

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Vol. XVI.—AUGUST, 1888.—No. 2.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—CRITICISMS ON SOME OF THE ABLEST REPRESENTATIVE PREACHERS OF THE DAY.

BY AN EMINENT PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS.

NO. VII.—REV. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D.

PART I.

I HAVE named in my title a man with every natural endowment, except, perhaps, plenitude of physical power, to have become, had he been only a preacher, a preacher hardly second to any in the world.

A conjectural judgment like the foregoing, it is, to be sure, almost always unwisely bold and hazardous to put forth. I simply record the impression which, after some familiarity acquired with the man himself, seen and heard both in public and in private, and after no little conversance with his productions in print, I find fixed and deepening in my mind concerning Dr. Broadus.

The natural course of treatment for adoption in the present paper obviously would be to attempt the justification of a claim so large, so extraordinary. But the basis of evidence supplied, on which in making the attempt, I could found, is, I confess, too narrow for me discreetly to build an argument to such purpose upon it. Dr. Broadus has put himself in print as a preacher and speaker in only one collective volume of "Sermons and Addresses," and his record of practical results accomplished through labor in the pulpit is, though considerable, yet not imposing. Dr. Broadus is distinctively a scholar, distinctively a teacher, and besides, though less distinctively, an author. His preaching work has been incidental, rather than principal, in his career. He presents a conspicuous example, perhaps an example quite unique, in the living generation, of the man who, notwithstanding that this must be said of him, yet enjoys, and justly enjoys, among the well-informed, a national reputation as preacher.

As teacher of preachers, Dr. Broadus enjoys a reputation more than national. For his treatise entitled "The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons" has crossed the Atlantic, as well as made the tour of this continent, everywhere acknowledged to be one of the very best contribu-

II.—CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES: HOW AFFECTED BY RECENT CRITICISMS.

NO. III.

BY PROFESSOR BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., PRINCETON.

IN any age of intellectual activity and rapid growth of knowledge, like our own, a continuous process of adjustment is necessary between our mental inheritance and our constantly increasing acquisition. Except to such excessively hospitable minds as can without discomfort entertain together contradictory propositions, advancing knowledge, involving this continuous adjustment, unavoidably brings a perpetual criticism of the whole body of knowledge already held, both in its statement and in its ground. An age of investigation is therefore also an age of criticism. The total body of old knowledge is tested and tried afresh when confronted with each new discovery; and we cannot avoid the questions, What effect has this new fact on the old facts? What place can it find among them? Which of them must give place for it? But we must not fail to remember—what is sometimes forgotten—that the criticism is reciprocal, and that we must equally ask on each occasion, What effect has the body of established facts on this so-called new fact? What place can they find for themselves in union with it? What in it must give way before their pressure? We must, moreover, have our eyes wide enough open to distinguish between the turmoil of the process—the fermentation of the limpid, liquid mass of knowledge when the new element is cast into it—and the final product. We must not mistake the battle for the victory. We must rather possess our souls in sufficient patience to note the condition of the field after the conflict; to observe what has been eliminated and cast out in the strife of the elements, whether some part or all of the old or some part or all of the new, or neither the one nor the other. Thus we shall be able to distinguish between the queries, What has been criticised? and What has been affected by the criticism?

Nowhere is it more necessary to make this distinction than when we are inquiring concerning recent criticism of the Christian evidences. If we mean to ask what in them has been subjected to searching criticism by recent thinkers, we may shortly answer, everything. Nothing has been allowed to escape. The validity of all the proofs of the existence of God is questioned. The very capacity of man's mind, not only to attain to the idea of God, but to receive it when presented to it, is denied. Historical criticism has been as busy and as radical as philosophical and scientific. Not only are we told, for example, that miracle is impossible, and that no evidence would suffice to prove it, but we are also told that there is no evidence, worth the name, which can be presented for the Christian miracles—that, as respects historicity,

they stand on a similar level with those of the Mediæval saints, if not with those of Mr. Anstey's "A Fallen Idol." No single book of either Old or New Testament has been left unassailed. Even such a liberal as Prof. Robertson Smith has felt called upon to rebuke the wildness of some of the recent Grafian critics. While, as regards the New Testament, grave scholars are telling us that even those books which Baur left us, are all late compositions—the word is used literally—made up of fragments of ancient Jewish writings ignorantly pieced together. If we are of such sensitive disposition that we dare not assert or believe to be true what some acute or learned critic affirms to be impossible, we may as well strip off at once all our Christian garments: there are no Christian evidences. Nay, we must in such case strip off still more, and, wrapping our heads in our discarded raiment, plunge, in complete intellectual nakedness, into the gulf of nescience. There is nothing that has not been criticised.

But if what we ask is how the presentation of the Christian evidences has been affected by recent criticism, we have another story to tell. "The Christian Evidences" are an essentially persuasive science: they undertake to prove something and to prove it to somebody. They are, therefore, especially sensitive to changes in current thinking. Not only does every attack call out its appropriate defense, but every new point of view must map out for itself the whole prospect of the world of fact as seen from its vantage ground. Hence every type of thought which takes hold upon men's minds, sooner or later, creates an apologetic for itself, suited to its needs and calculated for its meridian, by which its adherents feel their way to God and to Christ. So ineradicable is belief in divine things, so inseparable a part of human nature is it, that no sooner has a philosopher removed, to its own satisfaction, all rational foundations of faith, than forthwith faith begins to arise again out of the ruins and to frame for itself a new basis for belief. Accordingly, we already see building, stone by stone, before our eyes, a series of entirely new systematic natural theologies, based on the teachings of our current philosophies. Take such a book, for instance, as "Faith and Conduct," recently published anonymously; here a new apologetic lays its foundations in philosophical skepticism, and then builds a temple out of the material furnished by a thorough-going evolutionism, into which it invites all Christian men to come and worship their God and their Saviour. More constructive work of this kind, valuable as showing us how much can go and yet Christianity not go, may be expected from the adherents of the newer trends of thought every year.

From the other side, the mode of presentation of the evidences by the opponents of each new hypothesis is deeply affected by its nature and its claims. And in this way, every criticism creates against itself, so far, a new order of apologetic. The richness of the new apologetic

which has thus been beaten out by the controversies of the last half-century is almost incredible. The scientific attack on the supernatural, based on the idea of invariable law, for example, has quickened in the apologete the sense of order, and plan, and relation, until a new conviction of divine power and presence has grown up which bids fair permanently to banish Deistic conceptions from the minds of men. So the efforts of the naturalistic school of historical criticism, to bring into doubt the genuineness and unity of the books of the Bible, with a view to rearranging their material in an order for which a plausible plea for natural development might be put in, has not only called forth a mass of direct evidence for the authenticity of the books, such as was undreamed of before, but has also given birth to a whole library of more indirect argumentation of a nature and amount sufficient almost to revolutionize the science of "the Evidences." For example, the attack of the Tübingen school on the New Testament has developed a direct historical apologetic, which has well nigh made a separate science of the history of the second century, and at the same time has called out a body of reasoning, based on Paul's four chief epistles, which has almost itself grown to the stature of a complete and satisfying "system of Christian evidences." The effort to reconstruct the Old Testament history in the same naturalistic interest bids fair to perform a similar service for it. In particular, reply to modern criticism has developed a system of evidences, built around and resting upon the unique personality of Jesus, which almost constitutes a new science. It was in answer to Strauss that the argument (best known through Prebendary Row's "Jesus of the Evangelists") based upon the literary portraiture of the perfect God-man presented in the evangelists was first given vogue among us; and since then it has been successfully adapted, not only to the proof that the evangelical records are true records of a truly supernatural life which was truly lived in the world, but also to the proof that the writers of these records were divinely aided in their record of such a life, and not only they, but all those who in the books of the Old and New Testaments alike "testify of him;" and thence again to the proof of the divine origin and divine truth of the whole Christian record and system. It is in opposition to the reconstruction of the Old Testament by the presently prevailing school of negative criticism that appeal is being ever made sharper and sharper to the authority of the God-man when testifying to the origin and meaning of the Scriptures which he himself revealed and inspired. If it be a fact that he lived and taught as God-man, and being thus the very Word from Heaven, made assertions as to matters of fact: then there is an end of all dispute as to the reality of the facts asserted by such lips. He asserted, for instance, the reality of miracle; his very life in the world was an assertion of the intrusion of the supernatural into this world of sense. He asserted the supreme evidential authority of miracles—

representing them as in such a degree faith-compelling as to detract somewhat from the value of faith as evidence of a right heart. He asserted the divine authority of the Scriptures—declaring that no word of them should ever be broken. He asserted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch—affirming that Moses spake its laws and wrote its prophecies of him. Men may, and men do, deny these facts; but when they deny them, they deny them in the face of the assertions of the God-man, and they can save themselves from blasphemy only by taking refuge in a purely humanitarian or in an extreme kenotic theory of the person of Christ, such as reduces his life in the world to the limits of a simple human life, but which is already abundantly refuted in advance by the facts on which the argument from the portraiture of the God-man in the gospels is built. It is just because this Being is obviously represented as living and acting not as a mere man; it is just because he is obviously and consistently represented to us as “*God manifested in the flesh* ;” that we must believe that he really lived and taught in order to account for the record: and this argument, once developed for this literary purpose, is equally valid to compel us to bow before all his utterances. Thus, about the central figure of Jesus an entirely new apologetic is organizing itself, which in its own strength is able to hold the field.

It is, of course, not to be understood that the sole way in which the presentation of the Christian evidences has been affected by recent criticism has been in the way of addition to them of new lines of thought. Apologetes, too, are but men; and many unsound arguments have been put forward in defense of truth which the keen criticism of our critical age has exposed. Prof. Huxley tells us that “*extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science as the strangled snakes beside that of Hercules.*” It is easy to retort that they keep company there with an interesting body of scientific lights. But it is wiser to confess the fact and profit by the lesson. Apologetics is wiser than apologetes, even as calm-eyed science is wiser than any of her votaries. Many a crude argument has been put forth in her name which she has learned to repudiate; many an absurd position she has found it for her best interests to desert. But it is no more desirable to exaggerate this side than the other. Recent criticism has correctly affected the details and modes of presentation of the old evidences; but it would be beyond the truth to say that it has at all invalidated their essence. Every one of the old lines of proof of the truth of the Christian religion stands to-day with its validity and cogency unimpaired. The new scientific conception of the world, for example, has not at all either diminished the evidential value of miracles or rendered their occurrence incredible. They were always marvels, and they owed their evidential value to their marvelousness. But with respect to their relation to physical law, there

is not one whit more of difficulty connected with conceiving the intrusion of a divine will into the chain of physical causation than there is in allowing our daily intrusion into it of a human will. We must still within us the ineradicable witness of our consciousness to the spontaneity of our activity, and wipe out from the world around us all the manifestations of our directing energy, before we dare deny the possibility of miracle, which differs from our own activity chiefly in the stupendousness of the effect, witnessing to the all-mightiness of the source. The only difficulty of believing in their reality arises from the difficulty of believing that such a power can really exist in the universe; and this difficulty they were intended to raise that they might direct our eyes above the universe for their source. Historical criticism has, in like manner, completely failed to invalidate, in the least degree, the old argument from prophecy, although it may be freely admitted that it has set aside many old arguments from prophecies. All the resources of a numerous body of nobly gifted and splendidly equipped critics have been exhausted in a vain endeavor so to arrange the dates of origin of the Biblical books as to eliminate the proofs of prediction from their pages. With a truly Herod-like indifference they have murdered a host of innocent facts which stood in the way of their purposes, and yet the reconstruction still always fails. After all, the Old Testament books were written before Christ, and these are they which testify of Him. Through them all, one increasing purpose runs, which proclaims them a preparation for something to come; and this something actually does come in the New Testament, and is found to be the center to which hundreds of typical and prophetic fingers, which cannot be obliterated until we blot out the whole Old Testament record, convergingly point.

The success of negative criticism in the closely allied attempt to discredit the authenticity and genuineness and consequent historical credibility of the Biblical books has been no greater. Every new unearthing of lost documents but drives a new nail into the coffin of unbelief. The discovery of Hippolytus' "Refutation of all Heresies" in 1842, of the complete Greek copy of the Clementine Homilies in 1853, of the full text of Barnabas in 1859, of the complete text of the Letters of Clement of Rome in 1875, of the "Diatessaron" of Tatian in 1876 and 1887—each marks the final settlement of a distinct issue with skepticism in a victory for the old line of the "Christian Evidences." Critical investigation has had a similar history: the import of the Basilidean quotations in Hippolytus, the relation of Marcion's gospel to Luke, the source of the evangelical quotations in Justin, the meaning of the "Logia" in Papias—these are but samples of the heated controversies which have, one after the other, issued in decisive victories for the old line of the "Christian Evidences." The discoveries of archaeology have walked in the same path with those of literary research. Every new illustration from the monuments of either the Old or the New Testa-

ment has strengthened the old apologetic. A mere list of the statements of either Testament which have been paraded as inaccuracies, but which archæology has proven to be rather subtle indications of supreme accuracy, would constitute a telling sermon in defense of Scripture. These examples must, however, suffice. It must be already apparent that recent criticism has not so affected the old line of "Christian Evidence" as to set them aside or evacuate them of their force. It has rather, by detecting and uncovering their points of weakness, led to the filling up of their gaps, and thus to a large increase in their strength.

The single question that is left to ask has already received its reply in the last remark. What has been, then, the effect of recent criticism on the validity and force of the Christian evidences? Is there, on the whole, less cogent reason now available for accepting Christianity on rational grounds than has seemed to be within reach heretofore? A thousand times no. Criticism has proved the best friend to apologetics a science ever had. It is as if it had walked with her around her battlements, and, lending her its keen eyes, pointed out an insufficiently guarded place here and an unbuttressed approach there; and then, taking playfully the part of aggressor, made feint after feint towards capturing the citadel, and thus both persuaded and enabled and even compelled her to develop her resources, throw up new defenses, abandon all indefensible positions, and refurbish her weapons, until she now stands armed cap-a-pie, impregnable to every enemy. The case is briefly this: recent criticism has had a very deep effect upon the Christian evidences in modernizing them and so developing and perfecting them that they stand now easily victor against all modern assaults.

III.—SHOULD QUESTIONS AT ISSUE BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES BE DISCUSSED IN THE PULPIT? IF SO, WHAT QUESTIONS, AND WHEN?

NO. I.

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., NEW YORK.

It is the natural desire of the world to drag the church down to its level. The unrenewed heart can have no sympathy with heavenly themes, nor any knowledge of holiness. Hence the newspapers, which are the exponents of the world's sentiments, and which also assume to know everything, laud the preacher who comes down into the popular arena and takes part in the rough and tumble of politics, provided he takes part on their side. It is with the same utter ignorance of vital Christianity with which they praise the liberality of the Christian minister who indorses the theater and laughs at doctrine. Unfortunately, the Church of Christ has many unworthy ministers, who are ready to do anything for popularity, and who would degrade the