

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.

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