represented by Calvinism consist?* Dr. Charles Hodge, in his *Systematic Theology*, seems to have thought it a happy idea to set the term "Calvinism" in the main to one side, and to speak generally of "Augustinianism." We think this unjust. However highly Calvin, and after him every Calvinist, may have honored Augustine, still it was the former and not the latter who succeeded in elevating that abstract tendency, whose course Augustine mapped out, to the rank of an actual power in life. Augustine had to contend with two classes of opponents, not only with the Pelagians, but also with the Manichæans; and however bravely and successfully he may, in the sphere of theology, have defended against Pelagius the sovereignty of God, nevertheless, in his struggle with the Manichæans, he fell back for support upon the power of the hierarchy. In his *Locus de Ecclesia* he tore down again what in his *Locus de Gratia* he had built up. Augustine was lacking in

---

<sup>1</sup> These various points have been established more in detail by the author, in three separate treatises: *Calvinism the Origin and Safeguard of our Constitutional Liberties*, Amsterdam, 1875, 2nd ed.; *Calvinism and Art*, Amsterdam, 1888, and *Uniformity the Curse of Modern Life*, Amsterdam, 1869.

thoroughgoing logical consistency. Hence the semi-Pelagianism that lay at the root of the Roman hierarchical system was able gradually to pull down again his theological structure also; and in the person of Thomas Aquinas to undo his spiritual achievements by means of the dialectics of Scholasticism. History itself shows that Augustine had neither the will nor the energy to dig out for the tendency that possessed in him its unrivalled advocate a new channel in the life of the church and of society. When, in 430 A. D., Augustine dies during the siege of Hippo by the Vandals, things remain what they were. For a time a new wind has blown over the waters of the church, but the stream pursues its old course through the same hierarchical channels. It was not thus on the death of Calvin. In the *Locus de Gratia*, Calvin may have done little else than copy Augustine. But in one respect he stands far above Augustine: that he made the principle of the divine sovereignty operative for *the church*, and, through the church, in the life of *states* and *nations*. Not that he discovered an absolutely new tendency of thought. This would have been impossible; for every tendency that has a right of existence in the church must grow on a stem organically connected with the root, and must extend its most delicate fibres throughout the history of the church, down into its very origins. While, however, these various tendencies, like a compact bundle of fibres, are at first hidden in the common stem, there will at last come a time for each of them to part from it and shoot forth as separate and independent branches. In regard to *our* tendency, this time had come only with Calvin.

By conceding that Calvinism does not represent the absolute in its fulness, we did not mean to intimate that it appears as but one of many variations, coördinated indifferently with others; as if it could ever be a matter of slight importance whether one should profess and serve his God and Saviour according to the Greek, the Baptist, the Lutheran or the Calvinistic standard. Notwithstanding all variations displayed by the rose in the vegetable kingdom, nobody puts an equal value on the wild rose and the cultivated rose. A florist's price-list tells us differently. It goes without saying that whosoever is a Calvinist will consider the tendency followed and professed by himself the purest and highest

expression of Christianity, and, if a theologian, will be ready at all times to support this judgment. Otherwise his duty as an honest man and the fear of God would compel him to leave the Calvinistic church for the Lutheran or Baptist, or for whatever organization might in his view appear more nearly to subserve the glory of his God. That in their turn the Lutheran and Baptist will present a similar claim of moving in the highest and purest tendency should not lead us astray for a moment. He who forgets his noble birth disgraces himself. We can conceive of a Calvinistic renegade turning Lutheran or Baptist from conviction, but we cannot understand that an intelligent and well-informed man, who still continued to live in a Calvinistic church, should have extinguished in his heart the enthusiasm for Calvinism.

The characteristic superiority and specific difference of Calvinism does not lie in any single doctrine, but in this: that within the Christian religion *it does the fullest justice to the essence of religion itself*. Hence, in order to become familiar with the specific character of Calvinism, one need by no means delve into the vast works which Ullmann, Schweizer, Herzog, Baur, Schneckenburger, Scholten, Gass and others have devoted to tracing this specific difference. From a formal as well as from a material point of view, they all reach the same conclusion, viz.: that Calvinism in its conception of the Christian religion, nay, in its view of life and the world in general, assigns the first place to God Almighty. This should not be interpreted in the sense of Schleiermacher, who spoke of a "schlechthinniges Abhängigkeitsgefühl," for, by the very form of this expression, the subjective element of *feeling* has been placed in the foreground, thus subverting the Calvinistic principle. The Calvinist glories in his profession that religion, especially the absolute religion of Christianity, must not be lowered to an agency of salvation, nor adulterated into a mere incentive to virtue, nor transformed into a cosmology, but that in order to retain its honor, it must *remain religion*. And since all religion springs from the relation in which God the Creator has placed us, his creatures, to himself, it follows that the greatest religious height will be reached by him who at every point of his horizon views God as God, by honoring him in all things as the

almighty Creator who has created all things for his own sake, who, as God, is not bound by anything but himself, and determines for every creature both its being and the law thereof, now and forevermore. Not only "Deo gloria," but "Soli Deo gloria," and before his adorable majesty let every creature, prince or pauper, be as the small dust of the balance, a drop of the bucket, nay, be counted less than nothing!

We do not claim that this is exhaustive of the full riches of the Christian religion. When the Methodist places the salvation of sinners in the foreground, the Baptist the mystery of regeneration, the Lutheran justification by faith, the Moravian the wounds of Christ, the Greek the mysticism of the Holy Spirit, and the Romanist the catholicity of the church—we have no more desire to detract from the great importance of these other six elements for the true appreciation, the pure profession and practice of Christianity, than any of these groups would be willing to admit (theoretically, at least), the existence of a true Christian religion where God no longer remains God. There is no church or school that has ever entirely ignored any one of these six elements. Nay, rather, as long as no deliberate apostasy is made, they must all alike be honored; and Calvinism has not been found lacking in its appreciation of any one of them. The differences among churches and tendencies have not resulted from the *rejection* by one of elements retained by others. Not by a single church has religion been *mutilated* in its parts. But they are differentiated, and that to a high degree even, by the organic collocation of parts. In the perspective of one tendency, one element would occupy the foreground, which in another had been pushed to the side, or into the background. Now, in this collocation of parts the other systems were less correct than Calvinism. They, in one case gave predominance to the arm; in another to the foot; in a third to the texture of veins, or to the nerve tissue; whereas, the action of an organic body can be normal only when the head is allowed to dominate over all the parts. The seven elements enumerated above do not, like fence-pickets, stand alongside of one another, but are organically one. It is impossible, therefore, to keep them side by side in consciousness. One of them must take the first

place, so as to make the conception of those remaining dependent on itself.

In this tree, moreover, root, trunk and branches should be kept distinct, and the root-principle should, in our consciousness, control what we conceive of as trunk and branches. A Calvinist says: As in politics the principle of right, in social science that of well-being, in art the idea of the beautiful, are given the first place, so in the sphere of religion the knowledge of God Almighty can and must be the only controlling element, and all other elements are to be subordinated to this theological principle. God should not conform himself to the creature, but everything professed about the creature must be made to fit into our profession as to the Eternal Being. Theology cannot reach its highest stage of organic development until the doctrine of God shall have become its controlling feature. We may, therefore, conclude that, comparatively speaking, there can be, in our conception of the Christian religion, in our theology, in our creed, no truer or higher standpoint than that which unhesitatingly gives precedence to God as God, and rises to the sublime courage of viewing and explaining the whole range of our existence for time and eternity, under this one aspect. A sinner who is indifferent to his own salvation, and that of his fellow-men, stands on a plane far beneath the Methodist, who, perhaps, surpasses all others in his earnest appeals for conversion. But he that asks: How can even the whole of my existence, and that of others, be made to serve the glory of my God?—he ranks higher than the Methodist. Undoubtedly, the Baptist, deeply impressed with the necessity of regeneration, and measuring all other things by this standard, is superior to the Arminian, who fancies a change of mind to be sufficient; but a still higher standpoint is attainable, if, rising to him that generates, I marvel at the adorable work of God, of which regeneration is only the effect. If, with Luther, I am conscious of having been justified by faith, and no longer rely on any act or work of my own, my position is more correct, from a spiritual point of view, than that of the Roman Church; but I may ascend still higher by penetrating into the origin of that eternal justification, which has its source in the sovereign decree of God. To kneel down with the Moravian,

in adoration of Christ as my Lord and God, rapt in the contemplation of his wounds, no doubt causes rapture utterly past the comprehension of him who would coldly calculate the sum of Christ's merits; but there is an infinitely higher blessedness in the consciousness of being led, through Christ, to commune with *my Father in heaven*. The mysticism of the Greek Church must be acknowledged superior to the sober Socinianism that became its rival in the Slavic countries; but mysticism is transformed into a still more precious treasure, if, through the Holy Spirit making supplication within and for me, I find my way to him who knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit. Thus we may praise the Roman Church for her striving after catholicity, which forms such a refreshing contrast to the insensibility of the Separatist, who rudely severs the most sacred ties; and at the same time feel rise within us a holy anger against her ecclesiasticism, by which she forces herself between our soul and its God. And, while it may be admitted that, owing to its almost superhuman efforts, in deriving all things from God, in maintaining for all things a relation of dependence upon God, and in estimating all things according to their significance for the glory of God, Calvinism has not been equally successful in appreciating those other elements, and that it will, in consequence, have to enrich itself from the labors of others, to Calvinism, nevertheless, redounds the imperishable glory of having chosen the highest standpoint—highest, not according to its own subjective opinion, but revealed as such by God, in his Word, when the Holy Spirit made the apostle exclaim: "From Him, through Him, and unto Him are all things. Unto Him be the glory forever. Amen."

It is a mistake, therefore, to discover the specific character of Calvinism in the doctrine of predestination, or in the authority of the Scriptures, or in the doctrine of the covenants, or in the tenet of hereditary guilt, or in strictness of life, or in the Presbyterian form of church government. For Calvinism all these are logical consequences, not the point of departure—foliage bearing witness to the luxuriance of its growth, but not the root from which it sprouted. Because Calvinism would have God remain God, and could not conceive of any good will or work in man unless depend-



ing on a will and work of God, it professed the doctrine of predestination. Because it would have God remain God, and therefore held that wherever he spoke it behooved the creature to be silent, it professed the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Because it would have God remain God, and hence ascribed absolute validity to the bond of his covenant, it professed the mysterious working of covenantal grace. Because it would have God remain God, and hence did not allow itself to put the moral question of our guilt individually, as we are accustomed to do, but organically, as is the standing of humanity before God, it professed not only hereditary corruption, but also, as the cause of this, hereditary guilt. And again, because it would have God remain God, and held the entire range of human life in subjection to his law, for this and for no other reason Calvinism came to advocate a strict Puritanism.

Every other explanation leaves the historical phenomenon of Calvinism an unsolved riddle. If its specific character lay in "predestination," we might expect to meet in Calvinistic countries with passive people renouncing all manner of good works, and waiting in stolid insensibility for the evidence of election to make its appearance. So absolute an emphasis placed on the work of God, and so complete a denial of all value residing in the work of man, could not but have resulted in the most shameful Antinomianism. If now, in sharp contrast to this, wherever Calvinism has held its triumphant entrance, in Geneva, among the French Huguenots, in Scotland, in the Netherlands wrestling with Spain, and certainly not the least in the rise of the first American States, we meet with a display of activity that changes the whole aspect of national life, a moral, even Puritanic earnestness that frowns at every sin and connives at no form of iniquity, a care for the poor and suffering such as has scarcely been witnessed since the golden days of Jerusalem—then it is obvious that we must here either assume an inexplicable dualism, or acknowledge our attempt to explain Calvinism from predestination alone to have been a failure. But truly there was no dualism. Calvinism did not place predestination in the foreground to borrow from it a plenary indulgence for an Antinomian and passive life, but it took its stand in the

presence of God, in order that his word might shed light on the truth it had to profess and the path it had to walk. Because it would have God remain God, it professed to find the source of all grace solely in the mercy of God, and at the same time prescribed a rule of life that made the human will completely subject to the will of God. To be sure, Quietistic circles have formed in Calvinistic countries, and among Calvinistic nations Antinomian sects have arisen; but far from commending this Quietism or palliating this Antinomianism, the true Calvinism of all centuries has shaken both these morbid excrescences like venomous vipers from its arm.

To recapitulate: Religion on earth finds its highest expression in the act of prayer. But Calvinism in the Christian church is simply that tendency which makes a man assume the same attitude towards God in his profession and life, which he already exhibits in his prayer. There is no Christian, be he Lutheran or Baptist, Methodist or Greek, whose prayer is not thoroughly Calvinistic; no child of God, to whatever church organization he may belong, but in his prayer he gives glory to God above and renders thanks to his Father in heaven for all the grace working in him, and acknowledges that the eternal love of God alone has, in the face of his resistance, drawn him out of darkness into light. On his knees before God, every one that has been saved will recognize the sole efficiency of the Holy Spirit in every good work performed, and will acknowledge that without the atoning grace of him who is rich in mercies, he would not exist for a moment, but would sink away in guilt and sin. In a word, whosoever truly prays, ascribes nothing to his own will or power except the sin that condemns him before God, and knows of nothing that could endure the judgment of God except it be wrought within him by the divine love. But whilst all other tendencies in the church preserve this attitude as long as their prayer lasts, to lose themselves in radically different conceptions as soon as the amen has been pronounced, the Calvinist adheres to the truth of his prayer, in his confession, in his theology, in his life, and the amen that has closed his petition reëchoes in the depths of his consciousness and throughout the whole of his existence.

## III.

Our third question was: *How has this tendency found its expression in the ecclesiastical symbols?*

First, we will remark that every tendency in order to reach its symbolic destination naturally chooses its own way, and in choosing it is determined by its own inherent principle. When the Roman Church wishes to elevate the *Immaculata Conceptio* or the *Infallibilitas* of the Pope (when speaking *ex cathedra* in doctrinal matters) to the rank of a dogma, the Pope convenes a universal council. Hereupon he has the dogma formulated by the representatives of the majority in this council, on whom he can rely, manages to overawe the minority, and presently compels them to renounce their private judgment, and under penalty of ejection from the episcopate to submit to his wishes. Furthermore, the Pope chooses the most opportune time for the calling of such a council, in the present instance by fixing upon the moment when the great Franco-Prussian war precludes all resistance on the part of the Gallican Church, and leaves the German government no time for opposition. When, after the lapse of three years, Prince Bismarck organizes a systematic opposition in the *Culturkampf*, the Roman Church has in the meanwhile succeeded in suppressing all resistance in its own bosom, and feels itself sufficiently strong to give the lie to those haughty words of the *Culturkampf*, "*Wir gehen nicht nach Canossa!*" This mode of procedure is with Rome the logical outcome of the preëminence accorded on principle to the *Gloria Ecclesie*. The church stands between God and man, and determines their mutual relation.

An entirely different course of events presents itself in Lutheran countries. Here the government takes the initiative. The best Confession of the Lutheran Church, the *Confessio Augustana*, owes its origin to the Diet of Augsburg, which assembled in 1530. It was an elector that, through his theologians, had a draught of this Confession prepared at Torgau. This sketch of the Torgau articles Melancthon moulded into the form of the Augustana. Political delegates of territories and cities then presented this as an expression of their belief to the Emperor. And it was the Emperor who, after a long opposition, finally conceded in joint

action with the Diet the first twenty-one articles to the Lutheran Church. This was the natural course of affairs. Luther having once taken the initiative, the Reformation in Lutheran countries had been taken up by the civil powers, and ever after the church has continued wedded to these powers in a Cæsaro-papistic fashion.

No such course was pursued in Calvinistic countries. Here in virtue of the Calvinistic principle itself, the Confession had to be the spontaneous product of the struggle of believers, and to bear the clearest evidence of having originated under the impulse of the Holy Spirit. In their Confession, as well as in their theology, Calvinists take their point of departure in God and not in man. God, through the kingship of Christ under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, actually governs the churches. The same Holy Spirit presides in the church councils, expounds the Holy Scriptures in the assemblies of believers, and directs, deepens and inspires the studies of the theologians. Of course, not as if this work of the Holy Spirit bore an absolute character. On the contrary, the rays of the Spirit's light no sooner are intercepted than diffracted by the prism of the life of the church. Nevertheless, it implies that a Calvinistic synod, a Calvinistic pastor, or a Calvinistic theologian derives its energy from the sacred consciousness of being inspired and directed by the Holy Spirit.

Thus one of the richest Calvinistic Confessions, the *Helvetica Posterior* of 1566, was not drawn up by a delegated commission, nor prepared at the command of the civil authorities, but taken from Bullinger's Testament. It was an effusion of the pious man's soul written down as in the sight of God, many years before his death, and laid by with his testament, that even after his departure he might still bear witness of his faith. One of the oldest, the French Confession of 1559, is the work of the martyr-church of the Huguenots, adopted at a Synod which assembled at Paris amid the threats and murderous cries of persecution. As a result its beauty is unmarred by any terms of Scholasticism. It is a cry from the heart of an oppressed people feeling the sword on its neck, and is intended to bear witness in the Lord's name to the simplicity, the earnestness and the blamelessness of its faith. The

same may be said of the Belgic Confession, the product of the martyr, Guido de Brès, and soon adopted by the churches, not as a theological thesis, but as a cry of conscience, and presented to the Spanish powers. England's first Confession, that of the pious King Edward VI., was, *mutatis mutandis*, of a similar character. The original Scotch Confession was the work of a man who had been tortured and tormented in the galleys in France for his unswerving fidelity to the gospel, and who had become and continued to be the soul of the Scotch Reformation. It must be admitted that the Westminster Confession, drawn up as late as 1648, is not entirely in keeping with this Calvinistic tradition. But it should be observed: 1. That it was not so much intended to form a new Confession, as rather to give a *résumé*, in behalf of England, of the martyr-Confessions. 2. That the war which the Long Parliament waged against King Charles I. was merely a continuation, in a modified form, of the struggle which Luther had begun against the tyrannical rule of the hierarchy and the absolute monarchy in his plea for "*die Freiheit eines Christenmenschen.*" 3. That the Westminster Assembly solicited in behalf of its labors the opinion of the sister churches in the Netherlands, France, Switzerland, the Palatinate, Hesse-Cassel, Hanau and Anhalt. 4. But in addition, the Westminster Assembly was composed of a group of such eminent and godly divines, that it may be justly claimed to represent the ripe fruit of the Reformation, equally illustrious in its love of liberty and godliness as in its manly strength and sound learning.

Now, in tracing the general principle that has put this stamp on the Calvinistic Confessions, we may call attention to four things.

*First*, Calvinism does not undertake to formulate its Confession, except under the impulse, or after the close, of some powerful movement, stirring the very depths of life. So it was in the ancient Christian church, which committed its first symbol to writing under the pressure of an agonizing struggle with anti-Trinitarians, Montanists, Gnostics, and Manichæans. In a similar manner, Calvinism brought forth written Confessions in France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and, soon afterwards, in Scotland

and England. The impulse giving birth to such a Confession did not come from the spirit of man, but from the Spirit of the Lord. It was no product of theoretical discursive thought, but of a conviction that dominated the person and governed his entire life, exposed him to danger and toil, led him into conflicts and complications, and demanded from him the greatest sacrifices—a conviction from which his flesh might shrink, but which the Calvinist neither would nor could abandon, because God himself had impressed it upon his soul. Behind a Calvinist's confession there is always that hidden impulse of the Spirit, in reference to which Jeremiah exclaimed: "I was weary with forbearing, but I could not; there was in my heart as it were a burning fire, shut up in my bones." Before a Calvinist could attain to confession, there had first to arrive in the church that moment of a spiritual ἀκμῆ which the Psalmist has so vividly described in the Word: "It is time for the Lord to work." Then, to be sure, after the working of the Lord had been made manifest, and taken hold of the believer's spirit, so as to impart the assurance that neither the school-man nor worldly philosophy, much less the voice of the flesh, but the Spirit of the Lord, had begun to make itself heard—then the Calvinist, also, would breathe his soul into a living creed, and make profession before judge and magistrate, not in terms that had first to be sought, but in words that spontaneously suggested themselves, growing, as it were, as a shell around the pearl, words unctuous and sacred.

In the *second place*, according to the view of Calvinism, the Holy Spirit never satisfies this desire for a confession, but through the exposition of the Word. From the Holy Spirit the impulse proceeds; from the Word the contents are taken in which it finds utterance. Especially in the Westminster Confession this principle, at the prompting of the Scotch delegates, has been rigorously applied and distinctly stated; but in all Calvinistic Confessions, without exception, the feature is too prominent to require special consideration. In order that God might remain God, *the King's Word* had to exercise authority over their spiritual life, and over their confession as well. They wished but to repeat what God, in his Word, had dictated. Their confession neither will nor

can be anything else than a joyful response and a faithful echo to the Word of their God.

*Thirdly*, Calvinism, in its method of arriving at a confession, excludes all individualism and sectarianism. Placing no reliance on their individual utterance, Calvinists do not speak out in a full-voiced confession until they are assured that the same voice has likewise spoken from the heart of their brethren in all churches and countries. Only after perceiving that the one Spirit has, by means of the one Word everywhere produced the same conviction in the hearts of all that move in the same current, they feel warranted to make a public profession in the name of the church, and to formulate in writing that same faith which has been sealed with the blood of their brethren at the stake. Hence it is, that Calvinists always and everywhere have struck the same key-note in their confessions; that they have subscribed each other's symbols; that, in drawing up and revising their standards, they have always solicited one another's advice, and that, in point of fact, in their various creeds they have professed one and the same faith.

In the *fourth place*, we must observe that the Calvinists never proceeded to formulate their confession until after and only so far as the Holy Spirit had clearly given them to understand the meaning of the divine Word on disputed points. Nowhere is there a trace of what is common among enthusiasts of every sort, viz., that, proceeding on some obscure data, they give expression on the spur of the moment to their private opinions. Calvinists stand firm in the conviction that theology also is a servant of God, walking by his light, and for this reason they never proceeded to speak until this sacred theology had reached sufficient maturity of development to enable them to speak clearly and plainly.

We may be allowed to illustrate this last-mentioned point somewhat more in detail. In order to have a case of living interest we will select for our purpose the salvation of those dying in infancy. If the question be put whether the Calvinistic Confessions have expressed themselves on this delicate point, the answer must be an emphatic affirmative. Still there is a certain limitation, owing to the fact that at this point also our Confessions have not in the first place aimed at flattering human feelings, but at the glory of God.

Our little babes also must be made to serve his glory, instead of the latter being made subservient to the emotions awakened in us by the death of our darlings. Hence in their Confessions they did not venture further on this point than was warranted by the scriptures and had been revealed by the Spirit spreading light on the Scriptures. Within these limits, however, prescribed by their principle, the churches have most emphatically pronounced in favor of the view that those of our children whom God takes away before they have attained to years of discretion, must be considered as elect, and consequently as saved. In 1619 the Calvinistic churches at Dordrecht professed in the seventeenth article of the first chapter of the *Canones*: "*Quandoquidem de voluntate Dei ex verbo Ipsius nobis est judicandum, quod testatur liberos fidelium esse sanctos, non quidem natura, sed beneficio fœderis gratuiti, in quo illi cum parentibus comprehenduntur, pii parentes de electione et salute suorum liberorum, quos Deus in infantia ex hac vita evocat, non debent dubitare.*" This Confession of 1619 was subscribed not only by all the churches of the Netherlands, but in addition by the five English delegates, the three delegates from the Palatinate, the four delegates from Hesse, the five delegates from Switzerland, the two members from Wetterau, and also by the deputies from Geneva and Bremen. There can be no difference of opinion, therefore, as to whether it is still at the present day the unanimous confession of Calvinistic churches that "believers" losing their infant children by death have to regard them as elect and saved. If now we place the limit for the full awakening of conscious life at the age of seven, and reflect that, according to statistical data, out of one thousand deaths an average of thirty-five per cent. occurs before the close of the first year, fourteen per cent. between the first and fifth year, and two per cent. before the seventh year, then it will appear that the Calvinistic creed positively assumes the salvation of fully fifty-one per cent. of the total membership of our churches. Harshness is out of the question here; there is rather a presumption of excessive boldness in affirming the salvation of so great a number. This has all the more weight since from the foregoing it will appear that Calvinists have not permitted themselves to be led by



sentimental conjectures or *a priori* deductions from the love of God, but have constantly appealed to the revelation given in the *Word*, and hence have not tampered in the least with the truth that these infants also are lost in Adam, and that the sole ground of their being saved lies in election.

This conviction in regard to the salvation of dying infants is by no means a piece of new cloth sewed on the old garment at Dort, but a direct inference from what Calvinists have always held, and would still better realize in the present, if on the point of holy baptism they had not departed so far from the doctrine of the fathers. In our days baptism is generally conceived of as being administered in hope of subsequent regeneration, whereas Calvinists have always taught that baptism should be administered on the presumption that regeneration has preceded. In those days people still had an insight into the organic character of the work of God, and were taught to make a clear distinction between the various parts of the plant of faith. First there was the seed of faith, by which the power to believe is implanted in the sinner, coinciding with regeneration proper; further from this seed by a second work of grace the stem of faith is made to sprout, which then is seen to bud in conversion and finally to bear fruit in the works of faith. Now, of course, with an infant every act of faith, or budding of faith, or sprouting of faith is excluded. We may speak, however, in such a case of a seed of faith. Where this seed of faith, or the faculty of faith, has been implanted, regeneration has taken place, and, in case of death, salvation will follow—things which constitute a clear title to the seal of the covenant and holy baptism. On these grounds Calvinists have taught: 1. That children of believers are to be considered as recipients of efficacious grace, in whom the work of regeneration proper has already begun. 2. That accordingly they are to receive baptism as being sanctified in Christ. 3. That, when dying before having attained to years of discretion, they can only be regarded as saved. Of course, Calvinists never declared that these things were necessarily so. As they never permitted themselves to pronounce an official judgment on the inward state of an adult, but left the judgment to God, so they have never

usurped the right to pronounce absolutely on the presence or absence of spiritual life in infants. They only stated how God would have us *consider* such infants, and this consideration based on the divine Word made it imperative to look upon their infant children as elect and saved, and to treat them accordingly.

On the other hand their Confession is silent in regard to the infants both of Mohammedans and of the heathen. It was not intended to deny that God is able to perform his hidden work of grace in these little ones also; but where the Scriptures did not pronounce on this point, they thought that the church too neither could nor should speak. A creed is not for the purpose of stating our own surmises or conjectures, but for professing that, of which, on the basis of God's revelation, we possess most certain knowledge.

Already Calvin had laid down this Calvinistic thesis regarding the work of grace in infants in the most explicit terms, when he wrote, speaking of the Anabaptists: "But how, they say, are children regenerated, that still lack all knowledge of good and evil? To which we reply: That, although we may not observe in them a gracious work, still this can never be a ground for denying the presence of such" (*Inst.*, Lib. iv. C. xvi. § 17). And elsewhere: "What will prevent God from having already granted, if it so pleases him, *a little spark of his light* to those same children, on whom presently he will shed its full lustre, especially so when he takes them out of this life before they attain to consciousness" (*ib.*, § 20). And still more positively: "Moreover, this whole objection, that children are baptized in view of a *fides* and *pœnitentia* revealing themselves later, may be easily met in this manner: That although this *fides* and *pœnitentia* have not, as yet, assumed a fixed form, *nevertheless, through a secret operation of the Spirit, the seed of both (utriusque semen) is implanted in them*" (*ib.*, § 21). Nearly all truly Calvinistic theologians agree with Calvin on this point. Thus Maccovius writes in his *Theol. Quæst.*, Loc. 42, Cap. xx.: "*Anne infantes habent fidem? Resp. Habent, non actualem sed habitualem, quemadmodum enim regeniti sunt, ita et fidem habitualem habent.*" Voetius, in his *Disputationes Theologicæ, De Regeneratione* (comp. *Bibl. Ref.* iv. p. 247 seq.), says, in reference

to all baptized infants, of believers: "*Placet opinio auctoris, quod statuit in infantibus electis et fœderatis locum habere Spiritus Sancti regenerationem initialem, per quam principium et semen actualis conversionis suo tempore secuturæ imprimitur . . . nota est enim sententia theologorum reformatorum de efficacia Baptismi non in producenda regeneratione, SED in jam producta obsignanda*" (p. 254). This *regeneratio initialis* he then proceeds to describe more fully, in the following words: "*Non est actio, nec habitus proprie sic dictus qui facilitat potentiam, sed partim relatio, partim qualitas ceu facultas spiritualis in mente et voluntate, ex qua tamquam e semine quodam . . . actuales dispositiones et habitus per impressionem Spiritus Sancti suo tempore suscitantur*" (p. 255). In like manner Gomarus says in his *Opera Omnia*, Vol. iii. p. 130: "*Ad quos Spiritus Sanctus pertinet illis aqua Baptismi denegari non potest.*" Not to mention many others, Cloppenburg, in his *Exerc. Theol.*, Tom. i. p. 1097, declares: "*Opponimus, infantes fidelium arcana immediata operatione Spiritus Sancti inseri Christo, donec vel in hac vita vel in mortis articulo infantilis ætas accipiat finem, ut vel hic in carne, vel exuti carne, per fidem vel per visionem agnoscant, quæ ipsis gratificatus est Deus, ut et nobis.*" Even Van Der Marck, in his *Comp. Theol.*, C. xxii. § 12, still says: "*Interim lubenter fatemur . . . infantibus fidelium . . . competere juxta Christi meritum, Spiritus gratiam, quam fidem seminalem, radicalem, habitualementiam minus proprie, nonnulli appellant.*" And J. Van Den Honert, who lived towards the close of the last century, still wrote in his *De Gratia Particulari*, C. ii. § 44, p. 459: "*Potest enim vultque Deus fidem, sine qua nulla hominis salus est futura, in infantibus, quos elegit quosque ante auditum ab iis Evangelium ad cœlestem gloriam evocat, ignota nobis atque impervestigabili via operari, non sine Spiritu sancto, sed per ejus efficacissimam operationem.*"<sup>1</sup>

It amounts to a total subversion of the Calvinistic view therefore: 1. To deny that the seed of regeneration can be produced by God in a new-born babe. 2. Not to assume this in the case of

<sup>1</sup> The author has more fully discussed this topic in his *Exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism*; compare the articles on the "Sacrament of Baptism" and "Infant Baptism," in *De Heraut*, 1889 and 1890.

children of believers. 3. To administer baptism to them on any other supposition. 4. Not to consider them in bringing them up as potentially regenerated, and not to make this the basis of the demand for conversion. Evidently, this is the import of all Calvinistic Confessions, where they treat of the sacraments. For they all avow that the sacrament serves *ad fidem corroborandam*. How, then can baptism, more particularly infant baptism, pass for a sacrament, except on the supposition that in the child offered for baptism the seed of faith has already been implanted by God? Unless this be assumed, there is no authority for baptizing a child; for, the seed of faith failing, baptism cannot serve *ad fidem corroborandam*. The Westminster Assembly, also, has affirmed this in its Larger Catechism, when in reply to the question, "What is a sacrament?" it does not fail to enumerate among the effects of the same "*confirmare et augere fidem.*"

Now it may be objected that our Calvinistic symbols, and especially the Westminster Standards, are rather meagre in their treatment of this important point. This must be conceded, with the further remark, however, that this meagreness was due to two causes. In *the first place*, it is obvious that the Holy Scriptures almost entirely confine themselves to describing the way of salvation for adults, and scarcely touch upon the quite different way in which God saves infants. In doing so, the Scriptures do not deny that, alongside of the way for adults, there is *a quite different way for these little ones* (within the limits, of course, of election, redemption by Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit) and they even clearly indicate that such is the case. But they do not enlarge upon it any further than is absolutely necessary for our consolation. The Holy Scriptures are not intended to satisfy our curiosity, or to enable us to penetrate into the realm of mysteries, but have the sole end to instruct those who read and hear, and are of riper years, in reference to what they are to believe and do. To this principle our Calvinistic symbols adhere. They never go beyond the Holy Scriptures, and had no liberty to go beyond them. The *second reason* was that they never admitted into their Confessions such points *as had not been fully elucidated by theology*. Now, although the connection between baptism and the antece-

dent work of God had been under theological discussion for some time, and had received a partial explanation, still the fact that it had not been clearly formulated compelled them to be rather meagre in their statements. Later on, when the influence of Methodism began to be felt, *i. e.*, of that superficial tendency, which, on principle, denied the work of God in infants—did not recognize a distinction between the *seed* of faith and *budding* faith—robbed infant baptism of its sacramental character, and lowered it to the rank of a purely human ceremony—thus clearly taking its stand in maintaining that a person not yet converted cannot be regenerated—then Calvinistic theology, in reaction against these errors, reached a greater degree of clearness, and, at the present day, there can hardly be any further doubt as to its conclusions.

To recapitulate, we may conclude that the Calvinistic churches attained to confession only after the Spirit of God had given the impulse through the momentous events of church history and the personal inspiration of their leaders; that, secondly, in confessing they had no other aim than to reëcho the Word of God; that, thirdly, they did not speak until there went up from all the *Reformed Churches* one voice as a voice of many waters; and, fourthly, that even then in all soberness they confined themselves to what the study of theology under the illumination of the Spirit had brought to a sufficient degree of clearness.

#### IV.

Our last question was: *To what conditions is the revision of the symbols, in the case of a progressive development of Calvinism, to be bound?*

The answer to this question also should not be left to the caprice of subjective opinion, but depends for Calvinistic churches on the dictates of their own principle as interpreted in the light of history. It should be remembered that this problem of revision was formulated as early as the seventeenth century in connection with the Synod of Dort, both from the Calvinistic and the Arminian side, and that in contradictory terms. The documents bearing on that controversy are still extant, and have been rendered accessible by the author of these remarks, together with all explanatory data,

in his work, *Revision of the Revision Legend* (Amsterdam: J. H. Kruyt, 1879), to which we may be permitted to refer in this connection. In that controversy neither side called in question the abstract right of the churches to undertake a revision of their creed. Each side admitted, both that the possibility of error had to be assumed, and that either the inward development of the church or the more aggressive attitude of enemies from without might make a fuller explanation necessary.

On the other hand, Arminians and Calvinists were found to differ in principle as soon as the question was raised: In what manner is the revision of the symbols to be brought about? This difference of principle originated in the vast difference between the value and significance ascribed by either party to the symbols that were in force. Those on the Arminian side in arguing took their point of departure from man, and hence viewed the confessions as products of human study. They held accordingly that human judgment was at liberty, if occasion required, to remodel the adopted formulas or to substitute different ones, and they therefore demanded that the revising Synod pending the process of revision should be free from the trammels of the creed, and should be permitted to erase, to alter, or to add whatsoever it pleased at each moment; with the single proviso that the next or a subsequent Synod should be allowed to do the same work over again and to revise anew the already revised Confession. The Calvinistic side opposed this view as being essentially Arminian, as implying a disregard of the work of God and a denial of the Kingship of Christ over his church. No, Calvinists said, our Confession did not originate from man alone, and shall not be treated as a bare product of human study. God himself by the mighty deeds of his providential government created a more than ordinary movement in the current of church life; in the midst of this general stirring, took a firmer hold of the spirits of his people; enabled them thereby to pass through a period of deeper spiritual experience of the truth of the Christian religion; and thus in the light of the Holy Spirit there was gradually evolved out of this mighty commotion a clear, distinct, positive conviction, which has been formulated in our Confession. In these symbols, there-

fore, we possess a part and parcel of the life of our churches. They were given not to a single generation, but to the church of all future generations until the coming of our Lord. The church is bound, therefore, not to lord it over this truth, but to submit to it, and to keep the gold of this God-given Confession untarnished until that illustrious day when the King of his church himself will appear to profess his truth in judgment.

This Confession, Calvinists held, did not lie in the ecclesiastical archives as a lifeless and antiquated manuscript of which each future Synod could dispose at pleasure; but it stood up in the church as a living witness of Christ, insisting upon its rights, until after proper filing of complaint, proof should have been brought forward from the Word of God of its incorrectness on any point. The Confession possessed rights conferred by God and confirmed by history, and could only be deprived of these after due process of law. Only the Word of God stood higher, to it alone it had to strike the flag. According to this view, then, the method of procedure had to be as follows: In the Synod that took up the matter of revision no one was entitled to speak who did not begin by subscribing to the Confession, reserving, of course, the right of appeal to the Word of God. Next it had to appear, whether from the Synod itself or from without, any complaint was entered against the Confession on the *basis of the divine Word*. Such complaint having been made, a comparison had to follow with the Word of God as to whether the sections under complaint were actually untenable or inadequate. If the assembled churches, after having called for the assistance of the foreign churches, found this to be the case, they were bound to enter upon a revision, in order that the sovereign rights of the Word of God, as exercising authority over the Confession, also might continue intact and inviolable. This course of action was followed at the Synod of Dort, with the express approbation of all the foreign theologians. The Arminian method of revision was positively *rejected*. The Synod assembled on the basis of the Confession in force. The Arminians were permitted to bring their charges against this confession. They were held to proving these charges with evidence drawn exclusively from the Word of God.

This evidence was weighed and found wanting. And finally, in the five *Canones Dordracenæ*, the contents of the Confession on these disputed points were explained more fully with an appeal to the Scriptures, and the assertions of the opposing party were refuted by the most emphatic declaration of Holy Writ. Thus in the matter of revision also they remained faithful to the dictates of the Calvinistic principle that the *divine* factor should have the full respect to which it was entitled. The confession had been honored as God's gift to his church, the rights with which it had been invested by God in the course of history were respected, and no other revision was tolerated than that which the distinct utterance of the divine word rendered imperative.

So much for the formal side of revision. What has been said will suffice to show that the churches do not possess authority, for no reason in particular, to bring the confession as a leaking ship into drydock for calking, or to have it rebuilt after some presumably more seaworthy model. If this exorbitant demand were granted to the churches, a Reformed Church would be at liberty, from a formal point of view, to turn Lutheran from Calvinistic, to become Baptist ten years afterwards, still later to become Episcopalian, and to end with being Greek or Roman Catholic. According to the composition of its Synod, a church might be Trinitarian during one period and Unitarian during the next. This would, indeed, be to keep pace with one's time, or rather to drift along with the current of the "Zeitgeist," instead of glorifying God by bearing witness to the eternal rock of his truth, in contrast with the restless shifting of human opinion. In a short time every tie connecting us with our ancestors would be severed, and scarcely any connection with other churches would remain. From a formal point of view the whole character and essence of the church would become unsettled. And the end would be, that what called *itself* a church would, as a matter of fact, have been resolved into a debating society of religious sophists.

Still even these are not adequate to secure the right course in the process of revision. There is still another aspect under which this delicate question ought to be considered. Most assuredly the Reformation has not been the last "Sturm- und Drangperiode" of



the church. Even in these very days our churches are passing through a crisis of the most serious character, which will undoubtedly produce a higher tension of spirits, and thereby lead on to a deeper and richer conviction of faith, whence, as a matter of course, an enrichment of our church standards will result. The chasm that has gradually opened up between our subjective convictions and our objective confessions will have to be filled in due time. *But has the time for this already come?* And does not a Calvinistic church incur great risks in concluding that it has? In our opinion it does, and we on our part would not dare to enter upon a revision in our Dutch churches.

The reasons that, in our view, make a delay in this matter of revision necessary are the following: Four conditions must be complied with before a Calvinistic church can undertake the revision of its symbols on the ground of a richer spiritual development: 1. This development must tend in the direction of the church itself, not being a reaction against, but a richer unfolding of the Calvinistic principle. 2. This unfolding must have made such universal progress in the churches, that there is, in reference to it, a practically unanimous testimony of *all the churches*, and not the least danger of one-half of the consistories or classes obtruding their opinion on the other half. 3. Calvinistic theology must have made sufficient progress to furnish the churches with adequate means for formulating this development. 4. In the foreign churches of the Reformed Confession a similar conviction must have led to similar results, before this new stage of symbolic development can be entered upon. It is evident that of these four logically incontestable conditions not a single one thus far either has been or can be complied with.

Not the first. If anything then this is certain, that the most recent development of theology, starting from Schleiermacher, does not carry out the Calvinistic principle, but moves in an entirely opposite direction. It may indeed be questioned whether it can be held to represent, in even the most general sense, any Christian principle at all. One receives the impression that the old Gnostic and Neo-Platonic attempt to turn aside the stream of divine revelation into a philosophical channel has in a talented manner been

revived by this school of Schleiermacher. We would not gainsay the blessings of the Réveil that succeeded the fall of Napoleon, and we fully recognize that this God-sent awakening has worked miracles in the practical sphere and for the mysteries of religious sentiment. But its influence did not extend to the world of thought. In the sphere of scientific development a philosophical tendency, not seldom inclining to Pantheism, had all but absolute sway. Greater and greater emphasis has been placed on the *immanence* of God, at the expense of his *transcendence*, and the Calvinistic intent thereby more and more obscured. In reference to the spiritual development to be observed in our churches a two-fold influence should therefore be sharply distinguished. On the one hand we meet with a spiritual impulse creating a more vigorous manifestation of life in the practical and mystical sphere; on the other hand we observe a philosophical anti-ecclesiastical element, foreign, nay even diametrically opposed to Calvinism, secretly insinuating itself into the sphere of scientific thought. Now it is precisely this element of thought, not the practical or mystical element, which is chiefly involved in this question of revision. Hence there is a more serious danger than many suspect of permanently deflecting from the Calvinistic line, and of admitting an element into the Confession which, being the product of philosophy, will react against the truth of revelation. This danger may lurk even in the adoption of apparently harmless alterations and may unawares overtake even such as have not the slightest desire to invite it. The richer development of Calvinism is passing through a process of fermentation, but has not nearly reached a stage to show any definite results.

Nor can the second condition be complied with, viz., that such a development alone shall be formulated in the Confession as has become the common faith of the whole body of the churches. When in 1559 the Synod of Paris promulgated its Confession, every Huguenot in France responded from his heart with "Yea and Amen." The Confession of Guido de Brès was not adopted by a majority of votes, but with a sort of spiritual *élan* by all our churches. At Dort also the canons were passed unanimously. And after the Westminster fathers had completed their labors, all

Calvinistic churches of English origin felt that no other confession had been framed than the living confession of their souls. And thus it should be. As long as the Lord our God has not brought to completion the work of his Spirit in the hearts, the church is not prepared to revise its creed. To control one another, to make a majority rule a minority, should not be thought of here. As long, therefore, as the synod, convened for the purpose of revising, stands divided, this fact alone abundantly proves that the moment for so important a work has not yet arrived, and that a stage of riper development should be awaited.

In a worse plight even are matters in regard to the third condition by which every legitimate revision of the confession is bound, viz., that Calvinistic theology by its previous development shall have acquired sufficient strength to supply an adequate formula for the work in hand. In Germany, to be sure, an independent *Lutheran* theology has been evolved in opposition to the *Vermittlungstheologie*, owing partly to the stand taken by Villmar and partly to the energetic labors of the Old Lutherans. Roman Catholic theology also has exhibited significant symptoms of life. Even the Baptists have displayed not a little activity. But Calvinistic theology alone continues to slumber. Not as if the Calvinistic churches had been lacking in learned scholars and productive authors; the contrary is true; but their labors have either been of a more practical and edifying character, or when engaged more strictly with principles they have either been satisfied with *cocta recoquere*, or been occupied with smuggling the contraband of the German *Vermittlungstheologie* into the Calvinistic camp. Aside from Hodge, hardly an effort has been made towards reconstructing Calvinistic theology; and even Hodge, by his proposal to take "the facts of the Bible" as the *principium theologiæ*, has weakened his own initiative. What has been accomplished by Heppe and Ebrard, and partly by Schweizer and Scholten, should be appreciated as contributing to our historical knowledge; but it should also be remembered that these historical data have been used by them for the purpose of grafting a philosophical shoot on the Calvinistic stem. The theology of the French churches has either followed Vinet's individualism or moved in the grooves

of the schools of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. In Switzerland, after Gaussen and Merle d'Aubigné, no man has ever made efforts to pour fresh waters on the root of Calvinistic theology. In Germany the Calvinistic consciousness has well-nigh vanished in Reformed circles, a fact not difficult to account for.

The astounding influence on theological thought, not so much of Kant, but particularly of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, later of Lotze and Herbart, has here, as well as in other departments of science, placed Germany at the head of the intellectual movement of our times. Hence, under the influence and auspices of these philosophers, an entirely new theological life has been awakened in Germany, which has left the theological labors of other countries far behind. Germany has thus been enabled to produce manuals for every branch of theological study that in many respects are excellent and useful, and owing to their non-confessional character even have found their way into other countries. As a result there is hardly a single living theologian whom this German *Vermittlungstheologie*, in some of its many variations, has not considerably influenced, and whose way of thinking it has not molded to a greater or less degree, so as to estrange him from the theological basis of his own church. Not until sad experience had taught how this chameleonic German theology led from Martensen to Rothe, from Rothe to Ritschl, and presently from Ritschl to Lipsius and Biedermann, has the brave example of the Old Lutherans incited a few Calvinistic theologians to take in hand the development of what has been committed to their trust. A beginning, therefore, has been made. Calvinistic theology will in the near future be able to demand a hearing. But a development which could lay claim to being abreast of the times, and furnish the necessary light for re-shaping our symbols without forsaking its own principles, is as yet out of the question. Lacking these things that are absolutely indispensable in the line of preparation, the result of an attempted revision could only be that, notwithstanding the best of intentions, foreign elements would imperceptibly creep into our confessions, that we would formulate our views in a most questionable manner, and that the necessity would soon make itself felt to undo the work just accomplished.

To this must be added that our chances of being able to comply with the last and *fourth* condition are extremely slight. At Dort and at Westminster, on both of which occasions a body of exceedingly learned and thoroughly Calvinistic theologians was assembled, who had their views well formulated, still the absolute impossibility was recognized of closing the proceedings without having advised with the foreign churches. These men would not separate themselves from the Reformed Church of Christ scattered over the entire earth; and on the other hand, they felt that the approbation of all these churches would set the seal on the work undertaken. For the present, such a coöperation cannot be thought of, all the Reformed Churches being involved in a fierce struggle against the most glaring unbelief in their own bosom, and being for the greater part disqualified by their synodical organizations from serving as organs of the voice of Christ in formulating the divine truth. On the European continent at least the situation in this respect is pitiable. At the utmost, a few individual theologians could be consulted, provided these would give the preliminary assurance of being in full agreement with the confession of their churches. But after all, this could never take the place of the advice of the Reformed Churches all over the world.

Under these circumstances a revision of our symbols, carried through in opposition to the Calvinistic principle and the warning voice of history, would only be the forerunner of a still more thorough-going revision to follow immediately in its wake. Thereby the assurance of the certainty of divine truth would receive a serious blow in many of our churches. And of this unsettling the result would be that the confession instead of strengthening the faith, which is professedly its aim, would be turned into a very hurtful instrument for injuring the faith of our people to an ever-increasing extent. In order to avert this very danger our fathers have always observed the wise custom, wherever they were compelled to give a closer definition of the truth, of leaving the old intact, and of adding in the form of an appendix a further declaration on any disputed points. The Canons of Dort are an illustrious example of this, which might be imitated even now, should matters come to such a pass. Thus no piece of new cloth is put

on an old garment. All things remain firmly established, and the churches only declare that in regard to some points requiring further elucidation, they have arrived at a certain new formula. But even such a measure the author would not venture for the present to recommend to the Dutch Churches. Even in regard to the relation between Church and State, this would be untimely, although we can fully understand, why the Calvinistic churches of America have eliminated the third article of the twenty-third chapter of the Westminster Confession. He that would pluck the fruit before it has ripened always draws upon himself the penalty of a regret coming too late. The time for a revision of our standards will not arrive until after our churches shall have succeeded in purifying their atmosphere of heterogeneous elements, in regaining the consciousness, both in a theoretical and in a historical sense, of the principle that shapes their life, and in developing from this principle once more understood, a Calvinistic theology, that will draw its vital sap from its own root, and will be able to accredit itself to the scientific consciousness of the children of our age.

Calvinism is a specific tendency, which has to keep in the church of Christ *its own sacred trust*, to reveal the lustre of a principle peculiar to itself, to fulfil a distinct mission for the glory of God. By allowing this specific character to be effaced it would commit a crime, and the church would be impoverished and mutilated in a spiritual aspect, in so far as a member would drop out of its organism. We would sink from a higher to a lower plane. And the coming generation would address to us, laid to rest in our graves, the reproachful question, whence we derived the right to surrender the trust committed to us by God, the sacred inheritance of the fathers.

These are the reasons why the author, hearing of the revision proposed in America, and realizing what its consequences might be for the Dutch churches, would feel in duty bound, in the sight of God, to dissuade from such revision in the most positive manner, if it were proposed in his own country. We do not presume to give an opinion on American questions. This would obviously be out of place, and the good reader will not ascribe to us such

presumption. Some personal intercourse with the American churches would be indispensable to qualify us for forming such an opinion. Notwithstanding his almost enthusiastic sympathies for the life that is flourishing in America, the writer has not, thus far, found time to make this acquaintance. That we have, nevertheless, rendered this account of our views, is exclusively owing to the consciousness that in this question, also, there are certain universal principles at stake—principles that should govern the conduct of the “*issus de Calvin*” in every age and clime, independently of all transient conditions and local circumstances.

A. KUYPER.

*Free University, Amsterdam, Holland.*

## II. THE UNIVERSAL BOOK.

THE study of literature is beginning to take a much higher place in education, and deservedly so. Much of the so-called study of literature is limited to mere hand-books, setting forth the names and personal traits of authors, and the names and character of their several productions, with brief selections by way of sample and illustration. Such studies seem intended to improve the taste and style of the student, and the result expected is aptly expressed in the one word, culture. Such a study of literature is wholly inadequate, and even misleading. The literature itself is the proper object of study.

Books contain the best thinking of the men who wrote them, expressed in their best style, elaborated out of the real experiences of life, and arranged to accomplish noble ends. The man who masters the works of one great author, thereby approximates the greatness of his intellect, assimilates into himself his moral force, imbibes the very grandeur of his conceptions, and appropriates his knowledge in such a way that when he reproduces it in his own thinking, it comes with all the freshness and vigor of absolute originality. Such a student is thus so inspired with the aims and impulses of his author that he can start from his vantage ground and achieve yet greater things. The culture, which is in itself so desirable, is the natural and incidental product of such study, and not itself the prime object of pursuit; just as happiness is the result of the pursuit of virtue, and is not itself the chief good. The student of literature, therefore, has little use for books about literature, except as he needs a grammar or a glossary. Some men study literature, again, on the same principle as that on which they string beads. Memory is the string, and fine figures, racy anecdotes, striking allusions, and fine passages of rhetoric are strung thereon for ready use. To such a student of literature, a cyclopædia of quotations, or a concordance, is the perfection of tools.



If one could master the entire literature of a people, he would present in himself a marvel versatility of genius, profundity of thought, universality of knowledge, the climax of wisdom, and the perfection of beauty. At least, he would realize in himself all these things, in so far as they are found in the literature he masters; and just so far we might call him a universal man.

Now there is a literature the absolute mastery of which will make this universal man. Greek and Roman literatures fall far short of such perfection, though they ought to be studied, and will be studied, till the end of time—studied as the fathers of English literature studied them.

The literature of the English-speaking people falls short of a universal literature, except so far as it draws its inspiration from the universal fountain.

There is a literature, unique and complete, the product of a remarkable people, extending over a period of sixteen hundred years, the expression of a long-continued civilization—a varying and widely-varied civilization. Allow me to repudiate, once for all, the terms barbaric and semi-barbaric, as applied to a people whose law-giver was divine and whose civil king and supreme judge was the Eternal Son of God.

The literature of that people, comprised in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is from every point of view the most remarkable of all the literatures. Modern critics call it *a* literature to disparage it; we call it *the* literature—the Bible—to exalt it and to locate it among literatures. It is unlike all other literatures in that it is both human and divine. We approach it from the human side and find it as distinctly human as if it were all human; we approach it from the divine side and find it as distinctly divine as if it were all divine—the analogue of the real Word, the God-Man. Its facts are all attested, its conclusions are all incontrovertible, its principles are all impregnable. All the mere human productions of that people have been eliminated from the Compend, and have in the main perished.

You find therein all the valued elements and forms of literature: history and biography, poetry and proverb, philosophy and fiction, civil codes and social customs, morals and religion, and,

withal, a prophetic vision which sweeps the whole arc of time from the creation to the final glory, and unfolds the mysteries of two eternities.

Such a literature, with such an origin, and such authorship, may well be set forth as a universal literature; and, bound in one volume, it may be called the Universal Book. It is a mistake to limit its value to matters spiritual, as is the fashion in some quarters, and that for the purpose of disparaging the remainder, and with the result of destroying, or, at least, damaging the whole. Without quoting its own claims, it is fair to presume that the whole is profitable, and that none of its parts are superfluous.

It is safe and proper, just here, to premise a few things.

(a). This literature grew in volume as the centuries passed, just as other literatures, but not on the same principle. Each addition to these last is, in part, the product of the time and conditions which gave it birth, and, in part, the product of personal genius; while the additions to the Bible are but the working out of a plan and purpose by one author, who determined the whole. This opens up the question of the object and scope of a *written* revelation—a question too wide for this hour. Suffice it to affirm, that it is not an evolutionary product of an evolving civilization, but rather a reducing to permanent form of the doctrines of the ages, and a necessary consecutive refutation of newly-rising heresies. The growth of the volume of inspiration kept pace with advancing perversions, so as to save the truth against the time of universal apostasy.

(b). Each separate book of the Bible reflects the local color and conditions of its author and times, and is exactly adapted to the immediate end for which it was written. This does not, as some imagine, mar its general utility, but rather enhances the certitude of its lessons.

(c). This book, like all other books, is to be interpreted according to the laws of language, which are as imperious as the law of gravitation, and an honest and competent exegesis carries conviction against all comers.

Now, if the points made thus far be accepted, it will hardly be necessary to *prove* the Bible to be the universal book; it would

seem sufficient to *illustrate* the same. We need not forget however, that apt illustrations carry with them all the force of a syllogism, and are far more easily apprehended.

I. The Bible is preëminently a book of facts—attested facts. Now science has for its object the discovery and proper formulation of facts, and, to make proper inferences from the same, by processes both inductive and deductive.

True science must include all possible necessary data gathered from observation, experience and competent testimony. Now the Bible does not teach science, but every fact in the Bible or elsewhere has, or may have, a positive scientific value—so great that one single fossil shell found in the wrong place would necessitate the destruction and reconstruction of the entire classifications of one noble science, and perhaps the modification of others collateral. The facts of the Bible, then, are the primary, fundamental facts of science, attested and recorded by the Holy Ghost through Moses and Daniel and Paul, and are of superior authentication to those recorded by Humboldt, Agassiz and Spencer. The science which ignores these primary Bible data is partial, misleading, and presumptively false. For example, the science of philology deals with the origin and growth of language. The philologist finds certain laws operating to-day in the formation of dialects and in divergencies of speech, and that existing tongues show the operation of these laws in the past; and he concludes that all differences of language originated in this way. The confusion at Babel is a primary fact, and should be so recognized. The failure to start with it leads to a final rejection of it.

Or take ethnology. The true starting point of the science is found in the tenth chapter of Genesis, where are written the generations of the sons of Noah: "And by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

Why has the philosopher sought the *summum bonum* in vain, except that he has overlooked the revealed fact that, "man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever?"

In ethics, the world is full of systems and theories which practically ignore "the fall," "total depravity" and the processes of "sanctification by the Spirit." There are no better attested facts than these.

In psychology, men of the largest learning and ability elaborate plausible systems of every shade from absolute materialism on the one hand to the subtlest idealism on the other; whereas the surface Bible data of body and spirit are the starting point of the study of man.

And so through all the range of earth-born sciences. In their conclusions, they do sometimes suggest a mistaken exegesis of the Scriptures, but they cannot convict them of error. All truth is a unit in its correlations and presents essential harmony at all overlapping points. How then shall agnosticism formulate a science in harmony with revelation? Faith, therefore, remands all science falsely so-called to revise its agnostic conclusions, and to introduce Bible data as fundamental and paramount.

II. The Scriptures are full of general principles which need no further enunciation or elucidation. Indeed, every categorical proposition is closely allied to and dependent on some general truth. When general truths are once duly authenticated they take rank along with the axiomatic truths by which they have been tested, and themselves become the tests of other rational processes. This is true in mathematics. Thus, when once it is proven that the sum of the three angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles, no rational process can be accepted as true which in premise or conclusion contravenes this theorem. Now the Scriptures are full of principles as well as facts; and what is a principle but the statement of a complex fact? These principles are sometimes the conclusions of rational argument, sometimes the results of actual experience, sometimes the utterances of a sanctified common sense, and sometimes the more formal oracles of supreme wisdom but however, they may appear to be set forth, they have the divine imprimatur and the seal of eternal truth. All other truths must accord with them or be rejected. Rationalism hates these fetters and scorns their limitations and claims for itself the inerrancy which it denies to the Scriptures and brings all truth, human and divine, to the test of its own imperious and unwarranted assumptions. The principles of sound morals and good government, of true philosophy and common sense are all found in this book of books, and woe betide all that varies from it. The

illustrations of this will be more apparent as we illustrate this broader proposition.

III. The Universal Book solves all the problems of the ages. Such a civilization, reaching from Abraham to John, extending over two thousand years, modified by the civilizations of Egypt and Babylon, Assyria and Persia, Greece and Rome, and itself modifying them in turn, may fairly be supposed to have grappled with every problem. In this there is "nothing new under the sun." "That which has been is that which shall be." Human nature is everywhere and always the same, and asserts itself under varying conditions. The same things in essence are reenacted in divers forms, and their solutions are substantially the same. These problems are of supreme interest to the generations engaged in their solution and they inspire the literature of every people. It seems fair to claim that this literature illumines every human path with the light of divine wisdom. Take the lowest view of the scope of revelation, that it is only redemptive. Redemptive of what? Is it only a personal redemption? This view is too narrow. Is it not also the redemption of the family and of the state? The race is to be redeemed, socially, politically, commercially and industrially, if ever it shall come to pass that "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

The revealed word is adequate to all the race results set forth in these wondrous figures of speech. The Bible is the text book for the race; it touches human thought and action at every point, and may well regulate the whole.

Let us cite a few illustrations. The covenant made with Noah on that beautiful Sabbath day when he came out of the ark, and ratified by sacrifice, and sealed with the bow in the cloud, as if the very sign-manual of heaven were written across the sky, is the "bill of rights" for the race, giving the guaranty of "life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness." Under it the plowman follows his furrow and the reaper gathers his grain, for the promise is, that "seed time and harvest shall not fail." Under it we eat flesh, as well as the fruits of the ground, and the eating of blood is forbidden, because it is the life. Under it, murder is punished with death; blood redeemed with blood. This is a covenant for the race, and every attempt to set aside its provisions has met disaster and shame.

Or, consider the God-given right of representative free government. It was given to be exercised under a warrant. "Take you wise men, and understanding, known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." "Able men, and men of truth, who fear an oath, and hate covetousness." So long as the choice conforms to the warrant, a nation may be free, but when the warrant is broken, *jure divino* free government perishes in anarchy or despotism.

Take another illustration. Aristocracies have been the bane of republics and the curse of all peoples. The Hebrew commonwealth had such checks and balances in its inspired constitution as to minimize the danger, if not to make them impossible. Aristocracies are a seven-headed monster feeding insatiate on helpless populations. History tells us of priestly aristocracies, blooded aristocracies, landed aristocracies, monied aristocracies, military aristocracies, literary aristocracies, and prescriptive aristocracies. It were an interesting study to see how the model republic was guarded against all these; but time forbids.

Take another illustration. Adulterations and imitations characterize the civilization of which we constitute a part. Foods and medicines are adulterated. Clothes and shoes are shoddy; tableware and jewelry are base but brilliant imitations; education and religion, too, have their imitations and adulterations. I once heard the cynical Irish patriot Mitchell pronounce the word "civilization," with inimitable scorn. "A hybrid word," said he, "with a Latin head and a Greek tail, whose typical product is a God-forbidden mule." I do not know how far he understood the divine law against hybridization, adulteration, and spurious imitations. "It is confusion."

Take a last illustration out of hundreds more. The family is of divine origin; its constitution is of divine authority, the primordial unit of church and state, and the creature of neither, one woman for one man, an indissoluble bond, the man the head of the woman, the proper subjection of children, the autonomy of home, the end a holy seed. But instead, the outcome has, too often, been polygamy, easy divorce, young America, woman's rights, boarding-house life, coöperative nurseries and kitchens, and the relegation of childhood and youth to mere hirelings. Degrade marriage to a mere co-partnership between equals, to be dissolved at will by either party without social stigma, these and a host of other evils sweep in like a flood, and the very foundations of church and state, as God ordained them, are destroyed. Who will construct any thing better out of the ruins?

Suffice it to say that every phase of man's life has its laws, and every relation in life its duties and responsibilities, and these all operate so like the laws of the physical universe that men talk helplessly of fortune and fate and destiny; and well they might, if left to solve the problems of either alone. But this Universal Book sheds over all the clear light of a divine purpose and provides for every exigency. No man, nor people, nor nation are left between the upper and the nether millstone to be ground to powder, except as the teachings of Scripture are neglected.

Some study the Scriptures devotionally, some theologically, others homiletically. I would disparage neither of these except they be exclusive. Every educated man should find in them the unification and interpretation of all sound learning, the test of all that is vicious and inadequate. There is nothing good in human thought and action, in its ultimate product and analysis, for which we do not find a warrant there, or least a concrete illustration. Nor is there any human heresy which is not fairly exposed and refuted, either expressly or by implication in the Word of God.

J. B. SHEARER.

### III. THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

#### No. 1.

“For the prophecy came not in old time, by the will of man.”—2 PETER i. 21.

1. The Holy Scriptures are not merely entitled to our credit and confidence as *true histories*, but they challenge our faith and obedience as a *Divine Revelation—The Inspired Word of God*.

2. Respecting the nature of this inspiration, several erroneous theories have been, and are still, held by professed Christians and others, which differ from each other, not less than they all differ from the true idea of that essential element in the divine authority of the Holy Book.

3. The first error upon this important subject to be noticed, is that which attributes to the mere *inspiration of genius*, the sublime compositions contained in the Bible: representing the Holy Scriptures as the productions of philosophers, poets and sages, acting under influences that are common to other gifted and educated men, when their powerful intellects and fervid imaginations are aroused by great occasions, and inspired by the beauty and grandeur of their themes.

4. This theory, held by the so-called *Rationalists*, a school of critics that arose in Europe about the close of the last century, and which still has its disciples, both there and here, must be rejected as untenable by any candid mind admitting the authenticity of the Scripture narrative. For this theory either ascribes the Bible to a cause totally inadequate to produce such a book, or if, as the Rationalists maintain, the Bible is the production of the unassisted genius of mere men, then those *mere men* must have been, personally and essentially, possessed of *divine knowledge* to make known, and *divine power* to accomplish, the predictions which they have recorded; and they are, therefore, worthy to be worshipped as gods; while, at the same time, they prove themselves to be the vilest impostors, in asserting that they spake, not of themselves but “as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”



5. Another erroneous view of inspiration is that which regards *God as the animating soul and all-directing will-power of the universe*—the real, immediate, and sole agent of all motion of inanimate matter, and the all-pervading cause of all life, action, thought and feeling of organized beings, holding that

“All are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.”

This theory, properly termed *Pantheism*, was held by a sect of philosophers in ancient times, and although occasionally advocated later, by men of erratic mind, yet the good, common sense of the great mass of mankind, in all ages, has utterly rejected it. Nevertheless, this old, absurd and heartless theory is ever and anon revived, as the profound discovery of an enlightened age.

6. According to this fanciful notion, there was no peculiar inspiration of religious knowledge imparted to the writers of the Holy Scriptures; but they, with all angels, men, and devils, the wicked and the profane, as well as the holy and virtuous, are the mere channels and instruments through which the Divine Spirit manifests himself, as the sole actor in the universe. The absurdity of this idea is equalled only by its impiety and blasphemy. It obliterates the distinction between truth and falsehood, virtue and vice. It destroys personal individuality; it annihilates our responsibility to moral government; it is contradicted by the self-consciousness of every rational being; and it is utterly abhorrent to Scripture, reason, and common sense. And hence, it does not, and cannot, explain the phenomena of that influence under which the Holy Scriptures were written.

7. A third error on this general subject is, that which distinguishes between *revelation* and *inspiration*: understanding by the former, a direct and perfect exhibition of divine things; and by the latter, a supernatural stimulation or elevation of mind, enabling the subject of this influence to grasp at once intuitively, and without the intervention of reasoning, whatever divine truth is thus presented.

8. This subtle theory is wholly at variance with the Scripture account of inspiration; which is, that the sacred writers “were

moved" or "borne along" by the Holy Ghost, in recording what had been made known to them by the Divine "Inbreathing." That the word of the Lord came unto them; that the Holy Spirit unveiled and discovered to them the purposes and will of God; not that their minds were supernaturally elevated to grasp and comprehend the divine will by an instantaneous act of intuitive mental apprehension.

9. This theory is also contrary to the nature of human thought. We have no ability to acquire the knowledge of any truth external to our minds, except through the instrumentality of an appropriate mental process. Even those fundamental truths—axioms of science—which, from their simplicity, are denominated *self-evident*, are not all really apprehended by direct intuition; but in some instances, by a *process*, simple indeed, and very rapid as compared with other mental operations, but in which the mind actually goes through a train of reasoning: perceiving the truth, after a comparison of one thing with another. Now, if this be true with respect to some of the simplest axioms of human science, how absurd to suppose that the infinite and unsearchable mind of Jehovah may be known and comprehended at a single and direct glance of a finite intellect, how exalted soever in ability, and how highly soever enrapt, even by a divine afflatus!

10. If this theory of "revelation and inspiration" be correct, it is difficult to discover why the Prophet Daniel could not understand the vision, until it was explained by Gabriel. (Dan. vii. 15, 16; viii. 15, 16; xii. 8.) And why the Apostle Peter should for an instant doubt with respect to the meaning of the vision which had been so vividly presented to him. (Acts, x. 9-19.) And why the prophets, generally, if they enjoyed the kind and degree of "inspiration and revelation," contended for in this theory, should have found it needful to search and inquire diligently: "Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," (1 Peter, i. 10-11.)

## II.

*“The Gospel of God, which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures. Rom. i. 1, 2.*

1. Another erroneous opinion on this subject is that which admits “The Mosaic and Christian dispensations of religion are from God; *but that the Scriptures which record those systems were not written by divine inspiration.*”

In interpreting the Scriptures, therefore, we must receive their statements only when they accord and coincide with the principles of right reason; and reject them when they are contradicted by “the nature of things” or by “the ascertained facts of science.”

2. This opinion, thus denying the divine inspiration of the sacred writings, in effect, reduces them to the level of mere human compositions; and it proposes, in the interpretation of the Scriptures, to deal with them accordingly. To this there are several very serious objections:

*First,* It assumes the improbability, that God would reveal his will, for the salvation of men, to a particular generation, and then adopt no sufficient means to secure, for the benefit of all succeeding generations, an authentic and trustworthy permanent record of that way of salvation. In that case, after the death of God’s original eye and ear-witnesses, the church and the world would have been left, for the knowledge of God’s word, to the uncertainty of mere human tradition. But we know that God’s truth for the salvation of men was not left in the custody of tradition; but that it was, from the beginning, committed wholly unto writing by inspired men, in the lifetime of the original witnesses.

3. *Secondly,* This fanciful theory arrogates for every man to whom the Scriptures may come, in order to ascertain the divine will, as originally revealed, *the competency to correct this merely human record.* And this would require a perfection of knowledge and an infallibility of judgment, to decide *a priori*, and, independently of the Scriptures, not only what the Lord has revealed, but, also, what he ought to make known for man’s salvation. If any man is thus competent, he must be, himself, divinely inspired; and if all men are so, then the Holy Scriptures are wholly useless as the rule of our faith and life.

4. *Thirdly*, The application of “the facts of science” and “the nature of things,” as a rule of Scripture interpretation, would be, to a very great extent, impossible, since the mass of mankind are, to such an extent ignorant of “science” and “the nature of things,” as to be wholly incompetent to apply this test in ascertaining the truth of the Scriptures. And even the distinguished men who are justly celebrated for their accurate and extensive acquaintance with *the facts of science*, are not all agreed as to the *scientific explanation* of those facts. While most of those facts have been known in all ages, the science derived from them has been of very gradual development, and it is still so undetermined that it would be wholly impossible to adopt it as a safe principle of Scripture interpretation. It is true, indeed, that some men, eminent in the walks of science, have found difficulties in the Scriptures which they propose to remove by scientific criticism; but it is true, also, that many, not less eminent, have acknowledged the infinite superiority of the WRITTEN WORD OF GOD to all the science of material things. While such scientists as Silliman, Henry, Guyot, Airey, Dunkin, Thompson, and Piazzi Smyth, are worshipping at the Cross of Christ, the “scientific cavillers” at “Moses and the Prophets,” may well stand uncovered apart.

5. *Fourthly*, If even human science were perfectly developed, and universally diffused and acknowledged; still, it could never be legitimately employed as the standard of truth in considering the statements of a book, which is, to a large extent, professedly a record of *miracles*; assuredly, it could never be consistently placed in antagonism to such a book.

The miracles of the Bible are suspensions or controllings of the ordinary law and nature of things wrought by the omnipotence of God, for the specific purpose of authenticating the mission of his prophets. Those miracles, therefore, assume as true, *an ascertained science of nature*; and their credibility depends, essentially, upon the competency of the eye-witnesses to judge respecting both the fact of the miracle and the law of nature to which that miracle relates. When, therefore, the fact and the reality of miracles are attested by competent and trustworthy witnesses, as are those recorded in the Scriptures, it is absurd to reject those Scriptures,

because they contain such records. Had the Scriptures ascribed the working of miracles to any power less than that of the Omnipotent Jehovah, their statements would not have been worthy of credit; but ascribing as they do all the wonderful things which they record, to a power fully competent to do such things, the only question is that of *authenticity*—and that has been long ago sufficiently determined.

While, therefore, we maintain that no statements of the Scriptures are inconsistent with the ascertained “science and nature of things;” and neither require nor admit any correction; still the theory that “the Mosaic and Christian systems” are from God, will profit *us* little, if the *record* of those systems, made by the prophets, were not divinely inspired. For “in order to know the certainty of the things wherein one may have been (orally) instructed,” it is needful that they be committed (wholly) unto writing by those, “who have had perfect understanding of all things from the very first.” (Luke i. 3, 4.)

### III.

“*God spake all these words.*” (Exod. xx. 1.)

1. A fifth erroneous theory of inspiration is, “That it consisted in a mere transfusion of *the thought* into the mind of the writer, but not associated with *the words* in which that thought was to be expressed. Such an inspiration as this would be inconsistent with the laws of human thought. It is impossible for man to think without associating the thought with the words which would be properly used in expressing it in writing or speaking. It is impossible for us to think in any other way. This is the law of our mental nature—the ordinance of him who is the author of inspiration.

2. When men, therefore, become the subjects of divine inspiration they must necessarily receive the truth, as they are to make it known to others in the form and through the medium of appropriate, intelligible words. Especially was this the case when the prophets announced heavenly mysteries and new doctrines, of which they could have had no conception but from the inspired words, and also, when they delivered predictions which they did not

clearly understand at the time. Then the inspiration must have consisted solely in presenting to their minds the precise words they were to record, and that they did not in every instance fully understand the scope of their own predictions is evident from I. Peter i. 11. An inspiration of a thought unassociated with its appropriate words is, therefore, impossible, unless we suppose an essential change in the present *modus operandi* of the human mind.

3. A favorite and extensively received theory of inspiration is, "That it extended only to *some* particulars—the more important matters—and not to *all* that the sacred penmen have recorded." Doctrines, commands, predictions and other matters of essential importance, and which the prophets could know only by revelation, it is admitted, were given by inspiration. But other things which they knew or might have known by the ordinary means of information, it is maintained, they wrote without inspiration. This theory, therefore, denies that "*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.*"

4. As it is almost impossible in many instances to determine the relative importance of different passages of Scripture; and exceedingly difficult to separate the record of ordinary historical facts from that of important doctrines, prophecies, etc., it would be often impossible, on this theory, to determine what portions of Scripture are inspired and what uninspired. Such a partial inspiration of the Scriptures, therefore, would be of no more benefit to us than if they were not inspired at all. Unless every part of the Scriptures are truly and fully inspired of God, they cannot be that infallible guide and authoritative rule of faith and life, which men indispensably require, not only to save them, both from the licentiousness of lawless infidelity, and from the degrading despotism of "cunningly devised fables," but also to conduct them unerringly to the saving knowledge of God.

5. Nor is the opinion less objectionable which supposes "that the inspiration of the prophets was of different degrees, as suggestion, elevation, direction, superintendence, etc., according to the particular necessities of the several sacred writers."

Inspiration, to accomplish its evident design, must be, as the word itself imports, that direct and complete *inbreathing* of intel-

ligible thoughts into the mind of a prophet by which he certainly knows the divine will, and infallibly communicates it to others. Whereas, superintendence, direction, etc., may imply nothing more than mere preservation from error, while the prophet is communicating ordinary knowledge, derived from his own memory or observation, or from the testimony of other men. The inspiration of a prophet must be simple, direct, complete, and efficient, or it is nothing worth.

6. In opposition to the false theories considered, and to all other errors on this important subject, the sacred writers claim for themselves an inspiration which consisted in a *Divine inbreathing into their minds of that which they wrote, including the words as well as the thoughts.*

#### IV.

“*Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter.*” (Eccles. xii. 13.) “*Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*” (2 Peter i. 21.)

1. The writers of the Old Testament expressly declare that the word which they spake was THE WORD OF THE LORD. And this word was made known to them in general *verbally*; and if by symbols or in visions, the explanations were in words, or the objects presented in the visions were such things as at once suggested the words required to describe them.

Not to quote at length the instances in which the express words of the Lord are recorded in the historic passages prior to the time of Moses, such as Gen. i. 3, 5, 6, 9; iv. 6; vii. 1, etc., the third chapter of Exodus narrates in full the conversation between Jehovah and his servant Moses; and so, also, the narrative from the sixth chapter to the end of the fourteenth is chiefly a recital of *the very words spoken by the Lord.*

The Ten Commandments (written on tables of stone by the finger of God) are introduced with the announcement: “*God spake all these words*”—(Ex. xx. 1–17). The Book of Leviticus opens with a similar declaration: “And the Lord *called* unto Moses, and *spake* unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, *saying:*” (Levit. i. 1). And so, in like manner, the Book of Numbers. (Num. i. 1, and Deut. i. 6.)

2. In the childhood of the Prophet Samuel, the word of the Lord came to him so evidently in the tones and articulations of the human voice, that thrice it was mistaken for the voice of the aged Eli. (1 Sam. iii. 1-14.) The last words of David, King of Israel, declare that "the Spirit of the Lord *spake* by him, and *his word* was in his tongue." (2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2, *etc.*) The testimony of Nehemiah is, that "the Lord had testified against his people by his Spirit in his prophets." (Neh. ix. 30—Revised Version, "*through thy prophets.*") Isaiah designates his prophecy "a vision," and he calls upon the heavens and the earth to hear what "*the Lord had spoken.*" (Isa. i. 1, 2.) In the sixth chapter, verses 8-12, he repeats *the words* which he had heard spoken by the voice of the Lord. And the instances to the same effect, which occur in the prophecies of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Micah, Zechariah, Malachi, and others of the Old Testament, are too numerous to be recited.

3. This incidental testimony of the Old Testament prophets to their own plenary inspiration, is fully corroborated by the inspired writers of the New Testament.

The Apostle Paul, writing to Timothy (2 Tim. iii. 16) of the Holy Scriptures which the latter had known from childhood, pronounces them "*all given by inspiration of God.*" See also Heb. i. 1 and Acts xxviii. 25. And the Apostle Peter declares that "the prophecy came not at any time by the will of man; but holy men of God *spake* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter i. 21.)

4. And with respect to the writers of the New Testament, the evidence of their divine inspiration is not less clear, direct and conclusive. In Deut. xviii. 15-19, it is emphatically promised that the Lord would raise up to Israel, a PROPHET, one of themselves, like unto Moses, who should speak unto them all that the Lord should command him; and all men are required to hearken to the words of that prophet, as they shall answer to the Infinite Jehovah, the author of the revelation thus to be made known, the supreme Lawgiver and Judge of all! In Heb. i. 1, 2, this PROPHET is specifically and personally designated as THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, according to the flesh of the seed of Abraham, the



tribe of Judah, and of the house of David ; but in his divine nature, the coëqual and coëtternal Son of God !—who is thus and for ever constituted the only authoritative and all-sufficient Prophet to reveal to men the will of God for their salvation.

5. Accordingly, our Saviour not only made to his apostles a sufficient revelation of saving truth, but also promised them the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that they might be able perfectly to make known to others, *whatsoever he had commanded* (Matt. x. 18, 19 ; John xiv. 25, 26 ; xvi. 13 ; Acts i. 1–8). And this promise, proceeding from the Father and the Son, was promptly and abundantly fulfilled. (Acts ii. 1, etc.; ix. 10–17 ; 2 Cor. ii. 13 ; Gal. i. 11, 12.) And the Apostle John, the last in the series of the divine amanuenses, in closing the inspired record, affixes to it the inimitable seal of the Divine Author, testifying the terrible sentence denounced against any man that shall presume either to add aught to the things written, or diminish aught from the words of the divine prophecy.

6. In this view of the inspiration of the sacred writers, every sentence and every word is “ the sure testimony of God,” in that sense in which it is proposed as truth. Facts occurred, and words were spoken, as to the import of them, and the instruction contained in them exactly as they are here recorded. The sacred writers, indeed, spoke and wrote ordinarily, in such language and style as their different talents, tempers, education, and associations had rendered familiar to them ; but the Holy Ghost so completely *bore them along* as not only to preserve them from all error, but also to guide them infallibly in speaking and writing the matters revealed to them, in the identical words in which they were communicated, and in recording accurately and fully what they had learned in their own ordinary experience.

In general, the prophets were fully conscious of their inspiration, and they delivered their predictions or messages with an evident design to accomplish a definite object, but there were instances, such as that of Caiaphas (John xi. 49–51.) in which the prediction was undesigned and the inspiration not perceived.

7. The gift of inspiration, under which the Scriptures were written, was distinct from the work of the Spirit in regeneration, although it was enjoyed, for the most part, only by such as

were effectually called by divine grace. With the exception of Balaam and a few others, they who were moved by the Holy Ghost to speak in the name of the Lord were "holy men."

And it was distinct, also, from those gifts of the Spirit granted to the first converts in the days of the apostles, by which they wrought miracles and spake with tongues. (Acts. x. 46; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 8-11.) These gifts, indeed, were in gospel times enjoyed by those who were "inspired to write," but they were possessed and exercised also by multitudes who were not so inspired. These general gifts of the Spirit were evidently designed for the special benefit of that primitive period, that the truth of the Gospel might be impressively and rapidly diffused, and with the occasion, the gifts themselves ceased.

8. But the special inspiration of the sacred penmen was that peculiar and efficient agency of the Holy Spirit, by which they were *borne along* in committing "wholly unto writing," in the very words of God, "the whole counsel of God," for the salvation and comfort of his redeemed church, and for a testimony against his embittered foes in all ages till the end.

9. It is proper to observe in conclusion, that the PLENARY INSPIRATION here advocated relates, in its full and proper sense, only to the original manuscripts executed by the prophets, with their own hands, or at their dictation (Rom. xvi. 22), all of which original documents have long since passed away. It is not, in that high and peculiar sense, claimed for any transcripts, translations, or versions, made by uninspired men. Yet making all due allowance for any possible error from such source, and conceding all that the learned assert concerning the so-called "*Various Readings*" found in the different ancient copies; yet we maintain, that our "Received Text" in the original tongues, derived as it is from the consensus of all known ancient documents, assures to us, in all essential integrity, the original WORD OF GOD. And we may claim also for our ENGLISH AUTHORIZED VERSION, as now recently revised—the joint work of men eminent not less for piety than for learning and skill—a similar profound veneration, as a trustworthy rendering of the WORD OF GOD, THAT LIVETH AND ABIDETH FOR EVER!"

#### IV. GOD'S PROBLEM FOR THE SOUTH.

GOD is the greatest of all problem makers. Neither nature nor metaphysics nor grace contains a single problem that is not his by origination and proposal. The mystery of the milky way or the doctrine of perception or the method of reconciliation between God and man are not human. Since no human mind has ever fully understood them, it is but just to infer that they are super-human in origin. When God sets a problem before the human mind he usually indicates general principles by which it is to be solved. He never ciphers out the details for any man. God told Moses to go lead his people out of Egypt. "Come now, therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt. (Ex. iii. 10.) When Moses had insisted upon Jehovah's telling him something about the details of the work, he was at last asked, "What is that in thine hand? And he said, A rod. Cast it on the ground. He cast it on the ground and it became a serpent, and Moses fled from before it. And the Lord said into Moses: Put forth thine hand and take it by the tail. And he put forth his hand and caught it and it became a rod in his hand; that they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers hath appeared unto thee." (Ex. iv. 3-5.) Moses' problem was *to lead out the people*; his method of solution was to be *miracles*. Jesus stood in the midst of his disheartened disciples on the mount in Galilee, and gave them the greatest problem ever committed to human head, heart and hand. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Such a problem had never been given to men in the past history of the church; it has not been modified one jot or one tittle since its first announcement. It was original, startling, overwhelming. It gave the world a new estimate of the power of the human soul, that it could embrace with loving solicitude the entire human family. The problem carried within its depths its own solution as a granite mass bearing its imbedded dynamite. The problem was *Go*;

its solution lay in one word—*preach*. The problem is now before us. It is divine; so is its solution. The church must, and, by God's good grace, will work it out.

In working it out, the church in the United States has some peculiar conditions to meet. It is better equipped in brains, in money, in spirituality than ever in its history. More people are easily accessible than ever before. Cries for the preached word come from every quarter of our own country and in tumultuous mobs beneath our windows alarm our sleeping consciences. Mute appeals of unnumbered millions of heathen call us irresistibly to their help. The Syro-Phœnician woman in the coasts of Tyre begs for crumbs from the spiritual feast that our Lord spreads before us. Poor Lazarus, outcast, sore-covered, dog-licked, lies at our door piteously pleading, "Give, or I die!" Let us attend to this cry from Lazarus for a little while. We'll not stop to speak of the Chinaman, for he is removed from us by law, nor the Indian, who is fast being removed by powder, rascality, and liquor. Our problem in the South is how to reach the negro with the Gospel. It may be solved perhaps by first reaching the *white man*. For until his brain is cleared and his conscience aroused, very little can be done. What are the conditions of the problem? 1. Many millions of white and black people live in the same territory. 2. The whites once owned the blacks. 3. The whites are vastly in the majority, have indefinitely more money, education, and spirituality. 4. Against the will of the intelligent majority, the minority was freed. 5. By law both black and white are equal citizens of the same government. 6. Powerful influences have for years been at work causing ill-will between the two races. The question that we have to answer is, Can these two races live in peace on the same soil as equal citizens of the same government? If so, how?

What does history say about it? Before the general diffusion of Christianity when two alien races came into contact, one or the other was exterminated or enslaved. Rome and Carthage fought until it was written *Delenda est Carthago*. But what lesson do the records of nations since our Lord's ascension *even down to the year 1891* teach us? An elaborate experiment was made in Spain. But the Moors were expelled in spite of their superior science and

art. Spain and Portugal came into contact with the natives of Mexico and South America only to enslave and destroy them. The Puritan and the cavalier met the proud red man on his own soil and have killed him until only a small remnant remains to build the camp-fire and recall the deeds of ancient braves, with no hope for the future except his ration of blue beef and abuse. Slav and Hebrew, though not even of different races, cannot live together unless the Jew will submit to oppression nearly as galling as slavery. What says history? She says emphatically that the experiment that we are making in this country is a crime against humanity—that either slavery or death must be its end.

What says the Constitution of the United States? Before the adoption of Article XIII. of the amendments of the Constitution abolishing slavery, its existence had been simply ignored by that immortal document. Perhaps no greater experiment in making laws has ever been attempted than the adoption of the last three amendments, making citizens out of slaves up to that time kept ignorant by law. Questions as to the wisdom of their enactment or perpetuation are purely theoretical. They are there, and nothing short of a revolution can remove them. What does the Constitution, our highest and most unchanging law, say about these two races living together? It simply says to all alike, "You shall live together in peace!" This may not be the voice of conscience, but it is the fiat of authority. The Constitution therefore says to us, say we yea or say we nay, "I know that history declares it can't be done, but my voice is louder and my arm is stronger than history. Let there be peace!" The Constitution sought to create peace and interject it between the discordant and warring elements of society. As loyal citizens of our land and as staunch defenders of the Constitution, we must *obey the law*.

What says the Gospel of God? "As ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them likewise." "Follow peace with all men." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." We are perhaps too prone to apply these wholesome precepts to the lives of others, forgetting for the time their direct bearing upon our own consciences and lives. It is to no purpose that we say that we once did our religious duty to the negroes. Satisfying

reflections on our past performances may soothe us into present neglect. Energetic resolutions to do our duty in the future may be a subtly delusive way of calming the cryings of an urgent conscience to-day. A shifting of responsibility that God has laid, is impossible, for the only method of discharging responsibility to God is by doing the duties demanded.

A condition of society exists to-day in the South the like of which has never before been seen. Ignorance and intelligence, poverty and plenty, have always existed side by side everywhere. But when in the history of the ages has a people who were never in bondage to any man, conferred on an alien race, once their slaves, the equal legal rights and privileges which they themselves have created and enjoy?

When we have set aside all political considerations and social fears, we find that the essence of the whole matter lies in the question of, How shall two men, equal before the law, behave towards one another? History is eloquent with illustrations, and the Constitution speaks with the voice of authority. But to consider this question, neither history nor the Constitution is sufficient. For the Christian, there is but one code of morals, but one yard-stick for measuring this cloth, but one voice—and that of law and love united—that has inherently the power of solution. Political expedients are, at best, mere temporary aids. The law is useful as an educator, but it has no power of producing in its own subjects sympathetic obedience. We must have a solvent more permanent than party platforms, more powerful than all law. Something is needed to arouse the conscience, engage the heart, and direct intelligent effort. There are three persons concerned in this matter—the white man, the negro and Almighty God. The white man knows his weakness, the negro is expectant, and, unless the Lord show the strength of his right arm, the pessimism taught us by history and aggravated by the demands of an unfailing law, will soon change to discord and open strife. A learned divine once said, “Unless the gospel solve this matter, then it will be *bang! bang!*” Says the apostle “I can do all things in him that strengthens (*en-dynamites*) me.” What says the gospel: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel.” “For it is the power of God unto

salvation to every one that believeth"—“Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.” So long as we walk in such light as that, there is no pessimism, not even a shade of doubt.

Again, says this same gospel, 1 Thess. ii. 3, 4, For our exhortation is not of error nor of uncleanness, nor in guile; but even as we have been approved of God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which proveth our hearts. That is, we were made by Christ, at his ascension, trustees of his Gospel, for the benefit of all mankind. Shall not this stir up our consciences? A trustee must be *faithful*. Have we, as individuals, or as a church of Jesus Christ, done our duty to the negroes? At the judgment seat of Christ it will be too late to attempt an answer. It is called to-day. “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,” said Jesus, “because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.” Man can have no higher duty, he can enjoy no more sanctifying privilege than to do the works and speak the words of God to men everywhere. Is there a finer field in our South-land for preaching Christ than is afforded by the negroes? Humble, bound by Satan in chains of lust, enslaved to sin, blinded by the god of this world, ignorant of the time of God’s calling—amongst such, surely ought the gospel to be preached.

The Southern Presbyterian Church is just entering upon the great evangelistic period of its history. For the coming of this time God has been patiently preparing us. He has endowed us with a pure doctrine and an adaptable polity. He has enlarged our borders. He has filled our barns with plenty. He has unstopped our ears to the cry of the heathen. He has opened our eyes to the destitution at home. He has been perfecting us by the sufferings of persecution, dissension and discord from within and from without. Uniform and unified we stand before him to-day. In his own hand-writing he gives us our problems. The great home-problem is how to evangelize our colored fellow-citizens, who are our friends and neighbors. Surely, God’s people will not halt now.

To halt will be to retreat. With heart and head and hand, intelligently, wisely, humbly, patiently, cheerfully, sympathetically, for God's own glory, let us now do our whole duty *to the negro*. Let North, East and West be patient and charitable, while aiding us to adapt the Gospel to these hitherto untried conditions. Let all the people consciously introduce God into this mighty problem. It will soon be solved then, and, until then, *never*.

A. L. PHILLIPS.

*Tuscaloosa, Alabama, September 4, 1891.*



## V. THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES AT THE SEMINARY.

OUR Form of Government provides that "the Presbytery shall try" each candidate for licensure "as to his knowledge of . . . the original languages of the Holy Scriptures."<sup>1</sup> This paper will assume the propriety of this requirement. The importance which the church attaches to it is well known. It is manifest from the fact that in her seminaries she has at much cost provided for adequate instruction both in Hebrew and Greek. It is signalized by the fact that she has refused to admit to her ministry pious and able men, because they have failed to comply with this requirement. It seems fair to infer from the stress laid upon the study of the original languages of Scripture that the church sees some important end to be secured by this means. It will be the purpose of this paper to consider, first, what is the object of this requirement? and, second, what is the true method of attaining this object?

I. First, then, let us inquire: What is the *object* of the study of the Bible in the original languages in our seminaries? A correct answer to this question is important for the church which lays down the requirement, for her candidates upon whom it is laid, and for her teachers who are charged with the responsibility of giving it practical effect. Such an answer is essential to the professor, in order that he may intelligently shape his course of instruction. It is essential to the candidate, in order that there may be harmony of aim and effort between himself and his instructors, and in order that, having a definite end clearly before his mind, he may bend all of his energies to the attainment of it. It is essential to the church, in order that she may judge intelligently of the competency of her teachers and the soundness of their methods, and of the fidelity and success of her candidates. Every valid reason that exists for retaining this provision in our standards demands that it be complied with, according to its true intent and purpose.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chap. VI., Sec. VI., Par. 4.

Shams are not only utterly inefficacious, but essentially hurtful, and, we add it with all reverence, hateful to God as well as man. To keep this provision out of the last named odious category and make it practically effective, there ought to be, and must be, harmony of effort between Presbyteries, teachers, and candidates. And in order to harmony of effort, there must be harmony of aim. It would give a powerful impetus to these studies in the seminary, if the students felt that there was hearty accord between their Presbyteries and their professors as to the nature and importance of the end to be attained and the methods of attaining. It is obvious, however, that if, for any reason, they come to believe that the examination upon these studies in Presbytery will be of a perfunctory character, their preparation for this examination is likely to be of the same character.

If the present paper succeeds in bringing this matter in any considerable degree before the mind of the church, if it should lead to an interchange of views among the brethren, upon the question it handles, its aim will have been accomplished, at least in part. The present writer cannot, and does not, expect that his own views will at once command general assent. And while he himself holds them with some confidence, he submits them for the consideration and criticism of his brethren with much diffidence.

The question raised, then, is not, What is the use of studying the Bible in the original tongues in the seminary? This would lead us naturally to an attempt to defend the requirement made in our standards. But while we heartily believe in the wisdom of the requirement in most cases, and hope that our discussion will tend to establish its wisdom, such is not the main or direct object at which we aim. Our question is, What is the object to be accomplished by studying the Bible in the original tongues at the seminary? Let us press our inquiry somewhat into details.

1. First, then, *is the Bible to be so studied purely as a means of grace?* That a study of the originals may prove a gracious discipline to the average seminary student we are prepared to admit. Moral earnestness, conscientiousness, fixedness of purpose, are no mean basis for a ministerial character. These must all be called into play, if good work is done in Hebrew and Greek. Patience, too, some

would even say long suffering, may find exercise. And humility, that flower of the graces, which is, we regret to say, a tardy and feeble growth in some of the young brethren, may also be cultivated. But it will be observed that the gracious effects here are produced, not directly by the truths of Scripture, but by the effort to push through the originals and get at these truths. We are prepared, however, to go further, and admit that the Bible, when read in the originals, may and ought to be more efficient as a means of grace than when read in any version. This is simply saying that the light of divine truth will, like other light, produce the most powerful results when there is nothing to obscure or refract it. Every version, no matter how faithful and felicitous, must to some extent obscure or refract. But here, again, it will be seen that for the Bible in the originals to be a means of grace, one must be at least acquainted, and we would be disposed to say familiarly acquainted, with the originals. This condition does not hold in the case of seminary students.

There are those who affect to feel, and doubtless do feel, a kind of shudder at what they are pleased to regard as the atmosphere of chilly intellectualism and mouldy scholasticism which invests our seminaries. They deplore the fact that Bible study at the seminary does not minister to the spirituality of the students. Now, without pretending to deny that there may be room for such complaints, and being ready, for one, to hail with delight any feasible remedy that may even be growled out, we wish to call attention pointedly to the scope of this provision of our standards. We may have failed to grasp its intent ourselves, and are open to light; but when we consider the meagre attainments in Greek and utter ignorance of Hebrew with which most of our students begin their seminary course, we cannot persuade ourselves that the study of the Bible *in the originals*, as required by the standards, was designed to minister, at least *in primo actu*, to their "spiritual nourishment and growth in grace." That would look too much like turning sucking lambs in upon a stubble-field for pasture. The judicious reader, as a matter of course, will not press this comparison to the disparagement either of the students or the original languages.

2. *Is the object of this requirement to secure, upon the part of our candidates, an extensive and thorough acquaintance with the contents of Scripture?*

Much is said about the fact that seminary students in leaving the seminary know so little about their Bibles. Here, again, there may be, and doubtless is, ground for the complaint. Investigation might show that parents who neglect the religious instruction of their sons, pastors who do little or nothing to stimulate Bible-study among their people, and even Presbyteries, who too often ignore the Bible itself in their examinations, would be called upon to share the odium arising from this state of affairs with the seminaries, upon which it is generally saddled. Be this as it may, it does not concern our present inquiry—which relates exclusively to the object of that clause of the constitution now under consideration. Does this aim at securing an extensive and thorough familiarity with the contents of the Bible during a three years' seminary course? Hardly. The student's time during the first year is taken up, so far as his Hebrew is concerned, in learning the forms and getting something of a vocabulary. It requires five lessons a week, and honest work at that, to do even this. Then there is the syntax to be mastered, which is no mean or insignificant matter. There are about 1400 pages in his Hebrew Bible. If he were to read it over once during his seminary course, starting with the beginning of his second year and reading steadily every day, including Sunday, he would have to average about three pages of Hebrew a day. We do not mean to say that an ambitious and diligent student might not do this, but when done it would not involve a thorough acquaintance with the contents even of the Old Testament. Such an acquaintance cannot be got by one reading. Then, too, seminary students have other studies besides the Hebrew and Greek.

We do not mean, even remotely, to underestimate the importance of a knowledge of the contents of the Bible as a part of ministerial education. On the contrary, in our humble judgment, its importance cannot be overestimated; but we insist that this is not the object aimed at in this clause of our standards. It says nothing about a knowledge of the contents of the Bible, but speaks

solely of a "*knowledge of the original language of the Holy Scriptures.*"

3. *Is its object, then, to turn out yearly a lot of accomplished scholars from her seminaries?* The Presbyterian Church, in her standards, and in the *in thesi* utterances of her courts, lays much stress upon scholarship. Her theories on this point, in fact, are admirable, and as most of us are familiar with her practice also, it will be unnecessary to stop for the comparison. In the light of her theories, then, we are prepared to admit that one of the ends aimed at ultimately in this provision, and others, is accomplished scholarship. Accomplished scholarship, however, is a slow growth. It requires time, and a good deal of it, to secure so magnificent a result. A three years' course in a seminary, embracing the labors of all the professors, is all too short a time to transform "callow collegians" into accomplished scholars. Occasionally, a student comes to the seminary who "knows it all" at his entrance. But his professors regard it as "a work of necessity and mercy" to keep him from leaving the institution in such a frame of mind.

If these, then, are not, and, from the nature of the case, cannot be the ends sought to be accomplished, by requiring of candidates a knowledge of the original tongues of the Bible, what is that end?

We answer, first, *that it is, at least, possible that the study of Hebrew and Greek is prescribed as a means of mental discipline.* The Presbyterian Church, as intimated above, has always laid stress upon an educated ministry, and we hope that she always may. Now, education properly understood, is such a disciplining of the mental faculties as develops them, brings them into full and free play, and gives their possessor control of them. We must confess that we do not belong to the number of those who seem to think that these results are only attainable through the study of Hebrew and Greek. But we do heartily and firmly believe that for one who is to be a minister there is no means of mental discipline that is better, nor any single means that is quite so good as a study of the Scriptures in the original languages. We shall not indulge in comparisons, but ask a single question. It is this: What faculty of the mind is not

called into play in the study of Hebrew and Greek? Take, for instance, the perceptive faculty, at least so far as it operates through the sense of sight. What finer discipline could it have than is furnished by Dāgesh-lene and Dāgesh-forte, silent and medial S<sup>e</sup> wâ, the movement of the tone under the influence of Wāw Consecutive, the distinction between  $\bar{\tau}$  (=ā) and  $\bar{\tau}$  (=ō) and a dozen other constantly recurring features of Hebrew etymology? A student must learn to “see straight” and to see quickly before he can so much as pronounce the Hebrew words. This again demands close attention and entire concentration of the mind upon the matter in hand—an attention and concentration which, if even momentarily relaxed, will precipitate him into blunders. The conservative faculty, or memory, with its next of kin, the reproductive and representative faculties, are no mean endowments. A tenacious, truthful memory is an inestimable boon. The ability to draw upon its stores at will, and with confidence, makes its treasures practically available. And right royal is the power that enables one to re-present the material furnished by memory in its original form, or having reārranged and wrought it over to re-present it in new forms. All see that memory comes into constant play, and so of the reproductive faculty. But some will be incredulous of the assertion that the imagination, using the word in its noblest sense, has any scope in the study of Greek and Hebrew etymology and syntax. But such is the fact. No student can understand why the optative has dropped almost into “innocuous desuetude” in the New Testament, or the force of Wāw Consecutive with the Perfect in the Old Testament, without calling to his assistance what has been happily termed the “Historical Imagination.” To appreciate these, or a dozen other constructions, he must, by a vigorous effort, represent to himself the historical circumstances and mental habitudes which gave them birth. And what is true in the sphere of etymology and syntax is true in a far higher degree in the study of words. Greek and Hebrew words are not mere curious combinations of strange characters, to be heartlessly “committed to memory,” as we say. No wonder that the memory declines to be burdened with such lumber. But Greek and Hebrew words are not such dead things

as this. They are living things; they have a history, a genealogy. If we want to know them, we will have to go back and see when they were born, who their parents were, and in what society they grew up. Some of them wear badges of distinction, and are very exclusive as to their society. Some bear the brand of Cain. Some of them are learned, and even speak several languages. They are versed in history, poetry, ethics, philosophy, folk-lore, and much else that is curious and valuable. Some of them are vigorous, lusty, hearty fellows, and others are weak and decrepit. Some make us laugh, others make us cry. Some make our souls glow with honest pride, and others make us blush. Still others make us knit our brows and think. They know their rights, and their mysterious, majestic, magic power, and they utterly decline to put themselves and their treasures at the disposal of every brainless tramp who, perforce, makes a fool's journey through the republic of letters. In a word, the man who cannot, or will not, be at the pains to live, at least in imagination, where they were born and bred, and to follow them through their vicissitudes, will never see their faces, but simply their quaint habitations. He may know them as *φωναί*, or as *ρήματα*, possibly as mischievous and misleading *μῦθοι*, but never in their true character as *λόγοι*. Without the aid of the historical imagination, he may study Greek and Hebrew until he is gray-headed, and he will be simply learning his letters.

What is true of the languages as a discipline for the faculties already mentioned, is true of them as a discipline for the elaborative and regulative faculties, for the faculty of relations and the reason or common sense. We cannot enter fully into the argument here. Possibly a question will answer as well, or better than a syllogism. Well, then, if language—any language—all language, was, in the first instance, bestowed by the Creator as a special endowment upon man, as alone of all the creatures gifted with “discourse of reason,” and so capable of using it; if it is the instrument by which reason effects her conquests, the storehouse in which she preserves her treasures; if it be, so to speak, the very body in which the invisible reason incarnates itself, then, how can language be studied without calling into play the highest faculties of the mind?

How can the subtle essence enshrined in Greek and Hebrew words be "translated" so that it shall not see death without calling into play reason's noblest powers? Impossible.

We are prepared, then, to concede that the study of the Bible in the originals may have been prescribed as a most appropriate means of mental discipline for those seeking the sacred ministry. But this could hardly have been the chief, much less the only, end of this requirement.

Second, *It is at least possible that another object may have been literary culture*, that is, tillage in the field of letters with an aim to securing an abundant harvest of goodly words. A preacher ought to be a thinker; but he must be a speaker. Hence he needs words. He, as few others, can appreciate the sentiment of the wise man, "A word in season, how good it is." Now, when we consider the great number of topics, familiar and unfamiliar, trite and novel, doctrinal and practical, some of them delicate and difficult, many of them invested with awful solemnity, which a minister must handle; when we consider the variety of circumstances under which he may be called upon to express himself, and the variety of tastes he has to meet, we perceive at once that, if he is to have a word in season to meet all these exigencies, he must be, or become, a master of words. Mark the terms—a master of words. He must have at his command a copious vocabulary from which to select, he must have a nice appreciation of the force of each word and its fitness for a given service, that his selection may be with discrimination; and he must have his words well in hand that his selection may be prompt. If the preacher be a man whose ideas are few, he needs words—that he may secure for his intellectual progeny at least the same sort of attention that the rich father of a plain and not very brilliant daughter seeks to secure for her by a tasteful and varied wardrobe. If he be a man of vigorous thought, he still needs words. For a noble thought ill expressed in mean language, like a sweet and handsome woman in a dowdy misfit dress, forfeits in a measure the regal power which of right belongs to it, and may even become an object of ridicule to the less discerning. If there is—and who can doubt that there is?—"a fatal force and imposture in words," then the preacher should be a master of



words that he may be able to expose the fallacy underlying many a glittering sophism.

Now, in what other way can this mastery over words be so readily secured by our candidates for the ministry as by a study of the Bible in the originals? Does some one say, by a study of the English Version, which is still "a well of English pure and undefiled"? We are not an enemy to the introduction of the study of the English Bible in the seminary. We believe that it has rights there that ought to be recognized. We do not share the fear that, if admitted, it will prove an ugly rival to the study of the Bible in the originals, and finally supplant it altogether. On the contrary, we hope that, if it be properly taught, taught by one competent to teach it, that is, by one who knows and loves the original languages of Scripture, it will prove a stimulus to the more thorough study of Hebrew and Greek. But it ought to be distinctly understood, both by those who urge the introduction of the English Bible into our seminaries, and the students who may hope to find in it a sop for conscience and a pillow for indolence, that it never can take the place of a study of the originals, either as a mental discipline or a means of literary culture. We speak now only to the last of these matters, namely, that of literary culture. What is the English Bible? It is a translation of the Scriptures from the Hebrew and Greek into the English. Translation implies a careful survey and comparison of all the English words by which a given Hebrew or Greek word in a given context might be represented. It implies more, namely, a discriminating selection of the word which, in the judgment of the translators, is the nearest equivalent of the word in the original. But it implies more, namely, the *rejection* of all the words that have been before the mind of the translator except *one*. The student of the English Bible gets this *one*, and *loses all the rest*. Is that all? No. For he loses that part of the force of this one that is only discernible by comparing it with all the rest. Is that all? No. For he loses all the literary culture that comes from the mental habit and act of comparison. A translation is a result. But translation is a process, and here is a case where the process may be of nearly, if not equally, as much importance as the result. The use of

words, like that of tools, is best acquired *by using them*. I master somebody else's translation, and I get a great benefit. But the man who made it has the benefit of the result, plus the benefit of the process, and is just so much better off than I. But is this all? No. For the one who has merely the translation, loses that element in the original word which was untranslatable. Is this all? No. For the original word itself represents an act of comparison and judgment which led to its selection from a group of words that came under the mind's eye of the original writer. And so it goes. Even from this brief statement—and we have merely touched the possibilities of the argument—it appears at once that to talk of putting the student of the English Bible and the student of the originals upon the same footing as to opportunities for literary culture is simply preposterous. Passing from the relative, we might notice the intrinsic merits of a study of Hebrew and Greek as a means of literary culture, but our limits forbid. Enough, however, has been said at least to justify the statement, that a possible end aimed at by the requirement before us may have been *literary culture*. But surely even this was not the only, or the chief end.

Third, *We can conceive, again, that its object may have been to start our ministers upon their career with at least a modicum of competent Biblical scholarship, and to lay the foundation and furnish the means and incentive for future accomplished Biblical scholarship*. Certainly such scholarship is needed in the church. Never was it more needed than it is to-day. It is demanded by the nature of the questions that are thrust upon us. It is demanded by fairness to those whose ecclesiastical life may be involved in the decision of these questions. It is demanded by the honor of those who, under the solemnities of an oath, may sit in judgment upon their brethren in connection with these questions. It is demanded in the interest of Christ's church and truth, for if the decisions of our church courts are to carry with them any weight, the public must recognize the fact that those composing these courts are fully qualified to pass upon these questions. It would be well if we could all see clearly that many of these questions cannot be decided upon any abstract, *à priori* principles, for the simple reason

that they are naked questions of fact; and even when they run into the sphere of theory, they still ground themselves upon mere questions of fact. The question as to how many rings Saturn has cannot be decided on abstract principles—it is a question of fact. Moreover, these are questions which cannot be decided by majority votes; for facts are not dependent for their existence upon majorities, and they stubbornly decline to bow to the will of majorities, no matter how formidable or how venerable. The call for Biblical scholarship is the more imperative, because the facts in question in many cases lie embedded in Greek and Hebrew words and constructions. They are facts the knowledge of which implies, and the appreciation of which demands, linguistic scholarship. Now, let no one suppose that we have digressed, or intend to digress from the matter immediately in hand. We have called attention thus at length to the situation that actually confronts our sister church, and may, in the near future, confront us, with a view to emphasizing the need of *Biblical* scholarship among our ministers, and also with a view to confirming our position as to the object of the provision requiring of candidates a knowledge of the original languages of Scripture. Certainly there is nothing strained in the interpretation that regards it as framed with reference, at least in part, to just such situations as the present.

But we desire the careful attention of the reader to the manner in which we have attempted to guard our statement here, as to the quality, and especially as to the *quantity*, of the scholarship contemplated.

It is idle to expect our seminaries to turn out men equal in Biblical scholarship to those who are graduated at German Universities. Take Princeton, or Auburn, even, with their superior equipment, and how different are the conditions which obtain between them and the Biblical department of a German University. Our seminaries have no Lyceum work behind them. Our students are not specialists, giving their whole time to Hebrew *or* Greek. And, more than this, many of them are but youths, with their intellectual gristle hardly at all developed. And even our professors are at a disadvantage, because where we have three men teaching Hebrew and Greek and their cognates, and in addition instructing

in exegesis, and introduction general and special, the German University has a specialist at work in each of these departments.

The expectation that the professors in these departments should cover, or the students compass the whole field of Biblical inquiry, is utterly unreasonable. Many of the questions generally regarded as falling under the department of Biblical literature might with greater propriety be referred to that of apologetics. To expect a professor of Old Testament Literature to equip his students on leaving the seminary to shine in the Pentateuchal controversy, or that which wages about the books of Isaiah and Zechariah, to say nothing of a dozen others, is to expect impossibilities, as every one knows whose judgment on such matters is worth stating. The very most that can be done in these fields is to give the student some general view of them, and of the principles that ought to guide him when he enters upon an examination of them. If the day ever comes, as we hope it may, when there shall be a demand for post graduate courses in this department, then there will be the opportunity for more thorough investigation of these, in some aspects, important questions.

What has been said in regard to Pentateuchal analysis, is true, also, in a large measure, of Special Introduction. This is a subject of prime importance, a subject upon which every minister should seek to be informed, for it bears directly and immediately upon his understanding of the books of the Bible as to their specific contents, to say nothing of their interconnection. But there are many questions in Special Introduction which cannot be even glanced at in a seminary course. To go over these questions in a hasty, superficial manner, in the way of mere dogmatic statement, is either to disturb a student's mind with unnecessary doubts, or hopelessly to vitiate his mental habits, and give him a most undesirable sense of "carnal security," which is liable to be rudely dispelled at any time. And, on the other hand, to go into these thoroughly is simply impossible, for lack of time. Any one who fancies that they can be satisfactorily discussed in a brief compass is abundantly refuted by the mere *mass* of the literature which they have evoked. And, what is even more embarrassing, these questions, if intelligently studied, like those before mentioned, re-

quire a knowledge of the original languages, which our students do not possess until they draw near the hour for graduation. And if the professor persists in entering into these fields, what will become of the "knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek" required by the standards? The end is likely to be that the students "will know nothing," neither Hebrew and Greek, nor the problems of higher criticism "as they ought to know it."

Not to dwell too long upon this point, the most that students ought to expect, or Presbyteries to demand, is a thorough grounding in the fundamentals; and by the fundamentals we mean etymology, syntax, vocabulary, synonyms, peculiarities of style and diction in a given author, and the like. Certain it is that the man who knows these things has complied with the requirement of the book in the letter, for, at least in a measure, he has a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. And the man who is at fault in these matters not only knows no Hebrew and Greek, but is unprepared to grapple with the matters for the proper understanding of which such knowledge is essential.

Some may imagine that three years is too much time to devote to the acquisition of the fundamentals as thus outlined. We occasionally see astonishing statements of what can be done, in Hebrew, for instance, in a year by the use of certain methods. Now, after some experience, personal as well as professional, and after some observation, we are constrained to regard such statements as, to borrow the language of a certain school of writers, "highly idealized and sublimated." Harper's method in Hebrew and Greek is in our judgment the very best. And after having used it ourselves, and having seen the master teacher who originated it use it, we feel safe in saying that the average seminary student is doing well who, during his first term, gets a working knowledge of Hebrew etymology and a vocabulary of from four hundred to five hundred words. His next term is well spent if he perfects, in some measure, his knowledge of the etymology, gets something of a knowledge of syntax, and runs his vocabulary up to one thousand or twelve hundred words. During his third term he will find his hands full, if he gets a firm grip upon his syntax, synonyms and some peculiarities of style and diction. Of course, some ac-

count must be taken in estimating the justice of this statement of the exegetical work proper which, during the last two years is carried on *pari passu* with the study of the language. The case is but little different when we come to the Greek. Let the explanation be what it may, the fact is that nine out of ten of our students come to the seminary with a wholly inadequate knowledge of the fundamentals of Greek etymology, the merest smattering of Greek syntax, and almost no vocabulary. Those who are best grounded in these rudiments will probably feel least surprise at this statement; for their own experience will have taught them that a thorough acquaintance even with these first principles can only be had at the cost of much time and much mental sweat. The student who, on leaving the seminary, will, in translating his Greek Testament, instinctively distinguish between the Imperfect and Aorist, the Aorist and Perfect, the Aorist Imperative and the Present or Perfect Imperative; the student who instinctively feels the difference between  $\acute{o}\nu$  and  $\mu\eta$ , between  $\acute{o}\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  . . .  $\acute{o}\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  and  $\acute{o}\nu\theta\epsilon$  . . .  $\acute{o}\nu\theta\epsilon$ , between  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , and many other constructions that cannot be even alluded to here, has not been wasting his time—so far as acquiring a knowledge of the Greek is concerned. And “he that lacketh these things is blind, seeing only what is near.” The man who has even this modicum has, *quoad hoc*, more scholarship than the authors of our noble Version of 1611, and their attainments in Greek were by no means despicable.

But over against the limitation of which we have been speaking, we desire to place another. If a modicum of scholarship (we speak in this paper always, and only, of Biblical scholarship, and even of that in a somewhat restricted sense) is the most that can be reasonably demanded, *competent* scholarship is the least. Our meaning will, in a measure, be made plain by one or two negative statements. It is no evidence of competent scholarship that a student should be able to read, to the edification of his Presbytery, the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, or the first few verses of the first chapter of John’s gospel. Such an examination may furnish the material for a very feeble joke, but it furnishes no evidence whatever of the scholarship of the Presbytery, and no test whatever of that of the candidate. Its only, its natural, its neces-

sary, its rightful effect is to lead intelligent elders to discredit the necessity of the study of the Hebrew and Greek, and to clamour for a *thorough* study of the Bible, in some form, even if it be in English. So long as this standard of scholarship exists in the Presbyteries, it will be next to impossible to inspire seminary students with a sense of the vast importance of the study of the original languages of Scripture. The Presbyteries, which, by their representatives in the General Assemblies, magnify the importance of these languages, ought to have a care lest, by their examinations, they bring them into utter disrepute, not to say contempt, for here, also, "actions speak louder than words." Competent scholarship, as now used, is a somewhat relative term. The student, to have competent scholarship, must know, and be prepared to appreciate, the ordinary linguistic questions which are raised by the scholarship of his own day. If that scholarship is much occupied with grammatical questions, he should know what these questions are, and how they are to be handled. If it deals with matters of diction and style, he should be posted as to the fact, and have some familiarity with the subjects. We would suggest as a brief test of competent scholarship in the New Testament, that a student should be able to read intelligently, appreciatively, and discriminatingly Ellicott's superb *critical* Commentaries upon the Pauline Epistles. A similar test for the Old Testament would be the ability to read in the same way the Commentaries of Delitzsch, on Isaiah and the Psalms.

But important as is competent scholarship, it is not, in our humble judgment, the only, or the chief end aimed at in the requirements we are considering. Mental discipline, literary culture, and competent scholarship, neither singly nor combined, furnish this end. They are, in fact, themselves but means to the attainment of the higher end that is contemplated. *The chief end of this requirement is, unless we are greatly mistaken, that our candidates may be prepared to expound the Scriptures in and from the originals.*

The reader will please notice the last five words. They are often wholly ignored, and almost always relegated to the background when this subject is up for discussion. This department is so habitually styled the Chair of Exegesis, or of Old and New

Testament Literature, that one important end for which it was instituted is generally overlooked.

Exegesis is a comprehensive term. According to Dr. Briggs, it includes grammatical interpretation, logical and rhetorical interpretation, historical interpretation, comparative interpretation, doctrinal interpretation, and, last but not least, practical interpretation. Now, if our position is correct, the main object of this specific provision of our constitution is to secure proficiency in *grammatical interpretation*, using the word grammatical in its wide sense. In saying this, we do not design unduly to exalt it, or to imply that the other branches of interpretation are relatively of less importance. The reverse of the last position is, in our judgment, true. For, as the end is of more importance than the means, so, to pass by others, logical, doctrinal, and practical interpretation are of more intrinsic value than mere grammatical interpretation, in itself considered. That, however, is not the question. It may be that the ultimate general end of the provision is to secure ability in logical, doctrinal, and practical interpretation. Our contention, however, is that its immediate, specific end is to render our candidates proficient in *grammatical* interpretation, still using the word grammatical in its large sense.

We argue this, first, from the express language of the Book. It explicitly distinguishes between the examination of the candidate "as to his knowledge of . . . the original languages of Holy Scripture"<sup>1</sup> and the "exegesis, or critical exercise, in which the candidate shall give a specimen of his taste and judgment in sacred criticism, presenting an explication of the *original* text, stating *its* connection, illustrating *its* force and beauties, removing *its* difficulties, and solving any important questions which *it* may present."<sup>2</sup> The italics in the clause last cited are ours. They are introduced to show that even in that part of trial which many would regard, and possibly properly, as embracing much more than grammatical exegesis—even in that, *grammatical* exegesis, as distinguished from logical, doctrinal, and practical, is thrown prominently to the front. To begin with, the paper is styled a "*critical* exercise." It is expected to deal throughout with the "*origi-*

<sup>1</sup> Form of Government, Chap. VI., Sec. VI., Par. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



nal text." Its aim is to exhibit the student's acquaintance with the connective particles—those joints of discourse—of the *original*, the verbal beauties of the *original*, the lexical, etymological, syntactical, rhetorical, and other difficulties of the *original*. Now, if all this is not designed to give *grammatical* interpretation a place, if not *the* place, of chief importance, language is very misleading. But whatever may be true of this latter requirement, there is no room to doubt the intent of the former. It deals exclusively with the Hebrew and Greek. It deals with them, as for its purpose, in the same category with Latin. Whatever may be its ulterior object, the only fair conclusion is that its immediate, specific object is to ground candidates in *grammatical* interpretation.

We argue the same again from what the Confession says of the Scriptures in the originals. Its words are: "The Old Testament *in Hebrew* . . . and the New Testament *in Greek* . . . being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; *so as in all controversies of religion the church is finally to appeal unto THEM.*"<sup>1</sup> But how is such an appeal to be made? We answer, primarily and necessarily by grammatical interpretation. Logical, historical and comparative interpretation may come in after it has opened the door. But it, and it alone, has the key to the situation. It can open and none can shut, or shut and none can open. Now, if this be the position occupied by the originals, and this the relation which grammatical interpretation sustains to an intelligent appeal to them, then, surely, the church which holds these views may be expected to emphasize the matter of grammatical interpretation in the training of her candidates.

We crave pardon for arguing this point at length. But it constitutes the very heart of the subject we are trying, and shall try, to present for the consideration of our brethren. It is a point to which we wish not a cold assent, but which we desire to see become a powerful and operative conviction. It is a point upon which we want to secure the hearty coöperation of every candidate and every Presbytery. It is a point the importance of which it is hard to exaggerate. It is a point the magnitude of which is

---

<sup>1</sup> Confession of Faith, Chap. I., Sec. VIII.

emphasized by the discussions now agitating the theological world. And yet it is a position against which many students recalcitrate most vigorously and bitterly, and in reference to which, in some cases, this recalcitrancy, if not actually encouraged, is certainly not discountenanced by those who ought to be wiser.

The reason for this state of things, at least so far as students are concerned, is not far to find. It lies largely at least in such considerations as these: the impetuosity of youth is eager for results, and impatient of processes, especially if tedious and prolonged. But grammatical interpretation demands just such processes, and only yields her results to those who comply with her demands. Again, the results of logical, doctrinal and practical interpretation are more immediately and obviously valuable and available than those of grammatical interpretation. The true value of the results furnished by the latter only appear gradually. Then, too, logical, doctrinal and practical interpretation, while they furnish the professor the best opportunity for self-display, do not necessarily demand of the student much more than mental receptivity. This exactly suits the *vis inertiae*, which is so powerful in most men. On the contrary, grammatical interpretation is apt to lead students to underrate the ability and originality of the professor, and cause them to look upon him as a kind of blind mole nosing around among mouldy roots. Not only so, but it *necessitates* on their part a vigorous use of their own faculties. For the results of grammatical interpretation cannot be acquired by any otiose absorption. Other considerations might be adduced. But those given sufficiently illuminate the reason for the distaste which so many students feel for this kind of work.

Now in view of this state of things, and especially in view of the fact that some who sit "in the council of the elders" are inclined to sympathize with the students in this matter, it may not be amiss further to emphasize the importance of grammatical interpretation in the seminary work.

We remark, then, *First*, That unless one acquires the ability for this kind of work, and the habit of approaching the originals from this standpoint at the seminary, he is not likely to acquire it after he leaves.

*Second*, Without grammatical interpretation there is, and can be no scholarship; there is, and can be no secure ground for an appeal to the originals. "If the borrower is servant to the lender," then the man who merely borrows for an occasion some one else's translation, or exegesis of a passage, must of necessity take a position of dependence and inferiority.

*Third*, Grammatical interpretation, and that alone, can furnish the material and open the way for logical, doctrinal, and practical interpretation. Logic has no power to force her, nor any subtleties to illude her. She says to that proud science, "Thus far mayest thou go and no further." Rhetoric has no wings to escape her, nor any garlands with which to bribe her. Her magic touch reveals the glory of the promises, and enables the threatenings of Scripture to utter their awful voice. No declaration of doctrine or duty has any validity except as it bears the stamp of her approval. Grammatical interpretation may be, and is, servant of every other branch of interpretation, but by this very fact she makes good her title to be greatest of all.

*Fourth*, It may be very easy to assume an air of great superiority, and affect a certain arrogant compassion for those who waste their energies upon "grammatical minutiae." The initiated, however, know that this is, sometimes at least, the impotent effort of ignorance to conceal itself. The Greek article "is a little member," but "it boasteth great things." If any one questions this let him notice how often the interpretation of a passage is made or marred by the influence allowed the article. So  $\epsilon\iota\zeta$  is one of the least of the particles. But our Baptist brethren have found, sometimes to their sorrow, that  $\epsilon\iota\zeta$  is a slippery and treacherous something in the theory, to say nothing of the practice, of immersion, for it sometimes refuses to let them get to the water, and sometimes makes it difficult for them, when once in, to get out. Not only so, but this particle, insignificant though it seems, has given theologians pause in their attempts to decide between Calvinism and Arminianism. "Grammatical minutiae," indeed! Well, it ought to calm the feelings under this sneer to remember that several scores of the best scholars of England and America were not ashamed to give their unremitting toil for ten of the

best years of their lives to these matters. But enough upon this head. Having considered the true object of the study of the originals at the seminary, let us next notice briefly—

II. *The true method for accomplishing this object.* If we have succeeded in clearly and correctly defining the object to be attained, it ought not to take long to determine the true means for attaining it. We may safely say at the outstart, at least this much, that the method, whatever it may be, ought to be suited to secure—

1. *Mental discipline* We would include in this term the habit of accurate observation, and the power of mental concentration, as well as the cultivation of the reproductive, representative, elaborative, and regulative faculties.

2. *Literary culture.* This will involve, not only the ready command of a copious vocabulary, but more, a nice perception of the inherent force of words, and their fitness to express certain shades of thought. It will involve, in particular, an appreciation of the force of the particles, not merely as they affect the logical coherence of discourse, but also as they influence the freedom, smoothness and dignity of its movement. Nor should the hidden power that lies in the mere collocation of words be overlooked.

3. *Competent scholarship,* with its accompanying *ability to expound the Scriptures in the originals.* Now, we submit, that any method which is to secure these ends should embrace, or may well embrace, the following features:

1. Constant drill in the reading aloud of the words of the Hebrew and Greek text, together with constant drill in the writing and transliterating of the Hebrew and Greek characters in which these words are printed. This, to some, may savour of “minute micrology, or trifling acribology.” If so, we crave their patience. In our humble judgment, it is a matter of no mean importance. It would be hard to devise a better test of accuracy of observation, and the power of close attention, than this simple exercise furnishes. No student can read his Hebrew Bible with due regard to the vocalization, syllabication, and accent of its several words, without rigid attention. The evidence of habits of mental heedlessness afforded by the manner in which some students attempt to pronounce

a few verses of Hebrew correctly, would be grotesque were it not appalling; we say appalling, for, let heedlessness once become fixed as a habit of the mind, and it is liable to intrude itself into every sermon. But the drill we now propose does more than secure habits of accurate observation and attention. It furnishes one of the most useful means for obtaining a working acquaintance with the originals, and is an indispensable means to their mastery. Could any one ever hope to be a master of English until he could, at least, read the printed characters of the language with unhesitating ease? And have we forgotten how long it took, how much labor it cost, to secure this easy-going familiarity with our mother-tongue? What is true of English here is just as true of Hebrew and Greek. It is more true of them, for they are not dinged in our ears constantly by every one that accosts us, as was the English.

2. It should include a thorough mastery and constant application of the principles of etymology and syntax. The reader will pardon us for asking his attention to the language used. A general acquaintance with etymology is one thing, a thorough mastery of it quite another. And so a mere memorizing of principles of syntax is one thing, and an intelligent appreciation of their force quite another. In both instances, it is the latter that is to be secured. The student must not only recognize a form, but know its history and its cognate forms. He must not only know that *μῦ* is used with participles, but why it is so used. He must not only know the meaning of *ἐξ*, *ὑπό*, *παρά*, *ἀπό* individually, but relatively to each other, and their derived meanings in relation to that which is primary. Nor is it enough even to have a correct theoretical knowledge of these matters. This knowledge must be constantly applied. Thus only can the scholarly instinct be awakened, and developed into a habit. Thus only can the student acquire that facility in the use of the principles which will make them of practical value. Lectures on anatomy, indispensable as they may be in their place, need to be supplemented by practice in the dissecting-room, in order that one may become a skilled surgeon. It is not enough for him to be told what is to be done, and how it is to be done, he must take the knife in his own hand and do it, or try to do it. So it is in the study of language. It

is time lost, so far as the real end to be attained is concerned, for a professor to hurry over passage after passage, chapter after chapter, book after book, making learned grammatical comments as he sweeps splendidly along. Facility in grammatical exegesis cannot be acquired in any such way. The student must be encouraged and required to get a hold upon its principles, and apply them for himself. It is idle to say that this work is presupposed, at least so far as Greek is concerned, in a seminary course. It is enough to say that this, not unlike some other presuppositions, is not well founded. Nine out of ten of our seminary students have not the requisite *information* in regard to these matters, to say nothing of the ability to use their knowledge with discriminating facility. And for one, the writer feels no surprise at this, and no inclination to reflect severely upon the training given in these departments in our colleges. As a rule, college students cannot give the time, and do not possess the mental maturity which is absolutely necessary to the thorough mastery of these topics. It is idle to complain that this work is toilsome, tedious, repulsive to the average mind. We might reply that it need not, and should not be so, but the sufficient answer is, that it is indispensable. It is indispensable, if the study of Hebrew and Greek is to be a source of mental discipline. Not only so, but the mastery of etymology and syntax lays the only foundation for grammatical interpretation, as this lays the foundation for every other species of interpretation. Without a mastery of these, translation is guess-work and competent scholarship an impossibility.

3. No one will be surprised when we add constant translation as another element of the method we are seeking. We trust that the assent will be as ready when we say that there should not only be translation from Hebrew and Greek into English, but *vice versa* from English into Hebrew and Greek. If it were only as a drill for the memory this exercise would be worth all the pains it costs the student. But it is far more. Its relation to the *mastery* of the original languages, and to mental discipline is too obvious to require extended comment. It involves a continual process of comparison and selection. This again involves the repeated canvassing of the material which the student has been accumulating.

Its importance has long since been recognized by those who teach the languages in our colleges and universities, and is being more and more recognized in our seminaries. The main emphasis, however, in the work of translation must of course be laid upon translating the Hebrew and Greek into English. This work, if it is to minister to the ends in view, must not only involve a constant reference to the principles of syntax, but also a painstaking and discriminating study of words. Certainly there can be but little literary culture, little mental discipline, little scholarship, little ability to expound the originals without this careful study of words. It is not enough that the professor delivered learned disquisitions upon these points. The student himself must be taught to go through the processes by which the professor reaches results. The student must be encouraged to resolve words into their original elements—to trace each element back to its primary meaning, and to compare cognates from the same primal root, with a view to ascertaining the different shade of meaning expressed by each. He must be encouraged to study the *usus loquendi* of different writers and periods. This all takes time, much time. Often the results are apparently small. But in no other way can scholarly habits be formed and fixed. In no other way can a scholarly translation be produced. If this is a weariness to the flesh, it is infinitely more wearisome to reproduce a feeble, awkward imitation of the authorized or revised version by a sheer effort of verbal memory and call this translation. Such so-called translations are brutal shams. They crucify the English and originals alike. They insult the intelligence. They deaden conscience, they outrage God's glorious Word. No wonder that students who condescend to this style of work should come to feel a sickening contempt for it. It is a tax upon their patience, a burden upon their conscience, a shame to their manhood for which there is no compensation. But be it observed, that this is the result, not of studying, but of trifling with, merely pretending to study the originals. Important as is this method of translation, valuable as are the results which it yields, it should not be allowed to exclude another. We refer now to the rapid reading of extended consecutive portions of Scripture in the originals. This will give general familiarity with the orig-

inals; it will give a vocabulary; if persisted in, it will familiarize the student with the style of the different writers of Scripture; and, though this does not fall properly within the scope of the present discussion, it will give the general outline of the logical development of the several books of the Bible. If wisely conducted this work will not be a drain upon the student's time. The professor will here supply the words to the student as he reads.

4. Constant drill in the memorizing of consecutive portions of the Hebrew and Greek text. This is not merely nor chiefly to cultivate the verbal memory, or to secure a vocabulary. These important ends will be accomplished, and so good results secured. But what is of equal, if not greater importance, is that this is the best way to make the Hebrew and Greek feel at home in one's mind, and one's mind to feel at home in the Greek and Hebrew. If it is important for the eye, the ear and the tongue, to be upon terms of familiarity with the Greek and Hebrew, it is no less important for the mind to be upon the same footing. It wants to see, with the eye of the body shut, each word standing out before it clothed in its own individuality. Not only so, it needs to have them march in orderly array before it, and to put them through their evolutions until it has them well at command. Thus, and thus only, can it best learn their "several" and their "joint powers."

5. We may add finally, that there should be constant exercise in logical analysis to evidence and develop the student's knowledge of the force of the particles. The relation of this to the ends sought is sufficiently obvious. It is hard to overstate the amount of attention the particles demand and deserve. They are numerous and constantly recurring. The same particle will have several distinct shades of meaning. They are to discourse, not only what joints and sinews are to the body, but what coloring and tone are to a picture. The proper study of them calls into play the highest powers of the mind—yes, and all the finer sensibilities of the heart. The student who masters them is in a fair way to become himself a master of style. The relation which a knowledge of the particles sustains to scholarship and grammatical interpretation is too obvious to require comment.

Now the writer ventures to think that any method that em-



braces these features will secure the end for which the originals are studied in the seminary, and any method which overlooks any one of them will so far fail in securing that end. The following facts, however, should not be overlooked :

1. This method will demand severe application upon the part of the student. This ought not to surprise any one, nor ought it in the least to discredit the method—*nulla palma sine pulvere*. Those who are unwilling, or for any reason unable to endure hard study, should study their Bible in their mother tongue and adjust the matter as best they can with their Presbyteries and their consciences.

2. The method as outlined above gives the place of chief prominence to grammatical interpretation. It does not by any means exclude attention to other branches of interpretation. On the contrary, it opens the way for them, and constantly calls them into use. It gives all needed opportunity for a rigid drill in the principles of exegesis. But for all this it does centre attention upon grammatical interpretation. Surely this cannot be urged against it as an objection. The man who understands the principles of architecture, who has a knowledge of building materials and access to them, who knows how to temper mortar, to keep a corner square and a wall plumb, can, with the proper assistance, in the way of bricklayers, hod-carriers, etc., erect any kind of structure that may be needed. So the student well grounded in the principles of exegesis, if skilled in grammatical interpretation, may hope, with the aid of lexicons, grammars and commentaries, to build up or to defend, as the case may be, a sound system of theology.

3. But again, this method, while requiring much labor, will take the student over but little ground, except in the way of "Sight Reading." This is sometimes disappointing to students. They are apt at first to regard the results as disproportioned to the effort. Whereas, in a sense, the true measure of the results is the effort. Not only so, but it would be a mistake to judge a miner's progress by taking a horizontal measure of the mouth of the mine. The true measure here is the depth of the shaft, or better still, what comes out of it.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

## VI. CALVINISM; AND CALVINISM AND INFANT SALVATION.

The subject is of interest to all thoughtful men. It touches the whole line of human thought; is an essential factor in the statement and discussion of Christian faith; and both as doctrine and polity exerts controlling influence upon civil and ecclesiastical government. Christian charity and interdenominational courtesy, as well, suggest that it is incumbent upon believers to endeavor to understand the system of doctrine held by any considerable body of fellow Christians, and, in understanding recognize it as the formulated faith of men who love truth and not error.

Under the guidance of the Divine Spirit there is an advance towards a broad and withal a scriptural liberalism, and we believe that true Christian union consists largely, if not altogether, in an honest effort to understand the real tenets of others, and in according to those who hold them, the sincerity one claims for himself.

In the often repeated prayer for Christian union, probably more is included than an ingenuous effort to know one another better, but certain it is in any union that is vital and not formal, such prayer comprehends this spirit as an essential element in its realization. And when, after the fashion, there is an expressed desire for a creed, broad enough for one's own catholic spirit, the Christian man at once commits himself to a candor which will abhor all misrepresentation of the tenets held by others.

The term Calvinism is used to designate, not the opinion of an individual, but a system of religious doctrine, of which the person whose name it bears was an eminent expounder. Calvin did not originate the system known by his name; the system antedates the great reformer by centuries.

Augustine, of the last part of the fourth and the first of the fifth centuries, was an expounder of the general tenets of this system. Calvin in concise and classic language formulated it as Protestant doctrine. The system known as Calvinism, however,

is not most satisfactorily found in the writings of Augustine or Calvin, but in the Confessions of those churches known as the Reformed, and drawn by the several leaders of thought in the sixteenth century, together with the formularies immediately succeeding them.

It refers to Augustine as an interpreter, but does not accept all that was taught by the great man of Hippo, neither does it subscribe to all the tenets, either in their substance or the mode of expression, advanced by the prophet of Geneva.

Popular apprehension of Calvinism embraces much to which, interpreted by the standards, the system is not amenable. Whatever defects may be supposed to attach to a few points of this doctrinal system, the bulk of it is simply what all evangelical Christians believe. Thus it happens that declamations aimed at Calvinism oftentimes antagonize Christianity, as it is held by all believers. Doctrines characterized as the hard doctrines of Calvinism are, upon examination, found only to be the essential doctrines of a common faith. In the age of fierce controversy, as is to be expected, the defenders of the Calvinistic system "swung" between the extreme and moderate method of statement of the divine decrees, and to this day the objections urged by Arminian divines, against these doctrines, are mainly directed against the extreme theory which, however, is not now held, and has never been held, by any large proportion of Calvinistic teachers. Weapons used against it were forged to attack another system. A generous foe should be ashamed to use them. Quotations, many of them garbled, which have done service for generations, are still appealed to. The scholarly polemic of the nineteenth century should be honest enough to admit that they have been shown a hundred times to be irrelevant to the subject under discussion. The majority of that public which regard these doctrines as an "enormity," and understand "Calvinism," "fatalism," and "infant damnation," to be well nigh synonymous terms, have received the impression from caricatures drawn centuries ago.

To such an extent has detraction been carried in some localities that if one holding these tenets does not preach the so-called "horrid" doctrines expected of him, he subjects himself to the

charge of suppressing his convictions. The charge is unworthy, and should be carefully weighed before repetition. It alleges moral cowardice, or studied dishonesty, in those who occupy Calvinistic pulpits. These men are the peers of other ministry, and such charges can but render the general public suspicious of all who preach the gospel. "He does not preach the distinctive doctrines of his system," says one. The rejoinder to this silly assertion suggests itself. How is it possible for any man, worthy the name, to preach at all, unless it be subject to a real or supposed system of truth. No one can be qualified to teach others until the truth held by him has been formulated in his own mind. This having been done, every sermon will present more or less fully that system that has now become a veritable part of himself.

Further: to honest and capable men should be conceded the privilege of interpreting their own standards. There is, and has been for ages, a widely marked distinction between the two great systems of Calvinism and Arminianism, running through all human thought, philosophy and theological teaching. They have faced each other for centuries, and now confront each other as diverse and contrasted systems; but enough has been done, enough borne and suffered, and enough withal has been accomplished by each of them to prove that those who hold them subscribe to them not as error, but as truth. Each, after centuries of controversy recognizes the difficulty of removing to the satisfaction of the other, objections as earnestly and honestly urged as they are denied. The believer in his own system may not consider the objections urged against it as formidable, but of this he is aware, that men just as candid as he, do so consider them, and thus he is taught to concede to his brother the right claimed to himself of interpreting his own faith.

As long as reason is limited and logic imperfect, charity demands that each body of defined faith be conceded the right of self-interpretation.

At this point another preliminary demands attention. There exists in many minds the grossest conception of what is claimed to be, the narrowness or illiberality of Calvinistic creeds and practice. This has long been a fruitful theme for declamation.

We speak for Presbyterians who are Calvinists both in doctrine and polity. They consider that completed Calvinism logically leads to Presbyterian church government.

If, by the charge, it is assumed that we have a formulated system; are a church with dogmas; that we believe something; are generally men of convictions; have faith in our vocation and a heart to work the field that God has given us, then we plead guilty. There is a liberalism, however, that will deny to one the right to his own home and consign him to the state of a mollusk all pulp no vertebræ. If it is assumed that our system and practice are less broad or catholic than those of Arminian churches, facts emphatically disprove the charge.

The most salient point in such discussion is the relation of the church to other churches. This is the nerve-centre of religious controversy. In her teaching concerning other churches we claim for the Presbyterian Church, the broadest liberality. She can well claim apostolic authority for her government; but she has no exclusive ritual or ordination by which she claims to be the only church.

“The church is recognized as the body of Christ, and is not restricted to one form.” “The visible unity of the body of Christ, though obscured, is not destroyed by its division into different denominations of professing Christians, but all of those which maintain the word and sacraments in their fundamental integrity are to be recognized as true branches of the church of Jesus Christ.” Certainly there is no exclusiveness in these words of the Book of Church Order.

Secondly, we reply, Presbyterian liberality is evident from the simplicity and catholicity of the confession by which one is admitted into communion with the church. It is persistently affirmed by some who ought to know better that the penitent believer is subjected to an extended and exhaustive examination upon dogma before admission into fellowship. Upon careful examination into the subject it will be found that we have less distinctive doctrinal and churchly requirement than any other people. The candidate is received upon satisfactory evidence of a penitent turning from sin, faith in Jesus Christ our Lord, and an expressed determina-

tion to serve the Master. In the third place, appeal is made to the interest taken by us in all those schemes and objects which best represent the catholicity of Protestantism. There is in the Protestant churches more substantial unity than is found in the much boasted unity of Romanism. Our church exemplifies this in an eminent degree. Reference to contributions to the American Board of Foreign Missions Bible Societies and Sunday-school Union attests this assertion.

Again, it is assumed by superficial thinkers that the two great systems, Calvinism and Arminianism, dividing as they now do and ever have done the thought of the world and around which rally and segregate all divergent schools of philosophy and theology, must necessarily confront each other, at every point, in relentless and acrimonious warfare.

It is asserted with the rhetoric of enthusiasm, if not of sectarianism, that there is such an irrepressible conflict between them that one or the other must be put to rout, thus assuming that the mission of each is a death grapple with the other. The position is a mischievous fallacy. It predicates what is historically untrue, *i. e.*, that as to fact one has existed, or may exist, under our limited reason, without the presence of the other.

From the very beginning the extremes of faith and opinion fall into line about these great systems. They have ever dwelt near each other, often in fierce conflict it is true, but neither was born in this century nor the last century, nor even many centuries ago; they have traversed the ages, and, if often under fierce contention, they have as well often fought together against the common foe. Each has given to the other, as each has received from the other. To destroy Calvinism would be to obliterate Arminianism. Says a writer: "Surely, whoever is competent to take a calm, an independent and a truly philosophical survey of the Christian system and can calculate, also, the balancings of opinion, the antithesis will grant that if Calvinism, in the modern sense of that term, were quite exploded, a long time could not elapse before Evangelical Arminianism would find itself driven helplessly into the gulf that had yawned to receive its rival, and to this catastrophe must quickly succeed the triumph of dead rationalism, neology and then atheism."—*Isaac Taylor.*

That these systems may labor together is constantly exemplified and is notably seen in the history of the second English Reformation—one hundred and fifty years ago. The majority of the men who gave impulse to this religious movement, which resulted in the ecclesiastic polity of Wesley, were Calvinists. The name "Methodists" was first applied to these men of Oxford. Of the eleven men of might who inaugurated the revival, the starting point of our modern religious history, were Whitefield and Venn, Toplady and Rowland Hill, sturdy Calvinists, the greatest preacher of his time being Whitefield.

Mr. Wesley, in his sermon on Whitefield's death, said: "His (Whitefield's) fundamental point was to give God all the glory of whatever is good in man. In the business of salvation he set Christ as high and man as low as possible. With this point he and his friends at Oxford—the original Methodists, so called—set out."

"Their grand principle, there is no power by nature and no merit in man. They insisted, all grace to speak, think or act, is in and from the power of the Spirit of Christ: and all merit is not in man how high so ever in grace, but merely in the blood of Christ, so he and they taught."—*Ryle*.

This century has witnessed the phenomenal work of the Methodist churches. It has been through the itineracy developed by the executive genius of Mr. Wesley that Evangelical Arminianism has manifested its greatest power. By this system the Gospel was carried to the people scattered through the changing communities of the new world. Whether their success in the next century will be commensurate with that of the last is yet to be seen.

That the energy, self-consecration, and love of souls of the men who have been styled the heroes of the cross have been an inspiration to others is doubtless true. Not to honor these men would be to dishonor Whitefield, Toplady and Hill, of the old, and the Tennents, Findley, Davies, and a host of others in the new world, who rode forth, lance in hand, against sin and darkness; would be to dishonor Calvin himself, their teacher, whose life in large part was a forced itineracy in the face of well-nigh indomitable foes: would dishonor this century, which is preëminently one of missions.

To assume that the gallant men who preached under the system of Wesley procured success only at the expense of Calvinism, is illogical, and detracts as well from their just honor. There is no question of their influence in drawing the church nearer to the people; but if they gave, they also in turn received from contemporary Calvinism.

The confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church, however divergent from them in distinctive points of doctrine, was nevertheless a treasure house of the common doctrines of grace. What these heroes received from it, and to what extent educated by it, although in earnest conflict to some of its teachings, we may judge from expressions of such men as Dr. Curry, one of the ablest of *The Advocate* editors. He affirms the Confession to be "the clearest and most comprehensive system of doctrine ever formed. It is not only a wonderful monument of the intellectual greatness of its framers but also a comprehensive embodiment of nearly all the precious truths of the gospel."

In the same strain the *Methodist Quarterly* declares: "Ever since it" (the Confession) "has exerted a salutary influence in the world, its deep-toned orthodoxy has stood as a bulwark against the onsets of every form of seductive error."

That it should have exerted a salutary influence upon men who had few books in their hands, had little time to study and were not otherwise in contact with any other extended system of doctrine, we may well affirm. How much these heroes of the cross received from the sturdy Calvinists, with whom they were intimately brought in contact, reference to the pages of Bancroft discloses. They met these men everywhere, and doubtless were often their guests. They were from Holland, from France, Ireland and Scotland and England. They were not only imbued with the spirit of the Netherlands and the Huguenot conflict, the Scotch-Irish covenants, and English puritanism, but having borne the brunt of the war of the Revolution, were the controlling factors and exerted a formative influence in all affairs of church and state. To assume that the men in the pulpit were not influenced would be to assume an absurdity. "In every walk of private usefulness and public honor, in every cause of active enterprise and popular progress, in every



development of literature and in every branch of science, in every theatre of honorable ambition, in the pulpit and at the bar, on the field and in the cabinet, on the bench and in the halls of legislation, in the chambers of the highest courts and in the Presidential chair, they and their sons have written their names in imperishable characters upon the brightest pages of our country's history." — *Knott*.

Let no leaf be plucked from the wreath of their fame. These circuit riders heard the command and went forth in self-denying energy and consecration, they were loyal to their commission, but it is not true to history to affirm that they succeeded in their work preëminently by grappling with and overthrowing Calvinism. That Calvinism was then laying the foundations of the government and shaping her polity; in the person of Witherspoon and others, its impress is seen on every page of this early history. It was, besides, represented by Findley, Davies, the Tennents, Ashbel Green, McKemie, David Rice and others, all scholarly men, who met and beat back the tides of French deism and atheism, then rampant in a country just emerging from the throes of revolution. Certain it is these men gave strength to every other ministry of the word.

The proposition that the Calvinism of a century ago, teaching infant damnation, was overthrown by the circuit riders of Methodism, cannot be true. We account for the success of these honored men in a manner more worthy of them.

And now let us show that the proposition is entirely fallacious, as Calvinism, especially that referred to as the Calvinism of Edwards, did not teach infant perdition.

This subject is much wider and more important in its bearing than is suggested to a casual thinker. Its history reaches well-nigh to the apostolic age, and the doctrines involved in its discussion are fundamental. It involves in detail the doctrine of original sin, of baptism, the Holy Spirit's work, and that of the sovereignty of God.

That there have been Calvinists who believed in infant perdition is true, though I have never seen their books nor their sermons, but that there has been such a number of these as to shape the system known as Calvinism is not true; and the assertion that

Presbyterians as a body ever held such a doctrine, is emphatically without foundation. Neither the Presbyterian Church nor its ministry has at any time taught the doctrine of infant damnation. There have been those who held that the salvation of all children dying in infancy is not clearly revealed in the Scriptures, and who, therefore, expressed no positive belief upon the subject. Children of believers, dying in infancy, they believed saved, but beyond this these few would not go. This is the very most that can be said of these men, and their number is small.

Presbyterians affirm that children are all involved in the guilt and misery of sin, and are appropriate subjects of the Divine mercy: that the election of all who die in infancy secures to them the application of the atoning blood and the renewing of the Holy Spirit: that when Jesus shall gather his elect from the four winds, the great and small shall come, and infants will not be left behind.

Says Dr. Girardeau: "There have been very few Calvinists who have taken the ground that any infants dying in infancy are excluded from salvation, so few as to exercise no influence upon the Calvinistic system."

There have been many theories held upon the subject, all of them necessarily evolved from the theological systems of the writers. The history of these is of great interest, and may be divided by a number of salient epochs. The first embraces the views of the early fathers who taught infant baptism, with the gradual development of baptismal regeneration, to the days of Augustine. Secondly, we place Augustine and his cotemporaries down to the ritualism of the dark ages; then the reformation of the sixteenth century, with the teaching of Zwinglius and the Anabaptists, Luther and Calvin; from Calvin to the gradual development of the doctrine of infant salvation upon the logical principles taught by him; more clearly expressed by Zwinglius, and withal latent in the doctrine held by Augustine. The Pelagian, denying the doctrine of original sin, saw children saved without the necessity of a change of character. But the salvation was into an imperfect heaven.

They who believed in the sinfulness of human nature and bap-

tismal regeneration could accept the salvation of only those who were baptized. Others who denied the tenet of baptismal regeneration and yet accepted original sin as taught in the Scriptures, held the salvation of all those who were in under the covenant of grace with believing parents. There were others again who expressed no opinion concerning the salvation of the children of pagans and unbelievers.

Augustine taught a system from which logically the most satisfactory solution of the question would be evolved.

If Calvin did not teach the salvation of all children dying in infancy, the least that can be said of him is that he is an agnostic upon the subject. The precise opinion of Augustine is in doubt, and there are no evidences in the *Institutes* but that Calvin believed all children saved.

The position of Zwinglius is of great interest, involving as it does the true theory of the Reformed Confessions. It is thus summed up by Dr. Warfield :

1. All believers are elect and hence are saved, though we cannot know infallibly who are the true believers except in our own case.

2. All children of believers dying in infancy are elect, and hence are saved, for this rests on God's immutable covenant.

3. Superabundant grace extends to all infants dying in infancy.

4. All who are saved are only saved by the free grace of God's election and through the redemption of Christ.

"The essential principle of Zwinglius' teaching is not only the common possession of all Calvinists but the essential postulate of their system."

It is well to pause and consider the modern views upon the subject.

1. We are still confronted with the Pelagian view: children are born without sin. This we and all evangelical churches reject. It is not in accordance with Scripture; not taught by it; is contrary to our observation; does not meet the question of death and suffering. There are degrees of suffering among children which preclude any theory of compensation.

2. Then we have the admission of the sinfulness of the child

by nature, but the removing of this birth sin, in the death of Christ. This is a plausible position, but it will upon careful consideration be seen that it leads the untutored mind into gross error concerning the nature of sin, or it removes sin and yet retains sin. It is inconsistent in the use of the terms depravity, guilt, etc. It is an unsatisfactory position, though doubtless based upon a partial truth.

3. We have the belief in depravity and baptismal regeneration.

4. We have the tenet of original sin, and no salvation unless through the Word. The Spirit acts only through the Word. But children cannot understand the Word, and there can be no regeneration for them.

5. We have the Calvinistic.

They are not saved through ordinances of the visible church, nor through improvement of grace, common to all men, but only by the working of the Holy Spirit, "who worketh when, where and how he pleaseth." "All who receive life are called of God, without respect to condition of obedience; are saved through faith, the gift of God, and those children whom the Master takes from earth are thus called, and prepared for his kingdom: their sins are pardoned by the blood of Jesus, and they are regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit."

To the Calvinist, there is nothing in their condition of sin and guilt; in the method of God's electing love; nothing in regeneration, just the method of love, that stands in the way of their salvation.

On the other hand, this salvation is emphasized,

1. By the logic of truth, which, from God's elective love, calls from all nations, all classes, all conditions, to salvation.

2. By the Master's call to children.

3. By the sovereign power of the Spirit to regenerate with or without the Word.

4. By the number of those before the throne, great and small.

5. In the qualifying answer of grace, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

It is thus that the Calvinist has the most satisfactory solution of the question of infant salvation.

The article in *Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia* on "infant salvation," has this: "Calvinism, by its doctrine of election, rids itself of the stigma of infant damnation, for surely it is allowable to hope at least that the grace of election extends to all those who die in infancy. It furnishes the only ground on which the salvation of infants can be consistently maintained, for if those who die in infancy are chosen to eternal life, then we have the strongest possible assurance of their final salvation."

On the other hand, it has been said most forcibly: "The most serious peril which the orderly development of the Christian doctrine of the salvation of infants has had to encounter, has arisen from the intrusion into Christian thought of what we may, without lack of charity, call the unchristian conception of man's natural innocence."

Indeed, we may go further and say, that those quotations so often referred to by even evangelical teachers in charging Calvin with the repugnant doctrine of infant perdition, do, in fact, have no such reference, but are strong, polemical statements in defence of the doctrine of sin, as is held by these same brethren. He was forced into this strong language, no stronger than that of Paul, however, in the effort to hold the line of battle for these very teachers, who turn their guns upon him. They unite with Pelagians, Unitarians, Universalists and infidels in their warfare upon him, as he engages in fierce conflict with Pelagian and Socinian against errors concerning the nature of sin and the divinity of Christ. Aye, there sometimes is a ludicrous rivalry among these teachers as to which has done most to destroy the great Calvin!

Assuming that Cock Robin has been slain, many sparrows are claiming the honor of his demise. "Who killed Cock Robin? I, says the sparrow, with my bow and arrow," comes up as a chorus from Methodist, Campbellite, Universalist, Unitarian and infidel.

The texts, which have been repeated for years to prove that Calvin taught infant damnation, are found on pages 169, 170.

"All things being at God's disposal, and the decision of salva-

tion or death belonging to him, he orders all things by his own counsel and decree in such manner that some men are born devoted from the womb to certain death that his name may be glorified by their destruction." This occurs in Chapter xxiii. in refutation of objections against election. It has no relevancy whatever to the subject under present discussion and throws no light upon it. It is but an expression equivalent to the eternal election of men. It is a severe sentence, and may be construed without reference to the preceding pages, where men are declared to be punished for their sins, as teaching the highest supralapsarian theory of the doctrine of election, an interpretation not held by the Presbyterian Church. But it has no relation to the question in discussion.

The other passage reads: "Inquire again how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy (without any remedy in view), should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God." Again and again attention has been called to the qualifying clause of this passage. Dr. Rice, in his debate with Mr. Campbell, exposes the misapplication of the passage most clearly. He contends that in consequence of the fall of Adam, all his posterity, infants and adults, are in a state of condemnation and are exposed to the wrath of God, and that, had no remedy been provided, all must have perished . . . All nations, adults as well as infants, do actually perish forever, for he speaks not of infants only, but of both infants and adults—of the whole race.

Calvin writes (p. 521.): "Now, though I grant that all the descendants of Adam, being carnal, bring their condemnation into the world with them, yet I deny that this is any impediment to the communication of a remedy, as soon as ever God is pleased to impart it." He adduces the declaration of Christ, that "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," and concludes that infants, who are incapable of believing, remain in their condemnation." I answer that in this passage Christ is not speaking of the general guilt, in which all the descendants of Adam are involved, but only threatening the despisers of the gospel, who proudly and obstinately reject the grace which is

offered to them, and this has nothing to do with infants. I likewise oppose a contrary argument. All those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God, and, as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death." (520.)

"Moreover, they sentence all infants to eternal death, by denying them baptism, which, according to their own confession, is necessary to salvation. Let them see, now, how well they agree with the language of Christ, which adjudges the kingdom of heaven to little children." (516.)

"For, being born sinners, we need pardon and remission even from our birth. Now, as the Lord does not exclude infants from the hope of mercy, but rather assures them of it, why shall we refuse them the sign, which is so far inferior to the thing signified." (513.)

The Calvinistic creed on this subject reasons with the old epitaph on the grave stone over the three dead children :

"Say, are they lost or saved ?  
 If death's by sin, they sinned, for they lie here ;  
 If heaven's by works, in heaven they can't appear.  
 O Reason, how depraved !  
 Revere the sacred page, the knot's untied.  
 They died, for Adam sinned ; they live, for Jesus died."

But, as the subject is one greatly misunderstood, let us be at pains to give the opinion of representative men who express the Calvinistic doctrine relative to it.

The first we name is Dr. Girardeau, of the Southern Presbyterian Church. "There have been very few Calvinists who have taken the ground that any infants dying in infancy are excluded from salvation ; *so few as to exercise no influence upon the Calvinistic system.* No class affirms the certain or probable reprobation of any infants dying in infancy. The question, therefore, of the justice of their reprobation is groundless, since neither the certainty nor the probability of their reprobation is asserted by any class of Calvinists." (271.) It is not denied that there are Calvinists who held the doctrine of infant damnation, as there have been Arminians who so believed, but these are not so important either in

numbers or influence to formulate a system; it comprises not a few in number.

Dr. Stuart Robinson declares: "Hence the silly slanders to the effect that Calvinists have written and preached of 'infants in hell a span long.' "A preaching which none of the reporters have ever themselves read or heard; but only have in most cases from some one who heard some one else say, that he remembered to have heard his father or some old man say that his grandfather had heard it reported of some iron-sided Calvinist that he so wrote or preached. And yet all this in the face of the notorious fact that the men who have written most of the words of consolation for parents bereaved of their little children are those whom the creeds of the reformation have taught to expound the gospel." (Sermons.)

We next quote Dr. Hodge: "All who die in infancy are saved. The Scriptures no where exclude any class of infants, baptized or unbaptized, born in Christian or in heathen lands, of believing or unbelieving parents, from the benefits of the redemption of Christ."

Dr. Robert Breckinridge says: "I have said in a previous chapter that I know of no scriptural warrant, when the sum of revealed truth is taken together, upon which the damnation of infants can be asserted; and I have given some reasons for my belief that the assertion is not only gratuitous but untrue." (*Subj. Theol.*, 154.)

It is alleged that "*now*" the Calvinist is ashamed of the tenet and has been driven from it. How long that qualifying "*now*" extends no man can find out. Fletcher, of Madely, one of the English Reformers, used this expression in 1772: "Calvinists are '*now*' ashamed of consigning infants to the torments of hell." That was said one hundred and twenty years ago. But Turretin one hundred years before Fletcher said: "Christian charity bids us hope that they are saved." "They please God on account of the satisfaction of Christ imputed to them for the remission of their sins, though they themselves are incapable of apprehending him by faith."

It is a curious study, the determination of that "*now*," when the Calvinists ceased to preach infant damnation. We have seen that it was used one hundred and twenty years ago as it is in 1891.



Says an accomplished orator: "I do not charge that the Calvinists of to-day hold the doctrine of infant damnation."

We have quoted Robinson, Hodge and Breckenridge, who preached twenty years ago.

Go back fifty years, half a century. Nathan Rice said, "No respectable Presbyterian writer can be found either in ancient or modern times, who has taught that any dying in infancy are lost." That was fifty years ago, and Dr. Rice says the "*now*" embraces *ancient* times. "*No* writer in ancient times can be found."

Another (Fairbairn) declares, "It has often been proved, and is well understood by the intelligent part of the community that the Presbyterians do not now, and never did, maintain that doctrine."

In 1827 Lyman Beecher wrote, "I am aware that Calvinists are represented as believing and as teaching the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones. But having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic divines in New England, and in the Middle, and Southern, and Western States, I must say that I have never seen or heard of any book which contains such a sentiment, nor a man, minister or layman who believed or taught it. And I feel authorized to say that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation as any of those who falsely accuse them. And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons who have been accustomed to propagate the slander, that they commit to memory, without delay, the ninth commandment, which is 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'" (P. 530, *North American Review*, 1820.)

So writes Mr. Beecher, three quarters of a century ago, and further testifies that for thirty years he had known the cotemporary ministry, and no such doctrine was taught. It is rather remarkable that the polemic of to-day renders the "*now*" 1891, and the older polemic uses the term a century and a quarter since.

Half a century since, Dr. Adams, the accomplished pastor of New York, wrote, "The large majority of the human species die in infancy. They are simply born and die. They scarcely touch

our earth ere they are removed. This profusion of life is not waste, but economy, for they all live unto God. . . . It is not death but salvation." (*Three Gardens*, 258, 216.)

• Robert Candlish, of Edinburgh, writes, more than a quarter of a century since: "Their salvation is, therefore, sure. Christ has purchased for himself the joy of taking them, while unconscious of guilt or corruption, to be with him in Paradise. In many ways, I apprehend, it may be inferred from Scripture that all dying in infancy are elect, and are therefore saved." (*Atonement*, 185.)

The great Chalmers, fifty years before Candlish, wrote: "For anything we know the mediation of Christ may have affected in a most essential way, the general state of humanity, and by some mode unexplained and inexplicable, may it have bettered the condition of those who die in infancy, or who die in unreached heathenism; and aggravated the condition of none but those who bring upon themselves the curse and severity of a neglected gospel." (*Rom.* 139.)

One hundred and ten years ago Scott, the Commentator, declared: "There may indeed be a comfortable hope, that as infants die in Adam, without their personal transgression, so will they be saved in Christ, without their personal faith in him, as never living to be capable of it; yet that change must be wrought in them by the regenerating Spirit, which would have produced faith had they lived longer." (1780.)

Toplady, a century and a quarter ago, testified: "I testify my firm belief that the souls of all departed infants are with God in glory—that reprobation has nothing to do with them." "Such as die in infancy are undoubtedly saved."

John Owen, the unswerving Calvinistic author, two centuries and a half ago, said: "It follows unavoidably, that infants who die in infancy have the grace of regeneration, and as good a right to baptism as believers themselves."

These opinions from representative men determine the question.

Let it be remembered that Girardeau, Robinson, Rice, Hodge and Breckenridge were all teachers of theology, and formed the opinion of the men in the pulpit. But, in addition, there are the

unqualified statements of Calvinistic scholars, who affirm, in specific terms: "I have never seen or heard of any Calvinistic book which contained such a sentiment."—*Beecher*.

"No respectable writer, we repeat, can be found who teaches that any dying in infancy are actually lost." This is from Dr. Rice. His statement is worthy the closest attention. He, in the controversy with Mr. Campbell, being confronted with the charge that Presbyterians believed this doctrine, challenged the assertion and demanded the proof of its correctness. He appealed to Mr. Campbell several times as one of all men most qualified to substantiate the charge if true, to cite the authorities.

Beyond the irrelevant passages from Turretin and Calvin, the distinguished scholar utterly failed to produce evidence to sustain himself. And surely if such a man as Mr. Campbell, with the resources at his command, could not prove such an averment, it is a forlorn hope to many who now attempt it.

Says Dr. Girardeau: "No class of Calvinists affirm the certain or probable reprobation of any infant dying in infancy."

We have proved:

That the number of Calvinists who believe in infant damnation is limited.

That the severest judgment that may be passed upon the opinion of many others is that they are *agnostic* upon the question, *i. e.*, while they do not affirm that infants are saved, they do not believe them lost.

That the great body of Calvinists have, for centuries, believed infants are saved.

That Calvinism is really the most satisfactory, not to say the only, system to remove difficulties in, and affirm salvation to, those dying in infancy.

That those who have written most to comfort parents losing children are Calvinists.

In other words, that we do not believe in infant perdition, but have the most satisfactory system to remove any doubts in the way of their salvation.

From the Scotch Confession, in 1590, which distinctly announces their salvation, all orthodox creeds of the Reformed

Church assert that "in Adam all die spiritually, and every creature of Adam is guilty and depraved, before the electing love of God hath prepared a restoration of part of the guilty race, and that part are, by the grace of God, renewed, justified and received into the kingdom of God."

They assert the condition of children to be one of sin; but, at the time, assert the election of all who die in infancy. Inasmuch as there are those who suppose "original sin" to be a peculiar doctrine of Calvinism, I quote from the Discipline of the M. E. Church: "Original sin standeth not in the following Adam (as the Pelagians vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and, of his own nature, inclined to evil, and that continually."

Next, attention is called to the Confession of Faith. The clause to which so much attention has been given, "Elect infants dying in infancy," asserts that children dying in infancy are elect and saved by the merit of Christ. How are they called to salvation? The passage occurs in the tenth article that treats of this point. Having declared that the chosen of God are duly called by the Word and Spirit, and quickened by the Spirit, that they may answer the call, the question naturally arose, "But how, then, with those who die before they can apprehend and accept the call of the Word?"

The Confession proceeds to declare that such are regenerated in virtue of the atonement, without the call of the Word, by "the Holy Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth;" therefore, the infants elect are saved just as adults are, by the blood of Jesus, securing their gracious renewal.

If it be insisted, however, that the use of the word elect necessarily implies non-elect, if elect refers to the saved, and non-elect refers to the unsaved; then, inasmuch as the term is used in the M. E. Church Discipline, in the prayer at the baptism of children, our Methodist brethren are not the parties to bring charges of infant "non-elective reprobation" against us. If it is to be construed in the limited sense accorded to it by them, then they and we stand upon the same platform.

The language of the Discipline is: "Grant that this child, now to be baptized, may ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children."

In this discussion we have studiously refrained from counter charges against teachers in other churches. That there has been advance in the study of theology, no one can or cares to doubt. That Calvin sometimes expressed himself in extreme terms it is true. But it is well observed by Dr. Warfield that the erroneous teaching of Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism is responsible in the slow development of the scriptural views upon this subject. It is they who forced, by their bitter antagonism to the doctrine of original sin, much of the vigorous expressions of evangelical writers. It is they who are responsible for the misinterpretation of much that was said and they who have entailed upon Calvinism of the nineteenth century the unpleasant task of the rebuttal of false and slanderous charges. Even to-day, though the generous co-worker for Christ admits that the Calvinistic churches do not now teach infant damnation, the admission is often made by others with a whisper and intonation that imply something, not expressed in words.

It is further true: "Calvinism, as distinguished from Arminianism, encircles or involves great truths, which, whether dimly or clearly discerned, whether defended in scriptural simplicity of language, or deformed by grievous perversions, will never be abandoned while the Bible continues to be devoutly read, and which, if they might indeed be subverted, would drag to the same ruin every doctrine of revealed religion."—*Isaac Taylor*.

W. L. NOURSE.

## VII. NOTES.

---

### SOME ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES AND KINGS.

UNTIL recent times the book of Chronicles has had comparatively little interest for the commentator. Its close similarity in many portions to the older historical books, and its dry statistical form have discouraged separate study, and have led the exegetes to regard it as a kind of supplement to Samuel and Kings. Beyond the treatises of Lavater, Clericus, Rambach and the two Michaelis, there are no important discussions of this part of Scripture to be mentioned before the beginning of the present century. Since that time, however, it has attained a new interest and significance through the rise of the modern school of Old Testament criticism. Chronicles is inextricably bound up with the Pentateuchal question from the fact that it traces the whole law back to Moses, and represents the Levitical cultus as in full operation from the time of David onward. Consequently, it forms the great bulwark of the traditional view of the Pentateuch, and the unity and the antiquity of the law cannot be assailed without first impugning its historical credibility.

Vater's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, published in 1803, in which he attempted to prove its composite character and late origin, was of necessity followed by De Wette's attack on Chronicles in his "*Kritischer Versuch über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik.*" Since that time, the controversy over this book has gone on steadily and has gained continually in importance. Graf's epoch-making work, *The Historical Books of the Old Testament*, which appeared in 1866, turned the history of Israel upside down and put the law at the end of the process of development, instead of at the beginning. This theory, of course, left no room for the statements of Chronicles, and that book was summarily rejected. Wellhausen and the rest of Graf's followers have accepted this conclusion, and pronounce it destitute of historical value, a mere priestly fiction designed to carry back the provisions of Ezra's post-exilic law-book into preëxilic times. The Chronicler re-

gards the whole law as Mosaic, and represents its institutions as observed through the entire period of the kings. If he is right, the Graf theory is wrong; no possible *modus vivendi* between them can be devised; one or the other must go to the wall.

The main object of attack in the Book of Chronicles is, therefore, naturally its representation of the cultus. Samuel and Kings have little or nothing to say about the observance of the law, while Chronicles is full of it. In itself this does not necessarily constitute a contradiction, for the different point of view from which the book is written may determine the different selection of material. Chronicles is composed wholly from the priestly standpoint, while the Book of Samuel is interested in the establishment of the theocratic kingdom, and the Book of Kings in the work of the prophetic order. The mere fact, therefore, that Chronicles presents a different picture of the religious life of the preëxilic community does not in itself warrant us in rejecting it as unhistorical. The critics themselves feel this, and have, therefore, made great efforts to show that in other matters the Chronicler has perverted history, and that consequently his statements in regard to the cultus are not to be trusted. It is with this side of the controversy that we wish to busy ourselves in this article. The question whether the ritual observances of the law can be traced before the exile is far too vast a one to enter upon here. We propose only to investigate those cases in the parallel narratives of Kings and Chronicles, in which the Chronicler is accused of distorting or misunderstanding the civil history. There are a number of passages in which the two narratives apparently contradict one another; is this really the fact? and if so, does the contradiction prove that the author is unable to write history, and cannot be trusted where he makes independent statements in regard to religious usages?

The investigation has not merely a critical interest for determining the credibility of Chronicles, but has also an important bearing on the great questions of the inspiration and the infallibility of Scripture. These very passages that we are to examine are often cited as proof of contradiction within Scripture itself, and therefore if we can show that they are reconcilable, we shall be rendering service to theology as well as to Biblical criticism. For the sake of brevity I have omitted from the discussion all those discrepancies between the two narratives which rest upon textual corruption of one or both of them. Such cases are numerous, particularly in numbers and names. When, however, the true reading is restored the difficulty disappears and therefore these

cases do not affect the real problem. We shall limit ourselves to those remarkable passages in which Chronicles seems flatly to contradict Kings, and in which textual criticism gives no solution of the difficulty. We take up the passages in the order of their occurrence.

1. SOLOMON'S PREPARATIONS FOR THE TEMPLE.—The parallel records in 2 Chronicles ii. and 1 Kings v. show a number of curious divergences, and these have been seized upon by the critics and pronounced to be contradictions. Part are simply supplementary items drawn from the common source of both Chronicles and Kings, and can be regarded as contradictions to Kings only on the false hypothesis that Kings was the only source that the Chronicler used for this part of his history. Part offer difficulties of a more serious nature.

The various discrepancies between the two accounts are summarized by Graf<sup>1</sup>, page 127 ff., and by Wellhausen<sup>2</sup> on page 190. Wellhausen begins with the following charge: "While Hiram and Solomon, according to the older record, are on a footing of equality and make a contract based on reciprocity of service, the Tyrian King is here the vassal of the Israelite and renders to him what he requires as tribute." For this extraordinary allegation no proof is offered, and, as a matter of fact, there is none to give. A careful perusal of the narrative does not yield the slightest hint that the Chronicler regarded Hiram as a vassal who was called upon to pay tribute. The whole tone of Solomon's communication is one of request and not of command; and as for there being no reciprocity of service, what shall we do with the statement in v. 10: "Behold, I will give to thy servants, the hewers that cut timber, twenty thousand measures of beaten wheat, and twenty thousand measures of barley, and twenty thousand baths of wine, and twenty thousand baths of oil." In reality exactly the opposite charge could be made with a good deal more color of probability, namely, that Kings represents Hiram as a vassal, but Chronicles makes him an equal sovereign. According to Kings, Hiram sent messengers to Solomon immediately upon his accession, but Chronicles says nothing about this, and represents Solomon as taking the initiative in the matter. Besides this Kings alludes to no compensation in Solomon's requisition for timber. It does indeed mention later that the king gave Hiram some wheat and some oil, but on Wellhausen's principles we might infer that this had nothing to do with the furnishing of cedars and firs, but was due to Solomon's generosity. Chronicles, on the

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichtliche Bücher des Alten Testaments.*

<sup>2</sup> *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 3 Aufl.



other hand, states distinctly in the message itself that a return would be made for the services of Hiram. There is no foundation, therefore, for the charge that the Chronicler has here attempted to exaggerate the importance of his favorite king by making Hiram a mere subject prince.

A further assertion of the critics is that in vs. 8 the Chronicler has distorted the record by making the algum trees come from Lebanon, while according to 1 Kings v. 6, 10, only cedar and fir wood come from that region. According to Chronicles Solomon says to Hiram: "Send me also cedar trees, fir trees and algum trees out of Lebanon." אֲלֻגְמוֹת or אֲלֻמְנוֹת as Kings has it, probably denotes the genuine sandal wood, and, therefore, in Wellhausen's opinion, the Chronicler has here fallen into a shocking blunder through his ignorance of natural history and has made sandal wood grow in Lebanon. This assertion is easily answered. In 2 Chron. ix. 10 the Chronicler himself states that the servants of Hiram and of Solomon brought algum trees from *Ophir*, and from this it is evident that he knew perfectly well the source of this kind of wood. He connects it in this passage with the cedar and fir wood merely because Hiram was to supply all of them, not because they grew together. The only difficulty arises from the loose grammatical structure by which מֵהַלְבָּנוֹן is placed after all the names instead of after the two that it properly modifies. Analogous cases are not infrequent in which adjectives are placed last that do not belong to all of the substantives that precede them, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that any Hebrew reader would have been misled by this passage. It is incredible that the origin of a wood which Solomon made so abundant in Jerusalem, should have been so completely forgotten that the Chronicler could fall into the blunder that the critics here charge upon him.

The next difficulty that presents itself is in vs. 10, as compared with 1 Kings v. 11. According to the latter, Solomon sends Hiram 20,000 cors of wheat, and twenty measures of pure oil; but according to the former he promises 20,000 cors of wheat, 20,000 cors of barley, 20,000 baths of wine and 20,000 baths of oil. Gramberg,<sup>1</sup> Graf, Wellhausen and even Bertheau<sup>2</sup> pronounce this statement an intentional exaggeration on the part of the Chronicler. This charge is based on the slender argument that "20,000 cors of wheat" occurs in both passages and that, therefore, one must be derived from the other. The simple and perfectly obvious explanation of the matter, to anyone

<sup>1</sup>Die Chronik nach ihrem geschichtlichem Charakter.

<sup>2</sup>Kurzgefasstes Handbuch zu den Büchern der Chronik.

who has not a foregone conclusion in regard to the character of the historian and the sources that he used, is that the two histories are here speaking of different things. Chronicles says explicitly that the articles which it enumerates were for "the hewers that cut timber," while Kings states that the 20,000 cors of wheat and 20 measures of oil were "for food to his household yearly." There is not a trace of contradiction here unless it can be shown that Solomon could not have sent different lots of provisions to Hiram at different times. The assumption that both statements refer to the same event necessitates a perversion of the words of each narrative.

A further discrepancy is found by the critics in vs. 11, where it is said, "Then Hiram, the King of Tyre, answered in writing," while in 1 Kings, v. 8, we read, "Then Hiram sent to Solomon, saying." The latter expression is taken to mean that the message was oral, and thus a contradiction is created with the former. But **הִירָם לְאַמֹּר וַיִּשְׁלַח** cannot be forced into asserting that Hiram's communication was by word of mouth; it is an indefinite expression that might be used equally well for either an oral or a written message. Silence can never safely be construed as an affirmation of the contrary proposition. Because Kings says that Hiram sent a message, but does not state explicitly that it was written, the critics conclude that it was not written; there is however, as the reader will admit, very little logic in this kind of criticism. It does not help the argument any to claim with Gramberg (p. 182) that it is an anachronism to represent Hiram as sending a written communication, for in 2 Samuel xi. 14, it is related of David that he sent a letter to Joab by the hand of Uriah. It is now well known that the art of writing was very ancient among the Semitic peoples, and far from being unnatural, it is antecedently probable that such official messages would be in writing.

Again, it is claimed that 2 Chronicles, ii. 12, contains a contradiction to 1 Kings, v. 7, in representing Hiram as a worshipper of Jehovah. As Wellhausen remarks, "He not only openly avows his faith in Jehovah, the God of Israel, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, but also betrays an extraordinary acquaintance with the Pentateuchal priestly code."

There are two errors in this charge: The first is the old one of regarding silence as equivalent to denial. Because Kings does not say so much about Hiram's conception of Jehovah as Chronicles does, it is inferred that he must have had low religious ideas. The second error lies in putting more meaning into Chronicles than the words will ad-

mit. They do not necessarily imply that Hiram had become a proselyte, although there would be nothing impossible, even in that idea, considering the close friendship between David and Hiram. They indicate only that he identified Jehovah with the Supreme Divinity of his own religion, or perhaps no more than that he courteously adopted the Hebrews' way of speaking of their God. The inference from the expression "Creator of Heaven and Earth," that the Chronicler makes Hiram display an extraordinary acquaintance with the priestly code, is entirely unwarranted, for, as Rawlinson<sup>1</sup> shows, this phrase was very ancient, and was widely used among the Eastern peoples as a title of the Supreme God. It is of frequent occurrence in the Persian cuneiform inscriptions.

The next alleged discrepancy has more semblance of reality than any that we have noticed thus far. 2 Chron. ii. 14, says that Hiram, the artisan, "was the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan, and his father was a man of Tyre;" but, according to 1 Kings vii. 14, "He was the son of a widow woman of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father was a man of Tyre." The two narratives agree in regard to the father; it is only concerning the mother that they diverge. Graf's opinion is that the Chronicler has changed Naphtali into Dan in order to assimilate Hiram to the skilful workman of the priestly code, Aholiab, who, according to Ex. xxxi. 6, belonged to that tribe. Such an alteration, however, would be utterly useless, and common sense forbids our explaining the divergence on this theory, if any other simpler solution can be found.

The Jewish exegetes attempted a reconciliation by construing the words **ממטה נפתלי** in 1 Kings vii. 14, with the preceding **הוא**, instead of with **אלמנה**. This makes Hiram himself of the tribe of Naphtali, while his mother was of Dan, and necessitates the supposition that his father was a Naphtalite, and is called a Tyrian only because he resided in Tyre. This interpretation, however, does violence both to the construction and to the natural meaning of **איש-צורי** and is, therefore, untenable.

A more natural solution is found in a closer scrutiny of the passages themselves. Kings says that Hiram's mother was "a widow from the tribe of Naphtali." This the critics interpret to mean a Tyrian woman, who was, by birth, of the tribe of Naphtali; but this is a forced rendering. The expression, "widow from Naphtali," means, most naturally, a woman whose deceased husband was of the tribe of Naphtali, and implies nothing in regard to her own origin. Consequently, there is

<sup>1</sup> Chronicles in Speaker's Commentary.

perfect harmony between the two records, after all. Chronicles tells us that the woman was, by birth, a Danite; Kings adds the information that she had married into Naphtali and lost her husband, and both histories unite in saying that, subsequently she married a Tyrian, to whom she bore Hiram. Wellhausen characterizes this explanation as "an ingenious little family romance, constructed by the expositors;" but he makes no attempt to refute it. To any one who does not close his eyes to the fact that Chronicles had other sources of information than the Book of Kings, it will appear clear and satisfactory.

Another difficulty in the story of Hiram is found in the fact that, while 1 Kings vii. 14 speaks of him simply as a "worker in bronze," 2 Chr. ii. 14 says that he was skilful to work in gold, silver, bronze, iron, stone, timber, and also at weaving. This is another instance of the argument from silence. Kings speaks of Hiram as a worker in bronze, and, therefore, according to Graf and Wellhausen, he could not have known how to work in gold and silver; but Kings itself shows a reason why this particular accomplishment of Hiram alone is mentioned. 1 Kings vii. 14-46 is a detailed account of the ornamental *bronze-work* that Solomon had made, and the fetching of Hiram is simply an introduction to this narrative, so that there is no occasion to speak of his skill in working other kinds of metal than bronze. In itself, there is nothing improbable in Hiram's varied skill. Great talent is apt to show itself in many ways, particularly in those stages of civilization when the arts are not highly specialized. Michael Angelo was equally distinguished as painter, sculptor, and architect, and most of the artists of the Italian Renaissance had fully as many accomplishments at their disposal as Hiram possessed. The various arts with which Chronicles represents him as conversant are all closely related to one another, with the exception of working in purple, blue and fine linen, and it is not at all improbable that a man of taste and genius in the plastic art should turn his skill to textile fabrics also.

Finally, it is claimed that there is a disagreement between 1 Kings v. 13 and 2 Chron. ii. 17, in respect to the laborers employed in the building of the temple; that Kings declares that the levy of men was from Israel, but that the Chronicles regards it as incredible that the holy nation should be forced to do servile labor, and, therefore, changed "Israel" into "All the strangers that were in the land of Israel." This charge rests on a misunderstanding of the statement of Kings. The record in 1 Kings v. 13-15, distinguishes two classes of laborers employed by Solomon, one of thirty thousand, who worked in Lebanon

every third month, the other of seventy thousand burden-bearers and eighty thousand hewers in the mountains, who worked continuously, and evidently were slaves. The difference in numbers and in the kind of service prevents our supposing that the latter class was composed of Israelites, and this view is confirmed by the fact that 1 Kings ix. 20-22 states explicitly that Solomon exacted bond-service of the Canaanitish population, but not of the Israelites. Accordingly, the relation of Kings to Chronicles is simply this—Kings speaks of Solomon's employing both free and bond service, while Chronicles mentions only the latter.

Keeping this fact in mind—that there were two kinds of laborers—there is no difficulty in reconciling also the statements of the two histories in regard to the number of the overseers which 2 Chronicles ii. 18 sets at three thousand six hundred, but 1 Kings v. 15, at three thousand three hundred. In 1 Kings ix. 23 the number of *higher* overseers is given as five hundred and fifty, and this added to three thousand three hundred, makes a total of three thousand eight hundred and fifty; but 2 Chron. viii. 10, gives the number of the higher officers as two hundred and fifty, and this added to three thousand six hundred yields the same total of three thousand eight hundred and fifty. This identity of sums shows that the variation between Chronicles and Kings must arise solely from a difference in the classification of the overseers, and, moreover, 1 Kings v. 15, says explicitly that the number three thousand three hundred is apart from the higher officials. 2 Chron. ii. mentions the Canaanitish labor only, and, therefore, it is probable that three thousand six hundred represents the total number of Canaanitish overseers. The three hundred in excess of the number of Kings arises from the fact that both higher and lower overseers are included. The two hundred and fifty overseers of 2 Chron. viii. 10 are Israelites only, but if we add to this number the three hundred excess of 2 Chron. ii. 18 over 1 Kings v. 29, we obtain five hundred and fifty, which is the number of the higher overseers given in 1 Kings ix. 23. The relation of these numbers may be better exhibited in the following table:

Lower overseers,	. . .	native,	?	foreign,	3,300
Higher “	. . .	“	250;	“	300

The Book of Kings enumerates the overseers according to rank, as higher or lower, while the Chronicles gives all the foreign overseers together, and then the higher Israelitish ones separately. The undesigned coincidence between the two books that is thus disclosed is very striking, and is a strong evidence both of historic credibility and of the use

of independent sources. Our examination of this entire section of Chronicles fails, therefore, to reveal any real contradiction with Kings.

2. THE CITIES OF GALILEE.—Passing over the account of the religious celebrations given in 2 Chronicles v.–vii., which does not fall within the scope of our present discussion, we come to the curious divergence from Kings that is found in 2 Chronicles viii. 1. According to this passage, King Hiram gave Solomon certain cities which Solomon built and peopled with Israelites; but according to 1 Kings ix. 11, “Solomon gave Hiram twenty cities in the land of Galilee.” Here, say the critics, we have an irreconcilable contradiction. The Chronicler could not believe that Solomon would give away cities in the holy land to a heathen, and consequently he has exactly inverted the facts of the case. This is an exceedingly improbable explanation of the difference. If the Chronicler did not like the statement of Kings, the simplest way out of the difficulty would have been to omit it entirely; not to turn it upside down. The former method would accomplish his design without danger, but the latter would inevitably expose him to the charge of perverting the facts, for he could not expect that such a gross distortion of the truth would remain undetected. Any explanation is more natural than this one.

The true solution of the divergence is to be sought in the fragmentary character of the narratives, both of which are made up of short extracts from ancient sources. The old solution, though ridiculed by the critics, is a perfectly reasonable one, that Solomon gave Hiram cities in Galilee, and that Hiram gave in exchange cities in another region. Or we may hold with Keil that Hiram’s displeasure with the cities, related in 1 Kings ix. 13, went so far that he returned them to Solomon, and that thereupon Solomon rebuilt them and filled them with his own people. Either of these interpretations is admissible, and so long as a solution is possible, we have no right to assume a contradiction.

3. THE NAVAL EXPEDITIONS OF SOLOMON AND JEHOSEPHAT—We come now to examine three closely related cases, in which the Chronicler is charged with perversion of the history as recorded in Kings. The first of these is in 2 Chronicles viii. 17, 18, which corresponds to 1 Kings ix. 26. The latter passage states that Solomon built a navy at Ezion-Geber, and that Hiram sent him experienced sailors who went with his men to Ophir, but Chronicles seems to say that Hiram sent not only servants, but ships also to Solomon at Ezion-Geber. On the strength of this, almost all of the critics unite in saying that the Chronicler was so confused in regard to the location of Ezion-Geber, Ophir and Phœnicia.

that he has distorted the older record and made Hiram send a fleet from the Mediterranean to the Euxine Gulf.

A closer examination of the passage shows that the Chronicler can hardly be accused of ignorance of the location of Ezion-Geber, for he says explicitly that it is "on the sea shore in the land of Edom." He was not mistaken either in the direction of Ophir, for Ezion-Geber was the right starting point for that region. We are shut up to the conclusion, therefore, that, if he blundered at all, it was in regard to the place where Hiram lived. To suppose, however, that our author did not know where Tyre was passes all bounds of credibility. Yet the difficulty still remains in regard to Hiram's sending ships to Solomon at Ezion-Geber; and a variety of hypotheses have been devised to account for this statement. One theory is that he sent the fleet around Africa. According to Herodotus iv. 42, Phœnicians sent by Pharaoh Necho circumnavigated Africa, and it is claimed that this route might have been known as early as the time of Solomon. It hardly seems likely, however, even if Hiram knew of this route, that he would resort to such a long and dangerous way to get his ships to Ezion-Geber; and though we may accept the statement of Herodotus as true, yet Necho lived long after Solomon, and it is purely conjectural that anything was known of circumnavigating Africa at this early period.

Another theory is that Hiram had a permanent fleet in the Red Sea which he could send to Solomon; but there is not a shadow of proof for the existence of such a navy, and to say the least, it seems very improbable. A modification of this view is that Hiram sent workmen to the Red Sea and had them build ships for Solomon at Ezion-Geber (so Baer Zöckler). This conjecture is not improbable in itself, but fails to do justice to the words of both Samuel and Kings.

A third theory is that the vessels were carried over the Isthmus of Suez. It is true that instances of such transportation can be found in later history, but not before the time of Alexander, and never for any so great distance. The transportation theory is the one that Keil adopts in his "*Apologetischer Versuch*," but it is hard to believe that any such vast enterprise as this was undertaken by Hiram, who had no political jurisdiction over the Isthmus.

Other critics advocate the view that there was a canal through which the ships might pass. Such a canal is known to have been built by Seti I. and Rameses II., but the prevailing modern opinion is that, long before Solomon's time it had fallen out of repair and was no longer used. Even if one of these theories is accepted the difficulty

with Kings will not be wholly removed, for according to 1 Kings ix. 26, Solomon built his own fleet at Ezion-Geber, while according to their narrative Hiram sent the fleet to him.

I believe that the true solution of the difficulty is to be found in a different quarter from that in which it has hitherto been sought. The phrase in 2 Chr. viii. 18 is וישתח לו הורם. Now while לו would commonly mean "to him" it may also mean "for him." This is a common enough Hebrew usage (cf. לנפש, ריב ל, Is. vi. 8 לנו מי ילך לנו) when construed with שלה "for" is the proper meaning of the preposition. The uniform usage with שלה is the accusative of the person sent, אל of the person to whom, and ל of the person for whom or the thing for which. Compare Jer. xiv. 3, צעיריהם למים, שלהו. "They send their servants for water," not "to the water," for the next clause states that there was no water; Gen. xxxvii. 13, אליהם אליך להרא לך, להם; Num. xxii. 37, שלה לך; 1 Kings xx. 7, שלה אלי לנשיוג; Num. xiii. 2, שלה לך. Consequently וישלה לו must mean "he sent for him" not "unto him." The whole verse will then read: "And Hiram sent for him by the hands of his servants ships and servants that had knowledge of the sea and they came with the servants of Solomon to Ophir." By this rendering we not only avoid the difficulty of making Hiram send ships from Phœnicia to Ezion-Geber, but we also escape the discrepancy with Kings of having him send ships to Solomon at all. This translation harmonizes perfectly with the account of Kings, for it makes Hiram simply man and dispatch the fleet that Solomon had provided. I am not aware that this solution of the difficulty has been suggested before, yet it seems to me to be linguistically sound and to meet the facts of the case.

The second instance of this sort in which the Chronicler is charged with error is in 2 Chron. ix. 21. The parallel passage in 1 Kings x. 22 says; "For the king had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram, once every three years came the navy of Tarshish," etc. Instead of this Chronicles reads: "For the king had ships that went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram." According to the critics the expression, "navy of Tarshish," means no more than "merchantmen," such as might go to Tarshish, but the Chronicler did not understand the term and has substituted for it, "ships going to Tarshish," an alteration which entirely destroys the sense, for the fleet, it is claimed, really went to Ophir.

It is true that the expression "ship of Tarshish" may be used in



this general way, but it does not follow from the change made by the Chronicler that he has misunderstood the term unless it can be shown that this second fleet of Solomon's actually went to Ophir rather than to Tarshish. Kings does not state that it sailed to Ophir, and that this was its destination is an unwarranted assumption. It is unlikely that the authors of both Kings and Chronicles would give a second account of the voyages to Ophir, which they had just described, and the argument from the resemblance of the names of the articles imported to Sanskrit words, is far from conclusive. שְׁנֵהָבִים in הָבִים is said to be the Sanskrit word "ibhas," elephant; but, as Keil forcibly remarks, if the Hebrews derived their first knowledge of elephants from the East, it must have been through Semitic nomad traders, and the word for elephant in Semitic dialects is פִּיל (cf. Arab *fil* and Assyrian with change of the liquid *pīru*.) We can hardly suppose that the Hebrews were ignorant of elephants and of ivory until the time of Solomon. Elephants were well known in Egypt, and it is there we should look for the origin of the Hebrew name if it is not to be found in Semitic. According to Keil there is a Coptic word "eboy," meaning elephant, from which הָבִים is derived by prefixing the article. קופִּים is said to be the same as the Sanskrit "kapi," ape, but, according to Rawlinson "קִיָּה is an Egyptian word, signifying a kind of monkey which was in use as early as the reign of Hatasou, the widow of Thotmes II., *i. e.*, at or before the time of the Exodus." It seems probable, therefore, that both of these words were learned by the Israelites in Egypt and were naturalized in the Hebrew language long before the time of Solomon's expedition to Ophir. The third article of trade, תְּכֵיִם, has been taken to mean peacocks, and has been identified with a Tamil word "*toka*," but this is all pure conjecture. The suggestion of Keil is quite as likely that it means "*aves Numidicæ*" and that the name is derived from Tucca, a place which is known to have furnished these birds in later times.

No proof, therefore, that the voyage was to Ophir can be based on the names of the imports, and on the other hand there are a number of strong arguments to show that the voyage was really to Tarshish. Kings itself states that the fleet to Tarshish was בְּיָם, but יָם alone always denotes the Mediterranean and never the Red Sea. Kings states also that it was "with the fleet of Hiram," but we are nowhere informed that Hiram had a fleet in the Red Sea. He sent sailors to Ophir, it is true, but, as we have just seen, they went in Solomon's ships. The period of the voyage is also different from that of the ex-

pedition to Ophir. From 1 Kings x. 14 and 2 Chronicles ix. 13 we infer that the Ophir fleet must have come every year, while of this fleet it is said (1 Kings x. 22): "Once every three years came the navy of Tarshish."

The decisive fact is that the products brought by this fleet, with the exception of gold, are not the products that are elsewhere given as coming from Ophir. According to 1 Kings ix. 28 and x. 11 the products of Ophir were "gold, sandal wood and precious stones," while the things brought by this traffic were "gold, silver, ivory, apes and תנינים. All of these are products of Spain and of the adjacent African coast. Tartessus, or Tarshish, was famous in antiquity for its silver, just as Ophir was celebrated for its gold. Elephants were abundant in Numidia as late as Roman times. The Atlas Mountains still abound with large apes, as the writer can testify from personal observation. They are also found at present on the Rock of Gibraltar, and it is possible that in early times they were more widely distributed throughout Spain. Besides this, it is established beyond doubt from the discoveries that are continually being made in Northern Africa, particularly in Algeria, that the Phœnicians had trading posts there even before the foundation of Carthage. We conclude, therefore, that the fleet of 1 Kings x. 22, did not go to Ophir as the critics claim, but to Tarshish, *i. e.*, to Spain and adjacent African ports and that, consequently, the Chronicler has not made a mistake in substituting "ships going to Tarshish" for "ships of Tarshish."

We come now to consider the third and most difficult of these narratives of naval expeditions. The parallel passages are 1 Kings, xxii. 49, and 2 Chronicles, xx. 36. The former of these relates that Jehoshaphat made ships of Tarshish, to go to Ophir for gold; but they went not, for the ships were broken at Ezion-Geber. The latter states that Jehoshaphat made ships in Ezion-Geber, to go to Tarshish, but "the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish." Here it is claimed that the chronicler has certainly fallen into the blunder of supposing that "ships of Tarshish" meant "ships going to Tarshish," and accordingly, has misrepresented entirely the destination of the voyage. But if the Chronicler had before him the documents that Kings used, or as the critics claim, the book of Kings itself, he must have noticed the explicit statement, "To go to Ophir," and this would make it impossible for him to mistake the meaning of the expression "ships of Tarshish." Nor can we suppose that he did understand the direction in which Ophir lay, for in 2 Chronicles, viii.

18, and ix. 10, he agrees with Kings in making Solomon's fleet sail from Ezion-Geber to Ophir. Moreover, as we have already shown that the Chronicler did not mistake the meaning of the phrase "ships of Tarshish" in 2 Chronicles, ix. 21, we have no external grounds on which to suppose that he has made a blunder in this case.

For these reasons the hypothesis of error on the part of the Chronicler is out of the question, and we must seek some other explanation of the apparent discrepancy. Dahler<sup>1</sup> maintained that the two narratives were not parallel, but supplementary: that Jehoshaphat attempted first to send a fleet to Ophir, and afterwards one to Tarshish. This view was adopted and defended by Keil in his *Apologetischer Versuch*, and in his Commentary on Kings, the difficulty that the fleet for Tarshish was built at Ezion-Geber being answered by the supposition that Jehoshaphat's navy yards were there, and that the vessels were to be transported over the Isthmus. Subsequently, however, in his "Introduction," and in his Commentary on Chronicles, Keil abandoned this view as untenable, on account of the shortness of Ahaziah's reign, and admitted that the Chronicler had made a mistake. But, as we have already seen, the Chronicler could not mistake the clear and explicit statements of Kings, with which he must have been acquainted, that Jehoshaphat made the ships of Tarshish "to go to Ophir for gold." If he had had before him only the expression "ships of Tarshish," and had written for it "going to Tarshish," we might suspect a mistake; but in addition to this he has deliberately inserted "to go to Tarshish," instead of "to go to Ophir." This cannot be a mere *mistake*; if the Chronicler made this change, he must have done it intentionally and with his eyes open. But no dogmatic reason for such an alteration can be suggested, and accordingly we are shut up to one of two explanations. Either there is a corruption of the text in the passage of Chronicles, or else Tarshish had come to have a wider meaning in the time of the Chronicler than it had formerly. The latter seems to be the true explanation. In the Book of Kings we see already a beginning of the widening of the use of the word, for "ships of Tarshish" may there mean vessels that are going on any long voyage. It is quite likely that, in later times, when all trade with Tarshish had ceased and people had forgotten its location, the phrase "to go to Tarshish" came to be used of any expedition to distant seas, and the name, like the modern Indies, was applied to the most widely separated regions. This hypothesis is not a mere apologetic makeshift,

---

<sup>1</sup>De Librorum Paralipomenon Auctoritate.

but has external confirmation, for, according to Movers, in the usage of the Rabbins, the word Tarshish has so far lost its original meaning as to denote "ocean." This is the last stage of that widening of signification which was going on in the time of the Chronicler, and, accordingly, his alteration of phraseology is to be attributed solely to the desire to adapt his narrative to the linguistic usage of his times, and not to any ignorance on his part as to the meaning of the ancient expression, "ships of Tarshish."

One other difficulty must be noticed before we pass from this passage to the next. It is claimed that, according to Kings, Jehoshaphat refused to let Ahaziah join in the expedition, while, according to Chronicles, he took him into alliance. This objection ignores the plain statement of Kings, that the refusal was made only after one expedition had failed, and this unsuccessful one is the one in which Ahaziah participated, and that is more fully described by Chronicles. The course of events was this: the two kings built a fleet together, a prophet rebuked Jehoshaphat for the alliance, and the fleet was wrecked. Then Ahaziah proposed that they should make a second attempt, but Jehoshaphat, profiting by his experience, refused.

4. SOLOMON'S GIFTS TO THE QUEEN OF SHEBA.—The next apparent discrepancy that we are called upon to consider is in 2 Chron. ix. 12, where it is said, "And Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, besides that which she had brought unto the king;" while in 1 Kings, x. 13, we read, "And king Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty."

De Wette and Gramberg find here an insolvable contradiction; Movers and Bertheau resort to the hypothesis of textual corruption. According to Movers, (p. 213), in the expression of Kings **כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ** **כִּיד** the **נ** and the **ל** were confused on account of their resemblance in the old character; one was dropped out, then **כ** was changed to **ב**, giving as the text **כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ** **כִּיד** which latter form was paraphrased by the Chronicler into **אֵל הַמֶּלֶךְ** **אֵל**. This explanation, though ingenious, is much too elaborate and artificial to obtain our credence, and, besides, it rests on the false assumption that the Chronicler is here using Kings as his source. If we must assume a textual error, then Bertheau's theory is the most satisfactory, that the present reading **הַבִּיאה אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ** **הַבִּיאה** is a corruption of the reading **אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ** **אֶל**. The difficulty with this explanation is that **הַבִּיאה** would hardly be

applicable to Solomon; we should expect, instead, נתן, as we find it in Kings. The divergence can probably be explained without resorting to the hypothesis of textual error. The statement of Kings מלכ אשר נתן לה כיד המלך denotes, "Beside that which he gave her after the royal manner of Solomon;" i. e., beside those gifts which he was accustomed to give, in return for presents to him. On the other hand, the words of Chronicles, הביאה אל המלך אשר מלכ אשר are probably to be understood as meaning, "Beside that which was an equivalent of what she brought to king Solomon." In this case, the two narratives will be in perfect harmony with one another, in representing Solomon as first compensating the queen for her presents, and then giving her, in addition, whatever else she desired. It is objected to this rendering, that no similar construction can be found in the Old Testament, but it is a sufficient answer that there is no other occasion for the use of this construction. In any case, this rendering is more probable than the one which takes הביאה אשר to mean the identical things which the queen of Sheba brought. To return the presents of another sovereign would be no indication of greatness, but would be a gross insult, and it is, therefore, entirely out of the question to suppose that this was the idea which the Chronicler intended to convey.

5. JEHOAM'S BURIAL.—2 Chronicles xxi. 20 is claimed by the critics to contradict 2 Kings viii. 24. According to the former, "Jehoram departed without being desired, and they buried him in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings." According to the latter, "Joram slept with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David." A similar divergence of statement is found in the accounts of the obsequies of Joash, Uzziah and Ahaz as given in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 25; xxvi. 23; xxviii. 27 and 2 Kings xii. 21; xv. 7; xvi. 20, and we may appropriately consider these cases together. Graf tells us (p. 147) that "the Chronicler has not hesitated in these passages to warp the statement of Kings in order to depict the end of the wicked kings as gloomily as possible." Wellhausen remarks (p. 200), "It is wonderful to see how the people, which is always animated with alacrity and zeal for the law, and rewards its pious rulers for their fidelity to the covenant, marks its censure of these wicked kings by withholding from them or impairing the honor of royal burial."

Here, as usual, the critics build very large conclusions on a very small foundation. The whole difficulty between the several statements of Kings and Chronicles is readily solved by observing the account of

Uzziah's burial in 2 Chronicles xxvi. 23, "So Uzziah slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers in the field of burial which belonged to the kings, for they said, 'He is a leper.'" From this we learn that the expression "with his fathers" does not necessarily refer to the sepulchres of the kings, but may be used also of the field in which these sepulchres stood. If the Chronicler felt no difficulty in using this phrase in the very same verse in which he denies Uzziah a place in the royal tombs, we may safely infer that there is no contradiction between the two histories in any of these cases, but that Chronicles merely gives a more detailed account than Kings.

6. AHAZIAH'S DEATH.—The following passages are far more difficult to harmonize than any others in the Books of Chronicles and of Kings.

2 KINGS ix. 27-28.

But when Ahaziah the king of Judah saw this, he fled by the way of the garden house. And Jehu followed after him, and said, Smite him also in the chariot at the going up to Gur, which is by Ibleam. And he fled to Megiddo, and died there. And his servants carried him in a chariot to Jerusalem, and buried him in his sepulchre with his fathers in the city of David.

2 KINGS x. 12-14.

And he arose and departed, and came to Samaria. And as he was at the shearing house in the way, Jehu met with the brethren of Ahaziah king of Judah, and said, Who are ye? And they answered, We are the brethren of Ahaziah; and we go down to salute the children of the king and the children of the queen. And he said, Take them alive. And they took them alive, and slew them at the pit of the shearing house, even two and forty men; neither left he any of them.

2 CHRONICLES xxii. 7-9.

And the destruction of Ahaziah was of God by coming to Joram: for when he was come, he went out with Jehoram against Jehu the son of Nimshi, whom the Lord had anointed to cut off the house of Ahab. And it came to pass, that, when Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, and found the princes of Judah, and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah, that ministered to Ahaziah, he slew them. And he sought Ahaziah: and they caught him, (for he was hid in Samaria,) and brought him to Jehu; and when they had slain him, they buried him: Because, said they, he is the son of Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart. So the house of Ahaziah had no power to keep still the kingdom.

These passages the destructive critics appeal to as proof positive of error on the part of the Chronicler, and many even of the conservative exegetes despair of finding a solution. In regard to the slaying of the princes of Judah, the two narratives are in substantial agreement. It is true that the critics try to create a contradiction by saying that according to Kings, the princes were Ahaziah's own brethren, while, according to Chronicles, they were the sons of his brethren, but this objection

has no force when we consider the wide use of אָהֵב in Hebrew to refer to any male relative. We have no right to infer from Kings that the men were own brothers of Ahaziah, and the only difference in the statement of Chronicles, therefore, is, that it is more explicit. The great difficulty of the passage is the account of Ahaziah's own death, and it is upon this that the hardest attack has been made.

In explanation of it, Movers has fallen back on the hypothesis of textual error, and suggests that the reading of 2 Chronicles xxii. 9, הָיָא לַיהוּדָה וַיָּבֵא אֱלֹהֵי יְהוּא has arisen from הָיָא לַיהוּדָה וַיָּבֵא by a wrong division of the first eight letters and a confusion in the names יְהוּא and יְהוּדָה. This is an ingenious and at first sight a plausible explanation, but it does not go to the bottom of the difficulty between the two passages, for it places Megiddo, where, according to Kings, Ahaziah died, in the territory of Judah, while, in fact, it lay in the territory of Israel.

Keil's attempt to harmonize the two narratives is as follows: Ahaziah fled by the way of the garden house to Samaria and hid himself there. He was then discovered by the pursuers and brought to Jehu. Escaping a second time, he was wounded at the ascent of Gur, and died at Megiddo. This interpretation is thoroughly unlikely, for if Ahaziah was captured at Samaria and brought a prisoner to Jehu at Jezreel, how is it possible that he should next be seen flying in his chariot accompanied by his servants in the direction of Megiddo? Jehu was not the man to let a captive escape after he had once got him in his power. Besides this, there is no room in 2 Kings ix. 27 to insert the hiding in Samaria and the subsequent capture of Ahaziah between the words "and he fled by the way of Beth Haggan," and the consecutive words "and Jehu followed after him;" nor is there any room in 2 Chronicles xxii. 9 for inserting the flight to Megiddo between the words "and they brought him to Jehu," and the next statement "and they slew him."

A new and ingenious theory for the solution of the difficulty has been proposed by Lieut. Conder, of the Palestine Exploration Expedition, in the *Quarterly Statements* for 1877 and 1881, and in the *Memoirs of the Fund*, on the basis of a different identification of Megiddo from the ordinary one. Robinson puts Megiddo at *Khan Lejjân*, but the prevalent recent opinion favors rather *Muketta'*, a few miles distant from this place. Lieut. Conder now proposes to identify it with *Mejedd'a* in the Jordan valley about four miles south of Beth-Shan. *Mejedd'a* is etymologically nearer to Megiddo than *Muketta'*, for the Ara-

bic radical t can hardly have come from ת. The argument from the comparison of Old Testament notices of Megiddo and those in Egyptian records is also forcible, and if it does not establish the exclusive location of Megiddo at *Mejeddu'*, seems at least to prove that there may have been a second Megiddo there. Lieut. Conder speaks as follows: "The town of Jenin is generally supposed to represent the garden house (בֵּית הַגֵּן), but the explanation of the topography on this supposition becomes extremely confused, as it obliges us to trace the flight southward from Jezreel and afterwards back northwards (that is to say, away from Jerusalem) to the supposed site of Megiddo at Khan Lejjân. If, however, we suppose the בֵּית הַגֵּן, or gargarden house, to be the modern Beit Jenn, the flight of Ahaziah was directed northwards, and there exists in a position intermediate between Jezreel and Beit Jenn, a site called Bel'ameh, which may very probably represent Ibleam. In this case the king, by a detour, would have reached Megiddo on his way *towards* Jerusalem along the Jordan valley, and it is worthy of note that all the district thus supposed to have been traversed is suitable for the passage of a wheeled vehicle."

One difficulty with this theory is the statement of Chronicles, וְהוּא מִתְחַבֵּא בְּשִׁמְרוֹן: it is possible, however, as already suggested by some of the older expositors, that Samaria is used by the Chronicler in the post-exilic sense of the district rather than the city. A more serious difficulty, however, it seems to me, lies in the fact that Jehu could scarcely have come from Ramoth Gilead by any other route than that through Beth-Shan, the very one by which this theory supposes Ahaziah to have fled: but it is very improbable that Ahaziah would seek to escape by the same road up which Jehu was coming, and this appears to be an unsurmountable difficulty with the theory. Still, the location of Ramoth Gilead is uncertain, and it is possible that Jehu may have been travelling by some other way, so that this explanation of the passage is not one that can be summarily rejected.

I am inclined to think that the true solution of the difficulty is to be found in a closer adherence to the grammatical structure of both narratives. The participle מִתְחַבֵּא in 2 Chron. xxii. 9, is commonly regarded as referring to a past event, "he was hiding himself," but the Hebrew participle is properly timeless, and may equally well indicate a future or proposed event. So, Gen. vii. 4, אֲנִי מֹמְטֵר עַל הָאָרֶץ, "I am (about) to bring rain upon the earth"; Gen. xvii. 19, שָׂרַי יֵלֶד לְךָ, "Sarai, thy wife, will bear unto thee"; Deut. xii. 10, אֵשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מִנְהִיל אֲתֶכֶם, "Which Jehovah,



your God, is going to give you for an inheritance" Instances of this sort might be indefinitely multiplied, and accordingly we are justified in rendering **וְהָיָה מִתְחַבֵּא**, "And he was going (or purposing) to hide in Samaria." This is a much more natural translation, from the point of view of Chronicles itself, for, according to 2 Chron. xxii. 6, Ahaziah had come to Jezreel, and how, then, could he be said, without any transition statement, to be in hiding at Samaria? It is also in harmony with the statement of Kings, which makes him start out on the way to Samaria. He fled, it is said, by the way of **בֵּית רֵגֶן**, and this, there is little doubt, is to be identified with the modern Jenin, on the direct road to Samaria. From this point another road branches off towards Megiddo, and this was taken by Ahaziah, probably because the way to the south was already intercepted. The expression **וַיִּמְתְּהוּ** in 2 Chronicles xxii. 9, must not be forced into giving the chronological order of events, as if Ahaziah were slain only after he had been brought to Jehu. **וַיִּ** consecutive can never be construed in this rigid way. Here it introduces not a subsequent event, but a recapitulation of the episode, "so they slew him," the killing having already been implied in **וַיִּלְכְּדוּהוּ**. A precisely similar case is 2 Kings xi. 20. "So all the people of the land rejoiced, and the city was quiet, and they slew Athaliah with the sword." Here "and" does not introduce a subsequent event, for the slaying of Athaliah has already been related, but summarizes the whole incident. If the author of Kings had condensed the narrative that precedes this statement, the same obscurity would exist that we find in the verse of Chronicles, that is before us. Keeping the fact in mind that the participle is timeless, and that **וַיִּ** does not necessarily indicate chronological sequence, the two passages, in spite of their seeming difficulty, are brought into perfect harmony.

7. THE EPHRAIMITE AND SYRIAN INVASION—For the sake of brevity we pass over the divergent narratives of 2 Kings xii. 17-18 and 2 Chron. xxiv. 23-24, only referring the reader to Bertheau's commentary on Chronicles where a completely satisfactory solution is given, and take up the narratives of 2 Chron. xxviii. 4-21, and 2 Kings xvi. 4-9, which are confidently alleged by the radical critics to be irreconcilable.

2 CHRONICLES xxviii. 4-8.

He sacrificed also and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree. Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria; and they smote him, and carried away a great multitude of them captives, and brought them to Damascus. And he was also delivered into the

hand of the king of Israel, who smote him with a great slaughter. For Pekah the son of Remaliah slew in Judah a hundred and twenty thousand in one day, which were all valiant men; because they had forsaken the Lord God of their fathers. And Zichri, a mighty man of Ephraim, slew Maaseiah, the king's son, and Azrikam the governor of the house, and Elkanah that was next to the king. And the children of Israel carried away captive of their brethren two hundred thousand, women, sons, and daughters, and took also away much spoil from them, and brought the spoil to Samaria.

2 KINGS xvi. 4-5; 6-9.

And he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree. Then Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to war: and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him.

At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drave the Jews from Elath: and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day. So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son: come up, and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him: for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin.

2 CHRONICLES xxviii. 16-21.

At that time did King Ahaz send unto the kings of Assyria to help him. For again the Edomites had come and smitten Judah, and carried away captives. The Philistines also had invaded the cities of the low country, and of the south of Judah, and had taken Beth-Shemesh, and Ajalon, and Gederoth, and Shocho with the villages thereof, and Timnah with the villages thereof, Gimzo also and the villages thereof: and they dwelt there. For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz King of Israel; for he made Judah naked, and transgressed sore against the Lord. And Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria came unto him, and distressed him, but strengthened him not. For Ahaz took away a portion out of the house of the Lord, and out of the house of the king, and of the princes, and gave it unto the king of Assyria: but he helped him not.

There seem to be three discrepancies here: (1), in regard to the success of the allies; (2), in regard to the invasion of the Edomites and Philistines; and (3), in regard to the conduct of the King of Assyria. A great variety of hypotheses have been invented to remove the first of these apparent contradictions, namely, that according to the statement of Kings the allies could not overcome Ahaz, while according to Chronicles they carried everything before them. The favorite one with the older expositors was that of a double invasion of Syrians and Ephraimites, some commentators putting the events related in Kings first and some those in Chronicles. Movers (p. 143-150) Hävernack (*Enleitung* i. p. 66) and Rawlinson (*Kings* p. 81.)

adopt and defend the form of this theory according to which the kings of Syria and of Israel made each a successful expedition independently and then united in an attack on Jerusalem which was unsuccessful on account of the threatened invasion of Tiglath-pileser which compelled them to withdraw their forces. Rawlinson differs from the other two critics in making the capture of Elath an event, not of the separate expedition of the king of Syria, but an incident that occurred during the siege of Jerusalem by the allies. The great difficulty with this proposed solution is that the hypothesis of two campaigns is a pure harmonistic device that has no exegetical foundation in Kings, Chronicles, or Isaiah. Consequently it is rejected by the great majority of modern critics. Keil's reconciliation of the two narratives is as follows: The two kings came up and defeated Ahaz and captured many prisoners as Chronicles relates; then they attacked Jerusalem, but were unsuccessful as Kings records. On his way home Rezin captured Elath and turned it over to the dominion of the Edomites. This solution is possible, and it removes all contradiction in the two narratives, but it is so artificial that one hesitates to adopt it if a better one can be found.

By far the most satisfactory harmony of the two passages is that of Klostermann in his Commentary on Kings, by making the words in 2 Kings xvi. 5, **וְלֹא וּבְלוּ לְהִלָּחֵם**, "And they were not able to fight," refer not to the allies, as previous commentators have understood them, but to the besieged. The reasons for this view are conclusive. First, **לְהִלָּחֵם** cannot mean "to capture," but only "to fight," as in the preceding phrase **לְהִלָּחֵמָה**, and it would be a contradiction in terms to say that the allies besieged Ahaz and then to add that they were not able to fight. Secondly, if the phrase means that the allies were not able to fight against Jerusalem, what was the need for the distress of Ahaz and his sending to the Assyrians for aid? According to Isaiah vii. 2, when the Syrians and the Ephraimites came up against Jerusalem, "the heart of Ahaz was moved and the heart of his people as the trees of the forest are moved with the wind." Why should the people have been so disturbed at one unsuccessful attack of the two armies? Thirdly, the parallel reading in Isaiah vii. 1, cannot be urged against this translation, for there the singular **יָכַל** cannot refer to the two Kings just mentioned, but, on all sound grammatical principles, must refer back to the previous singular **אִהוּ**, and, consequently, **עָלְיוֹהֵם** must be regarded as a textual error for **עָלְיוֹהֵם**. With this translation of Kings, viz.: that the *besieged* were not able to

fight, all contradiction with Chronicles disappears, for Chronicles then merely relates at length what Kings here sums up in a single sentence. Moreover, on this supposition we find in Kings itself a natural explanation of the sending for help to Assyria.

The second difficulty in this passage is that, where Kings relates an attack of Rezin on Elath, Chronicles reports an invasion of Edomites and Philistines from the South. The critical claim is that this change has been made by the Chronicler in order to increase the number of Ahaz's foes and thus magnify the punishment of his violation of the law. Of course, this objection is not a strong one, for it is quite possible that the two histories are here relating different events on independent authority, but still it is a curious circumstance that so important an event as the Edomite invasion should be entirely omitted by Kings.

The text of 2 Kings xvi. 6 is open to considerable suspicion. בעת ההיא השיב רצין מלך-אדם את-אילת לאדם. It says that the King of Syria "restored Elath to Syria," but Elath had never belonged to Syria. It says also that "the Syrians came and dwelt there unto this day," but Syria fell presently under the Assyrian yoke, and, therefore, this last statement is an impossibility. The Qri' here substitutes אַדוּמִים for אַרְוִמִים, and the emendation is accepted by all the commentators, because אַרְוִמִים could not be written with a ך. Keil thinks that the Syrians after their conquest turned over Elath to the Edomites, but this is a highly improbable idea, and besides it creates a new difficulty with Chronicles; for, according to that narrative, the Edomites were fully able to look after their own interests.

There is no reasonable doubt that throughout this verse we should regard אַרְוִמִים as a corruption of אַדּוּמִים. On account of the *scriptio defectiva* of the older writing these names are uniformly confused throughout the Books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, and it can only be determined from the context, which is the true reading in any given case. If אַדּוּמִים, "Edom," is the true reading here, then רצין must be regarded as a gloss that crept into the text after the mistake of אַרְוִמִים had once been made. The original text read: "The King of Edom restored Elath to Edom and drove the Jews from Elath, and the Edomites came and dwelt there unto this day." This statement is self-consistent and harmonizes perfectly with 2 Chronicles xxviii. 17.

The episode of the Philistine invasion (vs. 18) is not mentioned by

Kings, but is fully confirmed by the prophecy against Philistia in Isaiah xiv. 29, "Rejoice not, O Philistia, all of thee, because the rod that smote thee is broken," etc. This evidently refers to a shaking off of the dominion that Uzziah had imposed on the Philistines, and can be nothing else than the attack which Chronicles here records. Even Graf is constrained to admit that this item is historical.

The third difficulty between the two passages, that, according to Kings, Tiglath-pileser listened to Ahaz's entreaty and smote Damascus, while, according to Chronicles, he did not strengthen him or help him is easily solved. Chronicles does not say that the King of Assyria did not smite the Syrians, but only that the alliance with Assyria was no real gain to Ahaz. It was merely substituting one oppressor for another, and from this time on Judah groaned under the Assyrian yoke as is abundantly testified by Isaiah x. 24-27; xxxiii. 18.

*Berlin.*

LEWIS B. PATON.

### CLOSED QUESTIONS.

THE Swiss have an entertaining legend concerning the origin of their mountains. In the olden time—so the story runs—the land was an irrigated pasture-plain of great fertility and beauty. In those days a race of giants came from the sterile Himalayas, famishing, and begging for supplies and hospitality. These were generously and bountifully accorded by the natives. By and by, the giants grew in wealth and power, and oppressed the inhabitants of the land, despoiled their charming pastures, and blocked up their flowing streams. Then the cry of the herdsmen and their herds ascended to heaven, and the Almighty Power metamorphosed the tyrannical giants into huge mountains, and there they remain to this day as the bulwarks of civil and religious liberty.

This legend illustrates the treatment which Protestantism is receiving at the hands of that famishing principle which it received into its bosom—the principle of free thought, free inquiry and free utterance. With it Rationalism, both within and without the Church, seeks to unsettle the whole Protestant mind, to overturn its venerable institutions, to invade the hallowed sphere of its worship with æsthetic notions, and to turn its own batteries upon itself. The attempt is ungrateful and iniquitous. It is the unlicensed perversion of a sound and useful principle.

Recent events and discussions emphasize the imperative import-

ance of our Protestantism, reminding its adherents that some questions are closed, and removed from the arena of debate; that there are some limitations upon the principle of free thought and speech which it will insist shall be respected. Unless this course is pursued, we shall be like children, "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

1. Protestantism has definitely settled upon the Bible as its rule of faith. To open this question as an original one would be equal to digging down the foundations, and beginning the theological superstructure again from the ground; and ere it could be completed, the same iconoclastic spirit would again make the same demand; and so on indefinitely. The science of mathematics refuses to put its axioms into interminable debate. It would be unreasonable to make such a demand upon it, and if such a demand were made, it would be the quintessence of absurdity did it recognize the demand for one single instant. The mechanician could never do the work of invention and construction, if he were required to discuss endlessly the rules of measurement. These practical illustrations show the suicidal and paralyzing folly of Protestantism holding the "source of authority" an open and unsettled question. Modern "progressives" are bitterly alleging that our Protestant theology is "anchored to a cemetery," in which the ecclesiastical sexton delights to inter all freedom and manliness; but these parties are themselves the greatest "barriers" to true progress in theology and church extension, for there can be no movement forward until there has been a fixation of some starting-point, and as soon as that starting-point has been determined upon, the "progressives" straightway raise the question, What shall be the starting-point? What is the source of theology? There can be no going on unto "perfection" unless there can be a leaving of "first principles." Protestantism, therefore, is bound to say to free thought, pointing its eye to the Bible: "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

All theism rests upon God as the ultimate ground of certitude in religion. But as soon as we ask after the *media* through which this voice of God utters itself to the world—as soon as we inquire for the proximate ground of religious certitude—differences of a serious nature instantly emerge. Rationalism predicates the individual reason as the final source of authority to be implicitly relied upon, and promptly installs the reason above the Bible with the amendatory and expurgato y

rights of an editor over the sacred page—a right which entitles him to reject the whole or any part of the “Testimony of Jesus,” and a right to the final interpretation of so much of the Scriptures as is permitted to remain. Romanism points to the church as the infallible organ of divine truth; but that ecclesiastical authority heads up itself in an infallible Pope, whose organ of utterance is his individual reason, which reduces the system of Popery to the vilest form of rationalism. A late writer appeals to the reason, not to the individual reason, but to the concrete and corporate reason—“the Divine reason done into the historical institution of the church,” “the communal Christian consciousness.” Our controversy, therefore, is with rationalism in its pure, dogmatic, papal, historical, and mystical forms, and their multitudinous combinations. Protestantism, while seeing in the church a divinely appointed witness to the truth, and in the reason, a divinely instituted organ for the reception of the truth, finds the Scriptures to be the truth divinely delivered. This is its synthesis of the relations to the truth of the church, the reason and the Scriptures. The Protestant, therefore, can raise the question, What is the rule of faith? only for the didactic purpose of expounding it, and for the apologetic purpose of defending it. To raise it as a question of fact is, *ipso facto*, to withdraw from Protestantism, which has already determined it in that character.

2. Protestantism has also determined some of the characteristics of its rule of faith, and removed them from the category of open questions. The genuineness, authenticity, verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures are, to the Protestant mind, closed questions. They can be handled only to be expounded and maintained against all gain-sayers. The moment they are opened and their verity challenged, the opener becomes a disturber of settled principles, and, unless he is checked, will draw the church into battle upon a field where it has already fought and won. It would be gratuitous in the church to accept a controversy through which it has already passed in success. Must it jeopardise its principles at the dictation of every rationalist and person of unbalanced faith? Must it review its judgments as often as an “advanced thinker” rises to shout in the tones of palpitating sarcasm, great swelling words about “intellectual cowardice,” which permits the church “in a live century and country” to be tied to old ideas that the world has outgrown? Is our Protestantism under any moral or intellectual obligation to permit a destructive criticism to unsettle the authorship, canonicity and inspiration of the

Scriptures, which doctrines it has with prayerfulness and patient labor formulated to its own satisfaction? If this demand should be acceded to and the destructionists be allowed all freedom to reconstruct, it would be but a question of time when another school of destructionists would arise, and in the name of the same freedom of thought demand the overthrow of the new construction. The demand upon our Protestant theology is that it shall tramp an endless circle under the lash of the world's religious restlessness. The higher criticism is traitorous to Protestantism. Our contention is that Protestant theology has a right to conserve and file away these results of its hard-fought and blood-won controversies.

3. As Protestantism has closed a certain set of questions for its adherents, so denominationalism has closed another set for its members. This latter set of closed questions is exactly equal to the contents of the denominational creed. While it is superlatively true that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only, the all-sufficient, the inspired, the inerrant rule of faith and practice, revealing all that man is to believe concerning God, and the entire duty that God requires of him, it is at the same time true that man must interpret each and every part of those Scriptures to the best of his ability, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and then combine all that the Scriptures teach upon every subject into a scientific whole. "Every student of the Bible must do this, and all make it obvious that they do it by the terms they use in their prayers and religious discourse, whether they admit or deny the propriety of human creeds and confessions. If they refuse the assistance afforded by the statements of doctrine slowly elaborated and defined by the church, they must make out their own creed by their own unaided wisdom. The real question is not, as often pretended, between the word of God and the creed of man, but between the tried and proved faith of the collective body of God's people and the private judgment and the unassisted wisdom of the repudiator of creeds." It would be spiritual presumption, intellectual vanity and wanton folly thus to discard the concurrent wisdom of the learned and pious of all ages, and erect in its stead the judgments of the individual reason. The egotism that would do it deserves popular rebuke instead of applause. Still each individual has the right to exercise this responsible presumption, provided he is outside of denominationalism and outside of Protestantism; for, while he is inside of either, he is inside certain lines which they have drawn, and behind which he voluntarily placed himself.



(1). These creedal statements are closed questions to the adherents of that denomination, because they are the results of its investigations into sacred truth. They mark the attainments already made in religious knowledge by that branch of the church. No man within that denomination has any intellectual or moral right to efface those marks in the name of his personal liberty—to demand of that denomination that it shall wipe out its constitutional principles, which are to it basic, to further progress, and instrumental to the great end of popular instruction. There is no greater mercy for which we are under obligations to thank our heavenly Father than this, that it is not our sad state to be in a plight, where nothing is settled, but where all is in a state of flux. If we cannot be bound by creeds, says some, and at the same time be free from creeds; let us be free. No man has the right to make any such demand for unsettlement. He has the right to withdraw, but not the right to undermine.

(2). Creeds are a covenant of fellowship voluntarily subscribed to, and covenant fidelity closes their contents against all destructive criticism within the fellowship. For purposes of self-protection, for the sake of internal peace and undivided coöperation, each denomination exacts of all its officers a solemn oath that they will in no point contravene that confessional bond of fellowship. The oath is a pledge of faith to one another. In entering into the doctrinal agreement, each member has the right to demand of every one of his associates a pledge of fidelity. Every other organization proceeds in a similar manner. It would be too silly to command the patronage of any, but that of the unwary, if it did not lay such an exaction of faith-keeping with one another. Denominational infidelity is perjury. For one to force into debate the points in the creedal covenant, which he swore at his ordination should always be regarded by him as settled, is the worst sort of faith-breaking. Bishop Seymour, of Illinois, has, in a late pastoral letter, very properly written, "It might reasonably be anticipated that no man, who was thus voluntarily bound by his own oft-repeated pledge and promise, and had in consequence of his reiterated declaration of fidelity obtained a position as a trusted minister of the church, could trifle with, much less deny the faith; and if by chance he was so unfortunate as to cease to believe any or all of the fundamental verities of the gospel as summed up in the creed, it might be expected that he would at once, as soon as he knew his own mind, renounce his orders and leave the ranks of the priesthood, in which he could no longer remain. Self-evident as this seems to be, it is not always the case;

nay, it is frequently otherwise. . . . Heresy seems to cast a blight upon the moral nature, and to deaden and paralyze the conscience. Its victims, though shut out from such a course by their own voluntary and oft-repeated pledge and promise to the contrary, seem to think that they are called to stay in a body whose faith and principles they repudiate, and reform it. They seem to fancy that to them all questions are open, as though they had not entered a system, the very essence of whose stability lies in the fact that within its bounds certain questions are finally and forever closed. When such men are called to account for their perfidy and dishonesty, they respond with the charge of persecution and bigotry, and the world echoes their cry." "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."

(3). The principle of free inquiry, in dealing with creeds, is further limited by the amount of Biblical truth there may be in them. This is obvious.

Out of the "thinking shop of Europe" and America, infidelity is offering an appalling variety of manufactures: sentimental, philosophic, scientific, secularistic, and other forms of unbelief. With these as the fruits of free thought, it is a marvel how men in the church can so vociferously demand that it shall more largely patronize this "shop."

R. A. WEBB.

---

### ON THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT.

As a few Sabbaths ago, I witnessed some score or more of persons, mostly young, standing up in one of our churches confessing publicly their faith, I could not but wonder how many among them would be found five years hence in the ranks of the faithful. All of our church members have, on being received into the church, given evidence of conversion, and yet we are unfortunately by no means justified in using the term church member and Christian synonymously. We are forced to admit the probability that a certain number of those who are received into the church will in time prove unfaithful to their vows, and will fall away from the faith. Now, if we look over the

church membership, we find that by far the greatest number have made their profession of faith while young; it is probable that not five per cent. among them have been received into the church after they have reached the age of thirty. This falling away can to some extent be attributed to a loss of faith in Christ, but it is probably for the most part due to a gradually increasing indifference. The converts either starve to death spiritually, from a lack of communion with God, and daily feeding on his Word, or their spiritual nature becomes atrophied from a lack of spiritual exercise. There is here, of course, a work for the Sabbath-school, but we all know how seriously the attendance on Sabbath-school falls off when the young reach a certain age; and then the work of the Sabbath-school is largely a giving, a feeding, and in many cases implies no healthy digestion of the food supplied. We are often inclined to look on the Germany of to-day as a hot-bed of skepticism. In more than two years spent there, in close intercourse with German students, I failed to meet any trace of skeptical influence; what I did meet, that which is everywhere, that which is sapping, or we might well say has sapped, the life of the educated classes in that country is indifferentism; indifferentism brought about by an utter neglect of spiritual things; indifferentism which is already beginning to make itself felt among us, and which we as Christians must use our every endeavor to combat. Does not every pastor feel that this is the greatest force opposing him in his labors?

The two great antidotes to this indifferentism and waning faith are spiritual food and work. Mr. Moody has said that the surest way to dissipate a man's doubts is to set him at work to save a soul. Some of us can affirm, from our own experience, that this is true. If we, therefore, would have our churches faithful and active, we must devise some method for feeding our young people and giving them spiritual exercise; the more of it the better. A realization of this truth has led again and again to the organization of young people's societies, but most of these, while accomplishing good for a time, have for one reason or another gradually passed away. When just starting in the Christian life, I was a member of a boy's prayer meeting, which for a time flourished, and then ceased to be; I have seen and known of many such, but none of them lived more than a twelvemonth. Now, since there is a class of such societies which has already been in existence more than a decade, and is at the present time growing more rapidly in power, influence and favor than ever before, whose oldest

societies are the strongest, it is wise to study carefully the principles at its foundation, in order to find out wherein its marvellous success lies, and further to see what lessons it may have for us in our labors for and with the young.

The first Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor was founded in 1881; to-day there are over 16,000 societies, in some thirty denominations, with more than a million members. The principles which, I believe, have most largely contributed to its growth, are the *pledge*, the *adaptability* of the society to the conditions existing in any church, and the idea of *fellowship* existing between all young persons working in these societies "for Christ and the church."

I. *The Pledge.* The corner-stone, or we might better say the foundation of all societies of "Christian Endeavor" is the pledge. These words "Christian Endeavor" have come to-day to stand for a certain class of young people's societies; that is, the class which is founded upon the pledge, and I believe that all unprejudiced persons will feel it but just that any society founded on this basis should acknowledge itself in its name as a "Christian Endeavor" society, no matter what other name may be linked with this. Thus to-day we have Epworth Leagues of Christian Endeavor, and I hope we will ere long have Presbyterian Leagues, or Westminster Leagues of Christian Endeavor.

As the Christian Endeavor Societies have increased in number and influence, the pledge recommended by the United Society has been twice modified, in order to emphasize certain points, which were not so clearly expressed in the pledge of the first society; but there is no point in the revised pledge which is not distinctly implied in the first pledge. The essential elements of the pledge are: 1, Daily prayer, and daily Bible reading; 2, Support of the local church, especially by attendance upon all its services; 3, Taking some active part in the weekly Christian Endeavor prayer meeting; 4, Allowing the only hindrance to the performance of these duties to be such "as I can conscientiously give to my Lord and Master Jesus Christ." In addition to these is the promise to do "whatever Christ would have me do," and "to endeavor to lead a Christian life," which are promises we all make on entering upon a Christian life, and the prelude "trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength."

1. *Daily prayer and Bible reading.* In the physical life, food is an absolutely necessary condition, not only of growth, but also of existence; is it otherwise in the Christian life? We all as Christians ought to take our daily spiritual bread, but is it not true that many of us

neglect our Bibles, and is a neglect of prayer as uncommon as we would wish it to be? The habit of Bible reading and prayer is easily acquired, but the habit of neglecting these is no less difficult to form. By emphasizing this point, the young Christian feels that he has made a definite promise, not lightly to be broken. I sometimes think that a similar promise would wisely be required of every one on entering the church, that our church members might more clearly feel the importance of daily intercourse with God and the daily receiving of direction and counsel from his hand; certainly this influence of the pledge in forming these habits is of great value to the young Christian.

2. *Attendance on Church Services.* This idea was first expressed by the United Society, in the pledge, at the Convention of 1890, for the purpose of definitely guarding against a fear that had been felt by some, that the young people might, in time, come to have a greater regard for the society than for the church. Loyalty to the local church had always been one of the chief tenets of the prominent Christian Endeavor workers; the society exists for the local church, but it is wiser to have it clearly expressed in the pledge. By this it is made perfectly clear that if a person cannot, from lack of time, be faithful to both church and society, his first duty is to the church; if he cannot attend both church and Christian Endeavor prayer meetings, he must go to the former. The society is, indeed, an integral part of the church; as much so as the Sabbath-school, or the various other church societies—more truly, indeed, than these, for the active members are, except in some special instances, members of the church. A difficulty is obviated by this phrase of the pledge, which we find existing in every Sabbath-school; here we have a larger or smaller proportion who are not connected with the church, and who do not attend her services, and these are the very ones we try hardest to reach. Loyalty to the Sabbath-school does not imply loyalty to the church; loyalty to the Christian Endeavor society does; and right here, I think, is to be found an explanation of the rapid growth of the Christian Endeavor movement, and the great and enthusiastic attendance on the State and international conventions, so far surpassing that of Sabbath-school conventions. It is the fact that we are loyal to our own individual church, that makes us ready and anxious to meet with Christian workers from other churches and other denominations, and to give and get all good points, that we and others may utilize them.

3. *Taking Part in Meeting.* If it is a law in the natural world, that for existence and growth we must have food, it is also a law that

for healthy growth and development, exercise is no less necessary. Professor Henry Drummond, in his chapters on Parasitism and Semi-Parasitism, has well brought out the fact that far too many of us are spiritual parasites; we attend church and prayer meeting, receive the food the minister has prepared for us, but the number in any church who take any spiritual exercise is far too small; there is a far too prevalent feeling that the pastor is paid to do all that. The result is, that though we may be faithful in our Bible reading and prayer, our spiritual limbs become atrophied, or, to use another simile, we become spiritual dyspeptics from lack of exercise. One of the most necessary forms of spiritual exercise is that of confessing Christ. How hard it is, for the first time, to stand up and say we are "on the Lord's side," or to lift up our voices in public prayer, we all of us know, and yet what spiritual strength that first step gave us; and so it is that we grow by the repeated public acknowledgment that we are Christ's. Every Christian Endeavorer who has been faithful to this part of his pledge, has felt its effect upon his spiritual life. Another great good that results from this public confession is the strength it gives us in temptation; one is far better able to resist when he feels that within a week he has stood up before his fellows and re-affirmed himself a Christian; this is especially true if he is in company with irreligious associates, who he knows are watching to see if he will be true to his professions. Another value in this participation in the prayer meeting is the effect the testimony has upon those present who are not Christians. The influence of testimony is one of the most potent factors in leading others to Christ; it need not degenerate into Salvation Army methods, yet who that has read "In Darkest England" can deny the immense good the Salvation Army has done, and can doubt the presence of the Holy Spirit in its work? Most of our churches are to-day suffering from the lack of those who can help the pastor in the prayer meeting; the prayers offered are, except in rather rare instances, by those well along in years. Are there others being trained to take the place of these when they pass away? I am sure the pastors are not few to whom this thought has come. The Christian Endeavor is training for the church a body of young men for this very purpose; in several churches I know of young men who have gained their experience in the Christian Endeavor prayer meeting, upon whom their pastors are now leaning and relying.

4. *The Revival of Conscience.* In requiring that the excuse for any neglect of the pledge shall be given, not to fellow-members, but to Christ, Christian Endeavor stands for a revival of conscience. We are

too prone to act for the approval of our brothers, and to forget that "Thou God seest me." It is so easy to find excuses for leaving our Bible unopened, for neglecting some of the various church services; but if we realize clearly that the only true ground for the sufficiency of an excuse is that we would be willing to offer it to Christ, many a neglected Christian duty would be performed. It is by no means the least service of the Christian Endeavor that it seeks to train its members to be truly conscientious in these matters.

II. *The Adaptability of the Christian Endeavor Society to the Conditions existing in any Church.* The first society was in a Congregational church, and for several years this denomination preponderated in number of societies. It proved too good to be monopolized, and to-day societies exist in thirty different denominations. Of the sixteen thousand and more societies which have been reported to the United Society, over four thousand are in Presbyterian churches. The Congregationalists come next, with over three thousand five hundred; the Baptists and Methodists have each over two thousand, among the latter many Epworth Leagues of Christian Endeavor, while the Christians (Disciples) have nearly a thousand. These figures show the great flexibility of the society.

The reason for this is the fact that each society is a part of the church to which it belongs; a pledge to certain Christian work is, we might say, all that is common to all the societies. As regards the methods of work, there is the greatest latitude; experience has shown that certain methods have proved most successful, and, therefore, they have been adopted by most of the societies. This is especially true of some phases of the committee work. We could consider the Lookout Committee almost a necessity to the society—a committee whose duty it is to "look out" for the members, and to have a general oversight of the society, to reclaim members who are remiss in keeping the pledge, and to advise as to new members. A Prayer Meeting Committee is necessary to take charge of the prayer meeting, and their duties may stop with merely selecting the leader, but will most wisely go much farther and include a general and prayerful supervision of the meeting.

Most societies, too, will wish to have a social side, and so the Social Committee has its *raison d'être*. Most societies have these three committees and usually several more; Sabbath-school, Missionary, Calling, Flower, Good Literature, Music, and many other committees all suggest duties which many a pastor will wish his young

people to perform. As the society is a part of the church, the pastor and officers of the church will be *ex officio* members, and have actual complete control of the society; they may not wish to exercise their prerogative, but they have, of course, absolute veto power on every action of the society. This enables each society to be kept strictly in denominational lines. We sometimes hear of a society which has strayed away to some extent from the rules and customs of its church, and I have heard some criticism on such societies, and even on the Christian Endeavor movement on this ground, but in every case the fault must rest wholly on the pastor and officers of the church. Far more societies are injured by too little attention from the pastor than by too much. In this respect the Christian Endeavor Society stands on precisely the same basis as the Sabbath-school. It would indeed be strange if a body of young people, however zealous in the Master's work, did not occasionally swerve from the course, if the elders never take a hand at the helm. I have spoken of the pledges which have been proposed by the various committees, but I do not mean it to be understood that it is in any way requisite that the last of these pledges, or indeed any one of them, must be adopted by any society; each society is perfectly free to adopt any pledge which seems to them and the officers of the church the wisest and best fitted for the work of their individual church; the only point being that if it is to be a "Christian Endeavor" Society, it should include the essential features of the movement, of which I have already spoken. There may be reasons in certain churches, and even denominations, why it would, for them, be better to modify the pledge in certain particulars, and this has been repeatedly done; while in many churches of our own denomination the young ladies fulfil their pledge of taking part in the prayer meeting by reading a passage of Scripture, which may be made to more or less express their own individual feelings on the subject; in many other churches this would be deemed inadvisable. I had some little correspondence a few months ago with Dr. Clark, the founder of the first society, and recognized leader of the movement, seeking to learn his views as to whether this would be any barrier to a Christian Endeavor Society. His opinion coincided exactly with that which I had already formed, that a modified pledge could be adopted by the ladies of such societies, they pledging themselves to be present at each meeting and to do such committee work as might be advisable, while the young men would take the ordinary pledge; or again, that a true Christian Endeavor Society might be organized with only male mem-



bers, the young ladies attending the prayer meeting or not, as might be deemed expedient. Indeed, I know of a society of this latter class in another denomination, the ground of the exclusion of ladies being, however, that the young men are afraid to take part in their presence. In general, experience has shown that the pledge proposed by the convention has given the best results.

This leads me to a consideration of the place occupied by the United Society. This is, perhaps, best expressed by an extract from the report of Secretary Baer, at the Minneapolis Convention. "The relation of each local society to the United Society is only the bond of a common name, common methods of work and a common warfare against a common enemy. The United Society exerts no authority over any local society, levies no taxes and asks for no contributions; every society can be affiliated with its own denominational union and conference, and can, at the same time, have the delightful fellowship that is to be found in interdenominational conventions such as this." The United Society is a self-supporting missionary organization for the dissemination of information on the Christian Endeavor Movement. Its board of trustees is made up of eminent men, from all the leading denominations, and no denomination has a predominance. This board sanctions the publication of such literature, on the subject of the Christian Endeavor movement, as seems to them will be the most useful to the cause, and by this means all who desire are enabled to readily gain information with respect to Christian Endeavor. This board is like the society itself, strictly *interdenominational*.

III. *Fellowship*. The third characteristic of the Christian Endeavor movement, which has contributed to its growth, is the *fellowship* existing between the different societies. In doing the Lord's work in what we believe the wisest and best, perhaps we might say, *right* way, we are too liable to forget that those who are working with other methods, of which, perhaps, we may not approve, are nevertheless doing the Lord's work. The points of similarity between Presbyterians and Baptists and Methodists and the other Evangelical denominations, are far greater than their differences. We all believe in Christ as our only Saviour, and we are all laboring to bring lost souls into his kingdom.

A speaker at the Minneapolis convention, referring to the poem "No sects in Heaven," said it was no less true that there are no sects in hell. In time past there has been too much attention given to fighting other denominations, instead of concentrating all the efforts of

Christians everywhere for a simultaneous attack upon the forces of the evil one. Not that denominational lines should disappear, not that any denomination should yield any of its principles, but each should remember that it is but one of the divisions of the great army of Christians, arrayed against a common enemy; not a union of belief, but a union of work. This is what the Christian Endeavor movement is tending to bring about. By emphasis on the principle of *loyalty to his church*, it is making the young Presbyterian a better Presbyterian, the young Methodist a better Methodist, the young Baptist a better Baptist; at the same time it is teaching each of these that he is not alone in the contest with evil; that all over the world there are others, differing from him in many points of belief it may be, yet serving under the same banner of Christ. This was expressed in the watchword of the society year before last, "We are laborers together with Christ;" it is expressed in the watchword of the society last year, again adopted for the present, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." And so the different societies come together occasionally for union meetings and conventions. In this city we have some four meetings of the local Christian Endeavor Union each year; we have also an annual State convention, lasting three days. A similar practice obtains in other States; once a year an international convention is held. These conventions are not delegated bodies, they are open to all Endeavorers; they are not legislative, and they have no power over the members of the societies; they are gatherings for the purpose of receiving and giving good; no one is so weak he cannot help his neighbor, none so strong he needs no help. Addresses by Christian Endeavor workers, on Christian Endeavor and kindred topics, is the chief feature of these conventions, and I think none who have attended them have failed to come away better Christians, and more willing to work in the Master's cause. The recent convention held at Minneapolis was probably the largest religious gathering ever held; over eleven thousand were registered as present, while the total number in attendance must have been nearly, if not quite, fifteen thousand. The great exposition hall, which holds easily twelve thousand, was again and again filled to overflowing. The inspiration of such a gathering as this is felt by every one; no one who has been present can forget it—a body of twelve thousand young Christians taking counsel together how best to work for the Master, and carrying home with them what they have learned, to the greater body of over a million young men and women, pledged together "For Christ and the church." In

the address of Dr. Clark before the last convention, on "Fidelity and Fellowship," after referring to fidelity to the individual church as one of the great underlying principles of the Christian Endeavor movement, the speaker expressed the relation of the society to fellowship in the following words: "Fidelity and fellowship, the two wings which will bear upward and onward the Christian Endeavor cause to final victory.

*"I believe in the Communion of Saints.* This sentence of the Apostles Creed has awakened an echoing sentiment in every church and in every Christian heart. We have an opportunity of showing, not only of saying, but of demonstrating, in a way never before possible, for young Christians in the history of the world, that we believe in the communion of saints. The church has waited long for the glad day when, without yielding conscientious scruples, or sacrificing the principles that her different branches hold dear, she might unite, not only in singing, but in living the hymn:

'Blest be the tie that binds  
Our hearts in Christian love;  
The fellowship of kindred minds  
Is like to that above.'

"Now for a million young hearts in thirty evangelical denominations, in every realm of the globe, the day has come when Christian fellowship is an inspiring reality. Thank God that the prayer of the ages has been answered, in some degree at least, in this great convention of youthful Christians. Thank God that without endangering a doctrine for which our fathers fought, without imperilling a rite or custom that any sensitive heart holds dear, without weakening a tie that binds any soul to his ancestral church home, we can come together in this fellowship, that is as broad and deep and lasting as the love of Christ."

Since the spread of the Christian Endeavor idea, several denominations have taken up the idea of purely denominational societies. The only one of these that has attained any prominence is the Epworth League of the Methodist Church. Had they adopted the pledge principle they would have stood upon the same platform as the Christian Endeavor, save that they would have cut themselves off from the help which the feeling of fellowship with similar workers in other denominations gives. As it is, they are organized on a broader (?) basis than the Christian Endeavor, in this respect, that they take in all the young, and not those alone who are willing to pledge themselves to active

work. By this I believe they cripple the influence of the society as a means of saving souls and growing in grace. That the League does not completely do the work desired by its founders is clearly shown by the fact that, in spite of all the pressure that has been brought to bear, there are to-day nearly two thousand five hundred Methodist Societies of Christian Endeavor, and the Canadian Methodists have come out clearly in favor of welcoming the Christian Endeavor, while in the Northern Methodist Church there seems reason to believe that a similar action is not far distant. Already there is a rapidly-increasing number of Epworth Leagues of Christian Endeavor.

The leaders of the Christian Endeavor movement strongly favor this denominational union of Christian Endeavor Societies, and it seems to me exceedingly wise that the Christian Endeavor Societies of each denomination should be under the immediate control of the governing boards of the denomination. Thus in our own church I believe that the matter should be in the hands of the Presbyteries, and I should be glad to see in every one of our Presbyteries such action taken as would look to the formation of a Christian Endeavor Society in every church in the Presbytery, each group to be known as a Presbyterial League of Christian Endeavor. The Presbytery would then formulate the constitution, leaving the by-laws to the officers and society of each individual church. Each society would report to its own Presbytery, and occasional union meetings of all the societies in each league would be held; at the same time each society would have the feeling of fellowship with the Christian Endeavor Societies of other denominations, and meet with them in convention. Such a movement among us would strengthen every one of our churches, and give us the brightest outlook for the future; it would give us a body of young workers, whose power for Christ and for our church can hardly be estimated.

This paper is the enlargement of an address made at the last meeting of the Louisville Presbytery; there are many other points to which I would like to have referred, especially to the work of Christian Endeavor in saving souls, and in the cause of missions, and to the Junior Christian Endeavor Societies; but the topic is so fruitful that it would need a volume to treat it with any degree of fulness.

I cannot, however, close without a reference to Dr. McKibbin's paper before the Cincinnati Presbytery, reprinted in the April *QUARTERLY*. Certain of the criticisms of the movement are the result of evident unfamiliarity with the subject and are misleading. This is especially

true as regards the evangelical basis of interdenominational fellowship; this "basis" of the union of the societies is one "of common loyalty to Christ, common methods of service for him and Christian affection." That the society is evangelical has been reiterated and reiterated both by conventions and by the United Society. The motto "For Christ and the Church," and the pledge "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise him that I will lead a Christian life," would be sufficient to show its thoroughly evangelical character, even had experience not shown that the central theme in every convention, State and international, the pivot on which all else revolves, is "Christ, the only Saviour of the world."

Again, Dr. McKibbin distinctly implies that the officers of the church have no power over the local society, whereas in point of fact, they have complete and absolute authority, just as far as they may desire to exercise it.<sup>1</sup>

One sentiment in the article in question ought to be kept before us until we see it accomplished: "Suggest such modifications in church methods as shall start our young people at the baptismal font, and never let them get out of the church until they get into heaven." How to accomplish at least a part of this, Christian Endeavor is teaching us.

JAS. LEWIS HOWE.

*Louisville, Ky.*

---

<sup>1</sup> In the last (July 23) number of *The Golden Rule*, I read in the "Question Box": "QUEST. Has the pastor of the church the right to call a business meeting of the society at any time when he sees fit, or is it the privilege of the president only? ANS. The pastor has a right to do anything that he chooses in an Endeavor Society. He is the only ultimate human authority in an Endeavor Society." This shows the attitude of the Editors of the *Organ* of the Society at least.

## VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

---

### Row's CHRISTIAN THEISM.

CHRISTIAN THEISM. A brief and popular survey of the evidence upon which it rests; and the objections urged against it considered and refuted. *By the Rev. C. A. Row, M. A. Oxon., Hon. D. D., etc., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; Bampton Lecturer, etc.* New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1891.

To the Editor of the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY:

DEAR SIR,—I am not surprised to learn from you that the author of *Christian Theism* should have taken exception to the notice of that work contributed by me to your July number. I very deeply regret, however, that there should be solid ground for part of his earnest reclamation. The sentence by which more than by any other Prebendary Row justly feels himself to be aggrieved, is the following: "Dr. Row is apparently a Pelagian, certainly a Restorationist, and possibly a Socinian." To "the second charge" (as the objector calls it), I understand you to say that this influential writer pleads guilty in so many words. What has displeased him is contained in the first and third, and especially in the third, "charge." The ground of his displeasure is twofold: He is annoyed that he should be brought under suspicion at all in reference to the points left in question, and he is annoyed that these "charges" should be merely "insinuated" and not formally made. His maladroit critic was not conscious of "insinuation" in any other sense than is involved in every statement whatever that is not made without qualification, and fondly supposed that he was giving the author the full benefit of an expressed doubt. The distinguished author frankly concedes and avows that he is a Restorationist. This is all that the present critic ever said that he was. This was at any rate the only one of the three propositions for which the present critic claimed certainty. The rest was presented as simply matter of suspicion, and was distinctly stated to be such. The author protests that he is neither a Pelagian nor a Socinian. This is highly satisfactory, and I hasten to withdraw any words of mine which were fitted to convey a different impression. But the words actually used were honest words, and expressed the sincere suspicions entertained at the moment of writing. It is seldom that an author is pleased with anything but commendation: but it is the office of criticism to sift and discriminate, and to separate the cockle from the wheat. In so doing the adventurous critic is liable, as in the present instance, to make mistakes. In every such case the only manly and honorable course is to make the *amende* and retract the injurious error. It appears that in the hurry of nocturnal writing, or from some other cause, two of the titles of Dr. Row's rather numerous books were unfortunately transposed. It was not, however, the intention of the critic in naming any of the author's works to pass any specific judgment on but one of them, viz., *Christian Theism*. The others were referred to almost solely to avoid repeating Dr. Row's name. A moment's additional reflection would

have convinced the critic that a prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral and an honored Bampton lecturer could not even by "possibility" be a disciple of Faustus Socinus. Yet the general tone of some of the discussion in *Christian Theism* left the momentary impression on the mind of one of its critical readers that perchance such views were harbored by its author. The author was at that moment contemplated by his critic as if he had been the author only of *Christian Theism*—indeed almost as if he had been a pure intelligence, which it is now sufficiently evident he is not. What made me suspect Dr. Row of Pelagianism was, that he takes pains to do away with every form of "determinism," as reducing man to the condition of a machine or of a brute; that he holds precisely that theory of the will, which it is the object of Jonathan Edwards in his monumental treatise to demolish; and that his whole theory of "moral evil" seemed to cohere more naturally with the Pelagian than with the Augustinian system.

Had he retained a more distinct recollection of the distinguished author's valuable Bampton lectures on the Christian evidences, the offending critic would probably have been reassured as to one, at least, of the points singled out for unfavorable comment. Had he at that time enjoyed a closer acquaintance with *The Jesus of the Evangelists* (not to mention at least one other excellent treatise), where the stress of the argument is from the resurrection of our Lord, the same aberrant commentator could not have been guilty even by constructive "insinuation" of impeaching the author's soundness as to the divine dignity of the Saviour.

The present writer was, however, thoroughly familiar with the honorable and reverend prebendary's popular and, in the main, useful compend on *Christian Theism*, having gone through and through it from beginning to end with a college class, who were much entertained by it; and having marked it up, annotated it in places, taken extracts from it, and made it the basis of a written examination. Again regretting, and even deploring, his own acknowledged imperfections, the impugned critic would close by applying to himself and commending to others the favorite maxim of Lord Coke, "Blessed be not the complaining tongue, but blessed be the amending hand."

H. C. A.

#### EDERSHEIM'S PROPHECY AND HISTORY.

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884. By Alfred Edersheim, M. A., D. D., Ph. D. Pp. 391. Price \$1.75. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1891.

These lectures first appeared in 1885. The thanks of the public are due to Messrs. Randolph & Co. for the present reprint at figures which will put them in reach of a much wider circle of readers than formerly. While the price of the book is reasonable, the make-up of it is quite creditable to the publishers. The binding is strong and neat, and the print is clear; the paper, however, is at times a little inferior. The intrinsic merit and timeliness of the lectures make them eminently worthy of being kept before the public, and should secure for them a large number of readers. Their timeliness may be inferred from the fact that they deal with such topics as prophecy, Pentateuchal analysis, the theories of the higher criticism, the Pseudepigraphic literature which sprang up between Malachi and Christ, and which is just at present attracting so much attention in the world of scholars. Some may be at a loss to understand how some, at least, of these topics can be

brought within the scope of the lectures as indicated in the title. The following extract from the preface will, we trust, not only remove their difficulties, but serve also to emphasize what we have said about the timeliness of the book:

"It need scarcely be stated that at the present time the questions connected with the Old Testament occupy the foreground of theological discussion. Whether, or not, there is in the Old Testament any prophecy in the true and, as we had regarded it, the scriptural sense; whether there were of old any directly God-sent prophets in Israel with a message for the present, as well as for the future; whether there was any Messianic hope from the beginning, and any conception of a spiritual Messiah; nay, whether the state of religious belief in Israel was as we had hitherto imagined, or quite different; whether, indeed, there were any Mosaic institutions at all, or else the greater part of what we call such, if not the whole, dated from much later times—the central and most important portion of them from after the Exile; whether, in short, our views on all these points have to be completely changed, so that, instead of the Law and the Prophets we should have to speak of the Prophets and the Law; and, instead of Moses and the Prophets, of the Prophets and the Priests; and the larger part of Old Testament literature should be ascribed to Exilian and post-Exilian times, or bears the impress of their falsifications; these are some of the questions which now engage theological thinkers, and which on the negative side are advocated by critics of such learning and skill, as to have secured, not only on the continent, but even among ourselves a large number of zealous adherents.

"In these circumstances it would have seemed nothing short of dereliction of duty on the part of one holding such a lectureship—indeed, inconsistent with its real object—to have passed by such discussions. For, in my view at least, they concern not only critical questions, but the very essence of our faith in 'the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular.' To say that Jesus is the Christ, means that he is the Messiah promised and predicted in the Old Testament; while the views above referred to respecting the history, legislation, institutions, and prophecies of the Old Testament, seem incompatible alike with Messianic prediction in the Christian sense, and even with real belief in the divine authority of the larger portion of our Bible."

We have given this somewhat extended passage not simply to confirm our statement as to the timeliness of the subjects handled in these lectures, and to exhibit the author's view-point and style, but because it is our earnest desire to secure for these important topics the serious attention of as many of our brethren as possible. To prevent mistake we ought to add just here that the book is by no means wholly occupied with the discussion of Pentateuchal analysis, and the theories of the higher criticism. Important as these are, and ably as they are discussed, they are not permitted to divert the author from his real object, which was not negative, but positive. What it was exactly will appear directly.

The merit of the lectures is guaranteed by the author's name. Dr Edersheim was a scholar of great erudition, and a thinker of unquestioned ability. If he was a conservative none could ascribe it to ignorance, self-interest, or timidity. He could have been such only, *because he felt that he had something worthy of being preserved*. Their merit is further evinced by the freshness of the line of argument which Dr. Edersheim marked out for himself. What his object was, and what the argument by which he sought to attain it can best be stated in the author's own words.

"The first lecture is intended to indicate the general ground taken up; tracing the origin of Christianity to the teaching of the Old Testament, and showing that the great Messianic hope, of which Jesus presented the realization, could not have originated in his time, nor close to it, nor yet in the centuries which had elapsed since the return from the exile. Lecture II. carries the argument a step further, by showing that the 'kingdom of God' had been the leading idea throughout the



whole Old Testament. At the same time, the form in which prophecy of old was presented to successive generations, and the relation between prophecy and fulfilment are discussed, while the character of prophetism is defined, and the development of heathenism by the side of Israel, and the ideal destiny of the latter, are traced. . . . Lecture III. establishes the position that the New Testament presents Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, by showing that this is borne out by unquestioned Christian, and by most important Jewish and heathen testimony (the Rabbis, Josephus, Pliny). Lecture IV. defines and lays down some fundamental principles in regard to 'prophecy' and 'fulfilment,' and discusses certain special prophecies. . . . Lecture V. distinguishes between prophetism and heathen divination; exhibits the moral element in prophecy; and discusses the value of the two canons which the Old Testament furnishes for distinguishing the true from the false prophet. Lecture VI. treats both of the progressive character of prophecy, and of the spiritual element in it, and shows how both prophecy and the Old Testament as a whole point beyond themselves to a spiritual fulfilment in the kingdom of God—marking also the development during the different stages of the history of Israel to the fulfilment in Christ. Lectures VII. and VIII. are devoted to defence of the views previously set forth concerning the Old Testament, and contain an examination of recent negative criticism in regard to the Pentateuch and the historical books. Lecture IX. resumes the history of the Messianic idea. It discusses the general character of the post-Exilian literature, and gives an analysis of the Apocrypha and their teaching of the new Hellenistic direction, and of the bearing of all on the Messianic hope. . . . In Lecture X. the various movements of Jewish national life are traced in their bearing on the Messianic idea—especially the 'Nationalist' movement, of which, in a certain sense, the so-called Pseudepigraphic writings may be regarded as the religious literature. Lecture XI. gives an account and analysis of these Pseudepigraphic writings, marking especially their teaching concerning the Messiah and Messianic times. Lastly, Lecture XII. sets forth the last stage in Messianic prophecy—the mission and preaching of John the Baptist, and the fulfilment of all prophecy in Jesus the Messiah."

Here we must close. If any apology is needed for so long a notice of a reprint, it is furnished by the importance of the work we have been passing under review. And if one is needed for our failure to offer any detailed criticisms of the body of the book may we not hope that it will be found in our already somewhat tardy regard for the reader's patience and the editor's space? W. M. MCPHEETERS.

#### MORRIS'S CALM REVIEW OF BRIGGS' INAUGURAL, ETC.

A CALM REVIEW OF THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS.

*By Edward D. Morris.* New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1891. Pp. 50.

BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP AND INSPIRATION. Two Papers. *By Llewellyn J. Evans and*

*Henry Preserved Smith.* Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1891. Pp. 65, and 61.

Six months ago, a *Note* of some length, in the *QUARTERLY*, gave an account of the inauguration of Dr. Briggs, at Union Seminary, New York, and of the address delivered by him on that occasion. Since that time the full text of the address has been published, and a second edition, with certain notes and an appendix, has also been issued. Our previous *Note* was based on what was called an "Authorized Syllabus," but a perusal of the complete address does not require us to modify the verdict then passed. Indeed, at several points, the full text of the address rather confirms that general verdict.

As our readers know, both the Presbytery of New York, of which Dr. Briggs is a member, and the General Assembly, which has veto power over the appointment of seminary professors, have taken action concerning the issues raised. The latter, by a vote of 448 to 60, declined to approve of the appointment of Dr. Briggs to teach Biblical Theology, and the former has resolved to enter on a judicial pro-

cess against Dr. Briggs himself. Meanwhile, the Board of Union Seminary has decided not to regard the veto of the Assembly. At this stage matters now stand, but the end is not yet in sight.

During the discussions caused by the address the three able papers now before us appeared. They all come from Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, and they testify to the ability and learning, if not in every case to the soundness of view or wisdom of utterance, of the teachers in that institution. These papers were first read before the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Cincinnati, and afterwards given to the public in neat pamphlet form. They have attracted wide attention, and form an important part of the literature which has already gathered round the now famous address of Dr. Briggs.

Professor Morris, in his "Calm Review," gives us a paper whose title and contents perfectly agree. It is a case of calling things by their right names. Reading it we find ourselves in an atmosphere so calm that there is scarcely a ripple on the surface of the sea of discussion. The tone of Dr. Morris' paper is kindly, and its spirit very fine. It gives a word of praise where such may be uttered, but also rebukes, admonishes and condemns with fidelity. Professed personal friendship for the author of the address runs as an undertone all through the paper, but this does not betray Dr. Morris into disloyalty to the truth. Seldom have we read a controversial paper so well-balanced and so free from blemishes. It will read well ten years hence.

Dr. Morris, in his *Review*, follows the text of the address closely, and takes up every important point raised therein. The plan of the address and the arrangement of its material is keenly criticised, and regret is expressed with its presumptuous tone. It is shown that it was a mistake to discuss at such length, in the address, the question of "Authority" in religion, and the matter of alleged "Barriers" to the acceptance of the Bible. Some very pertinent remarks are here made concerning "Inerrancy" and the "Miracle" as barriers.

Dr. Morris discusses at length, and with great ability and candor, the nature and contents of Biblical Theology, as set forth in the address. Here the Lane professor of Systematic Theology does excellent work. The views of Dr. Briggs as to the doctrine of God, of man, and of redemption, are carefully and fairly discussed, and the errors and defects therein faithfully indicated. But the whole paper must be read to do it justice. Its closing words need only be quoted to show its spirit and results :

"The writer cannot conclude this frank review of an address, in many respects remarkable, without some expression both of interest and regret. The high degree of intellectual vigor, of mental and moral earnestness, of intense personal conviction, of fearless loyalty to what the author regards as truth, cannot be too cordially commended. The extensive reading manifest on the topics discussed, and the diligent, though not always consistent or judicious use of material acquired, ought to be appreciated by every reader. . . . But the writer is bound, with deep regret, to say that, in his judgment, the address contains too much that is defective either in doctrine or in statement; too much that will not justify itself at the bar of sober judgment; too much that seems to carry in itself germinant seeds of error; too much that is, more or less, at variance with the teachings of a safe, and free, and scriptural theology; too much that appears to run counter, at least in form, to our symbols, and to some of the holiest convictions of the church." (Pp. 49, 50.) This is the verdict of Dr. Morris.

The papers of Dr. Evans and Dr. Smith treat of the same theme, and are very

properly published together, making a treatise of 126 pages. Their common theme is *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*. Directly, these papers are a plea for large liberty in the pursuit of Biblical studies; indirectly, there runs through both a good deal that looks like special pleading for Dr. Briggs and some of his positions. Hence, we can scarcely expect to find in these papers the same calm impartiality which marks the paper of Dr. Morris.

Glancing at that of Dr. Evans first, we find it able, eloquent, and full of enthusiasm. It gives abundant evidence of extensive learning, while its spirit is devout and its tone reverent. The burden of its message is that modern, strict definitions of *inspiration* are not supported by the latest results of Biblical studies, and are hurtful rather than helpful to the cause of true Christian faith.

The definition which receives special criticism is that of Hodge and Warfield, which asserts the verbal inerrant inspiration of the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs of the Scriptures. This view of inspiration Dr. Evans argues is purely *a priori*, is not sustained by the facts or claims of Scripture, and goes beyond the statement of the Confession. Then Dr. Evans states at length his own view, and calls it *Pneumatic Inspiration*. This view, he claims, is alike scriptural and confessional, and, at the same time, it leaves room for all the legitimate results of modern criticism, which has not yet been able to remove *errancy* from the record of the divine revelation. We have read, with some care, what Dr. Evans says in support of his view against that of Hodge and Warfield, and we are bound to confess that it not only seems to be as much *a priori* as theirs, but to confound *revelation* and *inspiration* in a way that they do not. If it be an hypothesis that the original autographs were inerrant, it is equally an hypothesis that they were errant, unless we further assume that present critical conclusions are final and infallible.

As professor of New Testament literature Dr. Evans draws most of his material from his own special field, and for a condensed presentation of the critical questions which are now *up* in relation to the New Testament we must specially commend this paper. He has finely outlined the scope of the discussions, and this must be admitted even where we do not agree with his conclusions. Dr. Evans also has some warm words of commendation for the new-born science of Biblical Theology, and expects great things from it, forgetful at times that it is open to the same dangers as Systematic Theology.

We cannot say more, but must quote the closing words of this able and stimulating paper:

“The Presbyterianism of our country cannot afford to put itself in antagonism to the most enlightened as well as devout Christian scholarship of the day. It cannot afford to put the yoke of bondage to an exploded relic of post-Reformation scholasticism on the consciences of our young men, alive as they are to the gains of reverent and careful study of the book, and sensitive as they cannot fail to be to the humiliation of such bondage. It cannot afford to silence the larger, profounder, more scriptural re-statements of revealed truth made imperative by improved methods of Biblical research. Nor can it afford to precipitate any issue on our churches, the surest result of which will be to foment suspicion, to drive out the spirit of charity and of justice, to gender misunderstanding and alienation between our chairs of instruction and our pulpits and pews, and to widen the gap between honest inquiry and earnest faith.” (P. 65.)

The aim of the whole discussion of Dr. Evans' paper appears from this quotation, and we leave it to speak for itself.

We have space to add but little regarding Dr. Smith's paper. He has the same theme as Dr. Evans, and as professor of Old Testament literature he uses material drawn largely from that field. He treats of the history of the doctrine of inspiration of the Old Testament Canon in an interesting way, and argues against verbal inerrant inspiration almost all through. This leads him to make much of the apparent errors and discrepancies which are found in the Old Testament.

In his discussion Dr. Smith deals with topics of great interest, and raises questions which must be faced and frankly discussed. We cannot but feel, however, that Dr. Smith has not been very happy in his treatment of the delicate questions raised. At times there seems to be failure to grasp the topics with a strong hand, a clear head, and a sober spirit, though generally the discussion is able and its tone unobjectionable. One feels, too, in reading his paper, as if the author felt called upon to gather in formidable array the apparent discrepancies found in the Old Testament, in order to make good his case against the inerrancy of its autographs. If the advocate of inerrancy is to blame for making too little of these discrepancies, surely the supporter of errancy is equally to blame for making too much of them. The latter fault, we fear, is that of Dr. Smith's paper. Moreover, we feel, too, that many readers of this paper will get the impression that the special mission of modern critical scholarship is to discover errors in the Scriptures, rather than also to explain and harmonize the apparent contradictions. Now the effect of this will surely be to make many earnest minds more suspicious than ever of this kind of criticism used in this way. If modern criticism is to commend itself it must be less *destructive* and more *constructive* than it has too often shown itself. It was one of the features of English deism that it made much of alleged errors in the Bible, and modern criticism surely has a far nobler mission than to reproduce in a somewhat different form those structures which the English apologists swept away.

It is in no spirit of hostility towards the most diligent and thorough study of the Scriptures in accordance with the modern methods of investigation that the above remarks are made, for Biblical criticism has its field and function, and a very important one; but we feel bound to offer a word of caution lest hasty results be too confidently accepted. If this is a time of transition and reconstruction there is all the more need to be careful and conservative. If the good ship is soon to sail for some other port, it is surely the part of wisdom to fix the helm, to set the sails, and to know whither the ship is chartered before we lift anchor and leave the present safe harbor. If the anchor be lifted too soon, we may find ourselves *drifting*, only to ask the question—*whither?* and perhaps to find the answer to be—*on the rocks*.

We commend these three papers to our readers as of value in themselves, and as of much interest in connection with the discussions which will no doubt continue for some time to engage our brethren of the Northern church. Indirectly, they must be of interest to us in the South, for no one can tell how long it will be till the questions discussed therein are raised here. To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

*Columbia, S. C.*

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

#### KERR'S VOICE OF GOD IN HISTORY.

THE VOICE OF GOD IN HISTORY. *Robert Pollok Kerr, D. D.* 12mo; pp. 279. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1890.

The effective use of church history is a problem that, at best, is only partially

solved. It is freely admitted that it has important uses, and that, correctly applied, it would aid in solving many of the questions of the present. It has passed into a saying, that current controversies are only the re-opening of old ones, which have been long settled, and there is a large element of truth in the saying. And the record of God's dealings with his people in former days is believed to be full of encouragement for his people of to-day. This is our theory ; but, as a fact, we look upon our trials and our controversies as if they were unique in the history of the world, and we approach them as if we were, for the first time, applying to them the Word of God. Whatever be the private studies of our ministry, their utterances from the pulpit draw very lightly upon the materials supplied by God's dealings with the church, while sermons or lectures upon such themes, however modestly delivered, will almost certainly make for any one that undertakes them, a name as a specialist. Partly in consequence of this, the great body of Christian people live without conscious relation to the historic past and, whatever their familiarity with Bible truth, they are strangers to the many and marvellous applications of that truth in God's dealings with his people for eighteen hundred years.

Dr. Kerr has not been misled by our theory ; he has grappled with the fact, and whatever his success, he deserves, at least, the credit given to an honest man who seeks to solve a very serious problem. The volume before us is the third which comes from his pen. His second, *The People's History of Presbyterianism*, is in the same direction as this one, although on somewhat different lines. His purpose is distinctly formed, and as distinctly carried out. He offers no original contributions to the facts of church history, and he makes no effort to supply the long-standing need of a text-book for theological students—a need best filled at present by Dr. Geo. P. Fisher's *History of the Christian Church*. On the contrary, the sources he draws on are accessible to us all. So far as we can recall, there is nothing in this volume which could not be found in the encyclopedias, histories, hand-books, biographies and periodical literature with which every Presbyterian minister is presumably familiar. To one with a more ambitious purpose a statement like this would be depreciation ; it is, in fact, simply the recognition of Dr. Kerr's success. His private studies doubtless go beyond the common sources, but his volume shows only how much can be gathered from common sources, and how freshly old truth can be stated. He has done what many with an average minister's library could do ; his virtue is that he has done it while others have left it undone. And, quite apart from the popular success of Dr. Kerr's books, we regard his undertaking as most valuable by reason of the encouragement it must afford to the pastors of the church to enter upon series of pulpit discourses hitherto despaired of. Success of a much more modest degree than Dr. Kerr's would be a most gratifying change from the present lamentable dearth of effort.

The theme of the present volume is the active presence of God in human history. This is illustrated by a series of sketches of various individuals, as Augustine, Mohammed, Wickliffe, Knox, Luther, Calvin, Cromwell, Wesley ; of various classes of people, as Israel, the Huguenots, the Puritans, the Covenanters ; and of various movements, as Monasticism, and the Crusades. Many of the leading points in each of these subjects are touched upon clearly and with much grace of style. We cannot imagine any Christian becoming weary in the midst of one of these chapters ; and if their brevity should stimulate any to more thorough investigation for himself, they will have done a good work.

The only historical statement in the book, which we see reason to question is that about Calvin's children. Dr. Kerr says (p. 138) that he had three children; but Calvin's reply to Baudoin, and one of his letters to Viret, seem to indicate that he had but one, although Idelette had several by a former marriage. Calvin's own words are: "Baudoin upbraids me as childless. God gave me a little son—He took him away." To Viret he wrote, "The Lord has indeed inflicted on us a heavy, painful wound, in the death of our little boy." The subject is important only in view of the brutal slanders of Romanist writers, as the Jesuit Brietus, who says: "He married Idelette, by whom he had no issue (*sic*), lest the life of so infamous a man should be propagated."

There are certain general features of Dr. Kerr's book which we think could be improved. It is difficult to criticise the writings of one with whom one sustains friendly, personal and official relations, but this department of the QUARTERLY would soon lose its value if it dealt out criticism to strangers, and indiscriminate laudation to friends. And the only relief the reviewer has is that the task was not voluntarily assumed, but arises out of the assignments of the editor.

Dr. Kerr would have increased our sense of the completeness of his undertaking had he included in his survey more of the familiar figures of church history. In them God's voice speaks as loudly as in any he names. The Waldenses were and are as notable a class as the Huguenots, the Puritans or the Covenanters, yet there is not in the index any reference to them. Savonarola was, in his way, as important a character as Huss or Wesley, yet there is no mention of him, and in the account of the Puritans one looks in vain for the names of Baxter and Owen. If the volume were a mere collection of essays, these omissions would not be proper ground for criticism, but with a purpose so well executed, as far as the author has gone, one wonders why these other names, equally familiar, were left out.

We could wish also that Dr. Kerr had given a somewhat fuller treatment to the ground he has covered. Augustine, Calvin, Luther stand first upon the doctrinal system they represent, and only second on the conflicts in which they were engaged; yet that doctrinal system is but meagrely stated, although it is better done in the case of Augustine than in that of the other two. It was an admirable opportunity to present the leading truths for which these heroes stood, and in Dr. Kerr's graceful style that statement would have been very effective. The Servetus incident of Calvin's life deserved more attention than Dr. Kerr has given it, for the reason that it is used to-day as a bludgeon to attack the system Calvin taught. We cannot parry the force of these blows by saying "we have heard too much of the Servetus affair." (P. 141.)

Dr. Kerr has added five chapters at the close, which, however interesting, are, in our view, quite aside from his purpose. "The voice of God in history" is not made evident to us in the chapters on "Protestantism and Liturgies," "Churchship," "The Great Theophany," "The Age of Missions," "The Church's Task." These chapters run through sixty pages without contributing to the illustration of the theme in any way, and while we read Dr. Kerr's opinions on these subjects with much pleasure, we must bear in mind that he has not only run counter to his own statement as to the duty of the historian, which is "to write history, and not to express opinions (*sic*) as to the expediency or propriety of measures which he records" (p. 243); but, besides, he has occupied with these opinions space that

his graceful pen could have most happily employed in supplying the fuller information, the lack of which is noted above.

Concerning these five chapters, one remark must suffice: it remains to be seen whether the Southern Church will adopt the proposed draft of a Directory of Worship, which contains "several liturgical features." (P. 243.) Some there are among us doubtless who favor liturgies, to whom the "several liturgical features" of this draft are only the beginning; others there are, who, out of sheer weariness, will vote for this draft. But if we are not mistaken, there is a large number in the Southern Church who have not been drawn to liturgies by "constant contact with the beautiful liturgical services of the Episcopal Church" (p. 243), and who would have a veritable Directory for Worship, and not the beginnings of a Prayer Book. These are of opinion that there is no compromise between simple services and liturgical services that is permanent, and that if we must have set forms at all they should be provided for our sacraments and our prayers, as well as for our marriages and our funerals.

In these particulars we think Dr. Kerr's volume is open to improvement, but we do not on this account abate our sense of indebtedness to him for undertaking to solve a very difficult problem or our appreciation of the success he has attained. On the contrary, we use every opportunity to bring these books to the attention of our people.

W. S. P. BRYAN.

#### SELECTIONS FROM BOCOCK'S WRITINGS.

SELECTIONS FROM THE RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY WRITINGS OF JOHN H. BOCOCK, D. D., with a Biographical Sketch by *C. R. Vaughan, D. D.* 8vo, pp. 644. \$3. Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson. 1891.

The publishers have done their work on this book with care and success. There is no page of errata at the close of the volume, and a rapid, though somewhat careful examination fails to show any need of such a page. The book is well printed, with clear type, on good paper.

The introductory chapter is from the pen of Dr. C. R. Vaughan, a personal friend and admirer of Dr. Boccock throughout an intimacy of many years. The high estimate set upon his friend by Dr. Vaughan, is sufficiently apparent in this brief sketch of his life, but the absence of mere eulogy is both notable and praiseworthy. And we are the more inclined to accept that estimate as we see the care and conscientious independence of thought with which it was adopted. An examination of these writings leads us to the conclusion that Dr. Vaughan has been studiously moderate. Even in this moderation and reserve he has been faithful to the friendship which did not die when his friend and brother died, and we commend his fidelity as well as the good taste with which he has executed his task.

This is our first acquaintance with most of Dr. Boccock's writings, and we must therefore, not speak of the editor's work. The book speaks for itself, and is bright, and strong, and sound, with here and there touches of tenderness that surprised us at first, for we had heard much of the writer as a strong and rugged warrior, fighting hard for the truth, and not stinting the force of his blows as his adversary went down. And, such is the force of habit, as we close the book and think of the man, the image that rises to our thought is that of a cavalry leader, rejoicing in the heat and storm of battle, riding straight at the thickest of the opposing ranks and *going through*, and then turning and trampling the disordered fragments left

undestroyed by the first terrible onset. This book shows us another side of the man, and the view it gives of his character is a singularly pleasing and impressive one. The tenderness of a brave spirit is always so, is it not?

About the middle of the present century the Synod of Virginia bore upon its roll the names of a number of remarkable men. Among them stands that of Jesse S. Armistead, D. D., who was Dr. Boccock's pastor in his boyhood and early youth. Memory goes back across the gap that many years have made and presents to us again that mighty preacher of righteousness, as we saw and heard him in the college church at Hampden-Sidney in our youth. We can almost fancy that we see again the tall and massive figure slowly rising to its height at the opening of the worship of God. The strong and kindly face seems once more to turn toward us and he begins to speak. But what a beginning! Was it ever before known that an educated preacher so spoiled the utterance of fair and precious truth with such a drawl? But the preacher's thought moves on and his heart and brain are both at work upon the message he is bringing. His sentences begin to measure themselves to that peculiar utterance—the drawl becomes almost a measured chant. The cords of an inexorable logic are winding about us now, and now the glow of that strong and passionate heart fills all the man and all his speaking. With awkward and most impressive gesture his heavy hands smite and cleave the air, and the words of that wonderful drawl fall red-hot upon the conscience. The word of God upon his lips was as a fire, and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces. What must have been the preaching of those men among whom such a preacher was not admitted to be the foremost! What must have been the merit of a man who rose to rank among such leaders of men! Dr. Boccock did this, and never till God's holy providence drew the veil over his mental vision, did he lose aught of what he had gained.

The influence of such a man as Dr. Armistead, upon a bright and conscientious boy, would naturally be great. It was not a small part of a liberal Christian education that was received through his preaching and teaching, and doubtless Dr. Boccock felt that influence to the centre of his life. It is a striking evidence of the strength and independence of his nature that no one ever charged him with trying to imitate the inimitable awkwardness and effectiveness of his old pastor.

Dr. Boccock comes before us in this volume as a pastor. Who can read the short notice of revivals at different times and places, in churches under his pastoral care, and then read the modest reminiscences of this volume, and not be satisfied that it was the Lord's blessing on the writer's work which gave them. And when they came, with what unflinching zeal and fidelity did he labor. At one time, in Georgetown, "he labored, prayed, visited and preached for ninety days," preaching "every night, in addition to the usual Sabbath services." He was himself so moved that, though he had help from other ministers, he could not keep silent. And then, when this remarkable "protracted meeting" ended, the revival went on, and, under the ordinary ministry of the Word, continued for two years. It is thought that the intense and continued labors of this season inflicted the injury upon his brain which at last caused his death.

We had marked for comment a number of passages from these writings, but we must close. And it is well. Those who read the book will find it the production of a scholar and thinker of uncommon grace and power, and of a Christian whose experience was unusually rich and ripe.

D. E. JORDAN.



## IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

The following have been received, and will receive notice in our next number :

*The American Sunday-school Union, Philadelphia :*

COMMENTARY ON JOHN, by E. W. Rice, D. D.

*The American Tract Society, New York :*

HISTORICAL EVIDENCES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PROGRESS OF DOCTRINE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Bernard.

*John B. Alden, New York :*

THE MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA. Vol. XXIX.

*A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York :*

HARMONY OF ETHICS WITH THEOLOGY. Robins.

INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Gerhardt.

JAMES AND JUDE. The Expositor's Bible. Plummer.

LEVITICUS. " " " Kellogg.

PROVERBS. " " " Horton.

THE LIVING CHRIST. R. W. Dale.

*Baker Taylor Co., New York :*

WHAT ROME TEACHES. M. F. Cusack (Nun of Kenmare).

*Christian Literature Co., New York :*

THE APOCALYPSE, ITS STRUCTURE, etc. Brown.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION. Warfield.

*Frank & Wagnalls, New York :*

CYCLOPEDIA OF TEMPERANCE AND PROHIBITION.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED FACTS AND SIMILES. Tingling.

PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH. Delitzsch.

*Ginn & Co., Boston :*

DUTY: A BOOK FOR SCHOOLS. Seelye.

THE MODALIST. Hamilton.

*S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago :*

HEGEL'S LOGIC. Harris.

*Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston :*

CHARLES GRANDISON FINNEY. Wright.

WHO WROTE THE BIBLE? Gladden.

*Wilbur B. Ketcham, New York :*

THE GOSPEL OF SPIRITUAL INSIGHT. Deems.

*Lea Brothers, Philadelphia :*

RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF SPAIN. Lea.

*Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York :*

THE ORACLES OF GOD. Sandy.

*Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond :*

DISCUSSIONS. Dabney. Vol. II.

*G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York :*

GOSPEL CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY. Cone.

*Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York :*

THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR. GENESIS. (2 Vols.) ROMANS, LUKE (Vol. II.)

A FRIENDLY TALK ON REVISION. Morris.

THE INTERPRETER WITH HIS BIBLE. Waffle.

OUR FATHER'S KINGDOM. Seelye.

THE PULPIT COMMENTARY. REVELATIONS, PROVERBS, JUDGES AND RUTH,  
PETER, JOHN AND JUDE.

ROBERT CARTER; HIS LIFE AND WORK.

ROMANS DISSECTED. "McRealsham."

SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT OF ST. PAUL. Matheson.

*Scribner & Welford, New York :*

THE ORIGIN OF THE ARYANS. Taylor.

*Student Publishing Co., Hartford :*

EXPOSITION OF GALATIANS. Stevens.

*United States Book Co., New York :*

THE BROAD CHURCH. H. R. Haweis.

*Thomas Whittaker, New York :*

DANGERS OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE. Moorhouse.

REASON AND AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. Sterrett.

THE RIGHT ROAD. Kramer.

THE SONS OF GOD. McConnell.

THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Simcox.

*Young Churchman Publishing Co., Milwaukee :*

JESUS CHRIST, THE PROOF OF CHRISTIANITY. Spalding.