

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 17—January, 1894.

I.

THE FUTURE OF CALVINISM.*

THE year 1892 was a year of great importance for the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands. Two influential groups of Churches, both originating in a secession from the Established Church, the one in 1834, the other in 1886, were, after long negotiations, brought together, and in June of that year held their "First General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands." For various reasons this event has excited considerable interest. It was something unforeseen and unexpected. Both groups, to be sure, were one in their confession and form of government, and both shared the conviction that a Reformed Christian was in duty bound to his Bible and his confession to break with the Established Church. Still, concerning "the method of reformation," *i. e.*, the manner in which this breach ought to be brought about, there existed an appreciable difference of opinion. This difference in method gave rise to the different attitudes which the two sides assumed in relation to the property of the Established Church and the civil authorities. The Christian Reformed Church, originating in the secession of 1834, had gradually come to consider itself as an entirely new Church, and as having broken off all connection with both the governing bodies and the individual members of the establishment. Consequently it raised no claim in the civil courts to retain or recover the property of the Established Church, and presented itself to the civil authorities as a new and different organization. On the other hand, the so-called

* [Our readers are indebted to Prof. G. Vos, Ph.D., D.D., of Princeton Seminary, for the translation of Dr. Bavinck's paper.—EDITORS.]

The discussion before us confines itself to the inquiry, What limitations are put by the authority of Christ upon the critical conclusions of Christian scholars? It does not allow the protest of those who deprecate the introduction of His authority into the settlement of critical questions, as though it were interposing a hindrance to free scientific investigation. And equal care is shown in guarding the rights of scholarship from an unwarranted intrusion of this authority in cases to which it will not legitimately apply. The author takes very moderate ground. He does not find that the teachings of Christ settle the question of the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, or whether Moses wrote the entire Pentateuch, or whether the whole Book of Isaiah was written by a single prophet of that name. But he insists that Christ does affirm, in the clearest and most unquestionable manner, that the law was given by Moses and that the Old Testament history is truthful and trustworthy. And while men may theorize as they please about these matters, they cannot, as Christians, hold a hypothesis which impugns our Lord's positive declarations on these points. To do this is inconsistent with thorough loyalty to Him. And that this assertion neither imperils the authority of Christ, nor trenches upon the freedom of scholarly investigation, is shown at length (pp. 118-154) in what, perhaps, is the most telling part of the volume. Some of the principal difficulties which encumber the critical theory that is now in the ascendant are here exhibited, evidencing very clearly that it is as yet far from being established, and there is no occasion yet for an attempt to adjust the Christian faith to the demands of this unproved hypothesis.

Princeton.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

HOW GOD INSPIRED THE BIBLE. Thoughts for the Present Distress. By J. PATTERSON SMYTH, Rector of Christ Church, Kingstown, and Author of *How we Got our Bible*. New York: James Pott & Co., 1892. 12mo, pp. viii, 209.

WHAT IS INSPIRATION? A Fresh Study of the Question, with New Discriminative Replies. By JOHN DEWITT, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., a Member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and for many years Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J.; Author of *The Psalms; a New Translation with Notes*, etc. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. [1893]. 12mo, pp. vi, 187.

INSPIRATION, and other Lectures. By T. GEORGE ROOKE, B.A., late President of Rawdon College, near Leeds. Edited by Two of his Students. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893. 8vo, pp. xvi, 261.

A copious literature on Inspiration is in process of production by the adherents of that lowered view of the Bible which the dominant school of Biblical Criticism is endeavoring to impose on the Churches. The three small volumes, the titles of which stand at the head of this notice, are very favorable specimens of this literature. The authors of all three books are men of devout spirit and of unquestionable attachment to the religion of the Bible; and they write with the earnest purpose of finding and commending to their fellow-Christians some way by which, in what they suppose to be the new conditions of knowledge as to the origin, structure and contents of the Bible, as brought out by recent critical study, they may still retain reverence for the Bible as the depository of the saving truth of the Gospel, and deference to it as the supreme rule of faith and practice. They are all, therefore, dominated by what we may call a conservative purpose; they wish to save to the

apprehension of Christian men the Bible as the foundation of religious doctrine and life.

These are therefore three very instructive little books. They exhibit to us the working of the new leaven in its mildest form; and advertise to us what is the least change in our attitude towards the Bible which will satisfy the most moderate adherents of the new views. As such, they are not reassuring. It becomes evident at once not only that an entire revolution in the doctrine of sacred Scripture incorporated in our creeds, and held indeed by the whole Christian past, will be required of us (which is a comparatively small matter); but also that on the new ground we can no longer occupy the same attitude towards Scripture that our Lord and His apostles occupied. The attempts of these books being taken as samples, it becomes equally evident also that no consistent doctrine of inspiration, conservative of the detailed divine authority of the Scriptures, can be framed on the basis of the new views. And we fear it also becomes evident that, despite their earnest desire to serve the cause of God's truth in preserving the authority of the Bible, the really dominant note in the thought of these writers is an overweening confidence in the infallibility of the latest deliverances of "scientific study of the records," by which they are betrayed into subjecting the Word of God to the word of men. Naturally this note shows itself in different degrees and in different forms in the several writers, who naturally differ also in extent and accuracy of learning, critical acumen and constructive power. Their writings vary, therefore, not only in force and interest, but also in "light and leading." Of the three before us, that of Mr. Smyth is the least important and that of Mr. Rooke the most valuable. But in all alike the ruling tendency is to save the Bible by conceding to "Science" what "Science" has shown no right to ask, and what cannot be conceded consistently with unreserved loyalty to the teachings of our Lord and His apostles.

Mr. Smyth's little book, well meaning no doubt, but scarcely well conceived, has probably been sufficiently characterized in an incidental notice in this REVIEW for April last (pp. 202, 203). There are many excellent things said in it, as, for example, that it was not the collecting of the sacred books into a volume "that made them of authority, but rather the fact of their possessing authority that made them be collected into a Bible" (p. 171). It is even formally acknowledged that "The Old Testament is the Scriptures which He," our Lord, "told men were of God and which bore witness of Him" (p. 36); though less is made of this witness than we could wish (p. 200). But the whole is vitiated by the very object for which the book is written, which is to counsel submission to the latest "scientific findings" of men as to the origin and structure of the Bible, on the plea that nothing of importance will be lost thereby (p. 198)—a plea one would think already discredited by its use by Strauss in issuing his *Life of Jesus*, and after him by every one who has had a destructive novelty to subintroduce into Christian circles. The underlying Christian conceptions of the author are continually breaking through, as, for example, when he betrays (pp. 150, 151) an uneasy sense that the Bible after all is infallible, and must not be permitted, therefore, to be interpreted in conflict with the Christian consciousness. But the natural result of the general attitude assumed is that the conception of inspiration is lowered to fit the assumed "findings of Science." The fact of inspiration Mr. Smyth would hold fast to: but he expresses a doubt whether a definition of it can be attained. His own definition is that it is "a Divine inbreathing, a Divine influence" (p. 96)—which is certainly indefinite enough. He thinks it "best described by the simple statement that it is God's endowing of the writers, each as was needed for the work before him" (p. 97): which by defining by an undefined purpose, leaves a loophole of

escape in every time of need. He rightly considers it impossible to draw the line between the divine and the human in the product of inspiration; but misleadingly illustrates by the staining of the pure light in its passage through a medium of colored glass (p. 125). The ineradicable *a-priorism* of this lowered view of inspiration is continually cropping out; the principle of construction is found in such questions as this: "Was it necessary for his purpose" that God should make the Biblical writers absolutely infallible? (p. 136.) Why not frankly answer that we do not know? Why not really take our stand with Butler, and say that "we are in no sort judges beforehand how God would give a revelation," and hold the only question to be "whether Scripture be what it claims to be?" (p. 131.) Why not, in a word, simply adopt the doctrine of Christ and His apostles? This is what we strive to do, and therefore we ask Mr. Smyth to note the clause "*but the Bible's claims*," in the passage which he quotes from us at p. 130 (doubtless at second hand, or he would not have neglected the essence of the statement), and to withdraw his unjustified strictures upon it. On the whole, we cannot think this little book likely to be helpful in the present distress; it will rather play into the hands of those who would destroy the credit of the Scriptures.

Mr. Smyth's book is the most popular of the three now before us; Dr. DeWitt's is the most polemic. It is wonderful with what warmth this venerable scholar enters the arena as the champion of Drs. Briggs and Smith. He thinks himself "neither a partisan nor an opponent" in this controversy, but the reader will surely beg leave to differ with the writer here. The whole tone and much of the matter of the book is determined by its partisanship in this controversy; and so dominant is this element that not only is it continually cropping out in and determining the thought and expression of the discussion, but the special subject of the book is even left here and there that some peculiar teaching of Dr. Briggs may be defended—as, for example, his unwise remarks about Dr. Martineau (p. 104), or his doctrine of the original state of man (p. 187). Whatever else it may be, the book must be regarded as primarily a brief for Dr. Briggs.

Dr. DeWitt's purpose in writing he explains to be, to "respond to an imperative demand" for a new doctrine of inspiration, to take the place of those doctrines of verbal and plenary inspiration which "scholarship has disparaged." He represents facts to have been "ascertained by the critical and conscientious study of the Bible during the last half century" which compel a revision of any theory of inspiration which does not allow for the presence of historical errors in the Bible, or even of "serious moral blemishes" "pertaining to the substance of revelation itself." He recognizes that this requires the rejection of all theories of verbal and of plenary inspiration alike, and calls for a new definition, which will adjust our theory to those multitudinous facts betraying human infirmity that are sown broadcast in our Bible.

Let us observe, in passing, the emphasis that is laid here upon the novelty of the facts which are asserted to compel a new definition, and the novelty of the definition which results from them. It is the tocsin of progress that is sounded. The facts are the product "of more exhaustive study of the Scriptures by improved critical and exegetical methods;" the readjustment, the result of "a legitimate and onward step in sacred learning." But what are these new facts? When we come to the specimens of them which are given us, they prove to be the oldest of old acquaintances. The first is the citation in Matt. xxvii. 9, which John Lightfoot notes two hundred and fifty years ago as an ancient troubler of expositors, and Augustine a thousand years earlier treats as a much discussed *crux* of his time. The others are like to this: the ordinary difficulties of harmony and interpreta-

tion—such as have been receiving the attention of expositors during all the Christian ages, and also, we may add, their plausible explanations. Even the “variations from fact” which are presented from the Old Testament are scarcely of recent “discovery,” although the power to compare the Old Testament narrative in detail with contemporary records is a modern acquisition. The two instances which Dr. DeWitt borrows from “an accomplished Assyriologist,” and upon which he stakes his case, are of the same kind as those adduced from the New Testament: have already received plausible explanations in abundance; and are so far from obviously cases in point that one wonders if they could be adduced by any one who did not have more confidence in the infallible science of Prof. Francis Brown than the infallible inspiration of “Daniel the prophet,”—as Christ at least thought and called him. Nor is the “new” definition new. In it, rather, very old and very familiar phrases meet us. We are told that inspiration is in the “substance,” not the “letter;” that it is “conceptional,” not “verbal;” that it is in the “thought rather than in the words;” and that its infallibility is “in matters of faith and practice” only. These “conceptions” and these “words” are as old as the Socinians.

It will already have been divined that the method by which Dr. DeWitt arrives at his “new” definition from these “novel” facts is the “inductive” one, so called. These “new” facts are to be taken into consideration for the modification of the old theory, and on them as a basis a new theory is to be erected. The principle of the new induction is thus made “the many inaccuracies and conflicting statements” and the moral incongruities which “the application of scientific tests” to the sacred books brings to light. Now, induction is a very important instrument for the discovery of truth. But it must be warily used. All the facts must be collected, and *understood*, and the reasoning upward from them must be exact. It must be rendered clear, for example, that the assumed “errors” are really errors, before the fact of “errors” can become determinative in the induction. There certainly still exists a difference of opinion on this point which might bid one pause in making them, as “errors,” the principle of the new induction. And there is a more important fact in a case like this than any or all of these “errors.” We have a fact of testimony—the testimony of Christ and His apostles. To set to one side this testimony and prefer to rest our doctrine on “induction from the facts,” is precisely the same procedure as to refuse to consider the signature of a letter and to insist on basing our “theory” of its authorship on an induction from the peculiarities of handwriting, style and matter alone. There is no doubt that in cases of necessity something can be done by this method, and, in the absence of a signature or where there is good ground to suspect forgery, dependence must be placed on it as the best we can do. But to neglect the testimony of the signature, to set it without reason aside, and to refuse it weight even presumptively, would be not science but folly. The great vice of “modern critical science” is that it does just this with the Bible. It makes a god of its so-called “induction;” it has such overweening confidence in its own divining power, that it thinks it can “just look at anything” and at once determine its origin and whole character; all those broad considerations which should really determine judgment are cast contemptuously aside, at the bidding of infallible insight. In the grasp of this modern tendency Dr. DeWitt also has been caught. He commits himself unreservedly to this method in determining the truth about inspiration. He declines to consider closely what Christ says about Scripture: he prefers to rise, by his own insight into the nexus of causes, from the *phenomena* of revelation to the *noumena* in which they originate. We are not misrepresenting him. He says, indeed, that the Bible

"does not define inspiration" (p. 72), and the like; but he says this on the basis of a refusal to investigate what our Lord does really say on the matter: "We shall not examine the sentences in which absolute endorsement is thought to be expressed, in order to ascertain whether they bind us to a strictly verbal inspiration of all the Scriptures. It is more than doubtful" (p. 40). But was not this examination just what he was bound to make? And must not the true meaning of these passages be something very much indeed "more than doubtful" before they can be neglected in favor of a so-called "inductive" determination of what Scripture is?

What is the principle that underlies this careless neglect of the teaching of Scripture as to itself, in favor of our own determination from the "phenomena," of what Scripture must be? Is it not this,—that we have more confidence in our reading of the meaning of facts than we have in the explicit teaching of Scripture? And is not this just the principle of Rationalism? Are we to put most confidence in the Bible's doctrine of creation, or in our findings as to creation, by induction from the facts as observed? Are we to put completest confidence in the Bible's doctrine of man's condition, or in our findings as to man's condition, by induction from the facts as observed? In a word, when the Bible is pitted against human insight and human speculation, which is to be trusted? It is sad to see Dr. DeWitt approvingly quoting the late Dr. Evans in a broad statement of this fundamentally rationalistic position (p. 43): "You may be sure that . . . as long as you exalt the Bible to the same pinnacle of authority in matters respecting which God has given us fuller and more exact revelation elsewhere, as in matters respecting which the Bible is the only revelation, the irrepressible conflict between faith and science will go on . . . The Christianity of our day cannot afford to fight the battle of the Book on that line." That is to say, when the Bible is the only source of knowledge concerning a matter, we may believe it; where there are other sources of knowledge, we must follow them and reject it. Certainly this is a good prescription for closing "the irrepressible conflict between faith and science." But it closes it by yielding faith. It gives up the case of the Bible once for all, and declines to defend it against any comer whatsoever. Is it wonderful that men who, more or less (and no doubt we must also say more or less consciously), act on this principle, find "multitudes" of errors in the Bible? Whenever there is an apparent disagreement, give up the Bible statement at once and without further parley. Should a nascent science, or a crude philosophy, dispute a Biblical statement, yield it. Should Josephus and Luke be found in disaccord, yield without further question to the authority of Josephus. If the inscriptions of the East do not as yet vindicate all that Daniel tells us, assume that we know all the details, wait for no more light from the monuments, and proclaim Daniel at once in error. Then make your induction on the phenomena of the Bible, thus ascertained. No wonder the resultant theory of inspiration is something different from that which the Church of God has always held.

When we turn to Dr. DeWitt's definition of inspiration, the first thing we notice is that it is not a definition of inspiration at all, in the more technical sense of that word, but a broad statement of the mode in which the whole divine element enters the Bible. Inspiration with him is the mode of revelation; God's part in the revealing process; the divine activity in giving the conception to the recipient of revelation. It thus does not express the activity of the Holy Spirit in securing the true record of revelation, but the activity of God in giving the revelation. This might well be a matter of mere definition, and might merely determine the sense in which Dr. DeWitt elects to use the term "inspiration," were it not that he seems to imply that the whole divine activity, in giving men a revelation (which he calls "inspi-

ration"), is exhausted in giving the revealed conception to the prophet himself. He says of the prophet: "He must express in human language the divine conception with which he was inspired, as well as he could" (p. 82). "The objective illumination was perfect. The prophet took in for the people what he could, and could give them no more than he had" (p. 92). "In some way—we need not know how—God thrusts forth into our murky atmosphere a pure thought concerning Himself, to be caught up and apprehended by human faculties, according to their condition and capacity. The form which it exhibits in these historic pages is principally the work of human brain-work, the best possible at the time" (p. 94). Accordingly, although the human and divine elements in the Scriptures are so closely wrought together in a single fabric that they cannot be separated—like the tares in the wheat is the author's own simile in another place—yet there is a "purely human" element in the Scriptures (p. 186), by virtue of which they may be called "merely human sources, even if inspired" (p. 168). There is in them "admixture of the true and the false" (p. 117). Worse than that: inspiration may have given only an impulse which was in its origin divine and holy, but which in the mind of the recipient may have become confused with his own "savage instincts," and so have undergone a fearful change before it has been consummated in act, to be recorded (as Paul, at least, says) for our example (p. 95). The Bible must be read therefore most judiciously; not everything recorded or even commended in it, or even represented in it as commanded by God, is right or authoritative. Christ's words are the Word of God, pure and undefiled: the apostles stood on a higher plane than the prophets, but both are subordinate and secondary to Him (p. 159). And from this fact we may obtain our criterion in judging them. Whatever in them we consider incongruous with the personal truth and grace in the Christ of the historic Gospels, is not to be held as authoritative to us (p. 168). Of course, this is to erect reason into the test of truth, within the limit of the Bible. Dr. DeWitt clearly perceives and allows it (pp. 64, 179): "How shall I discriminate between the better and the worse. . . . By the use of reason . . . including conscience and every spiritual faculty with which God has endowed him, strengthened and enlightened by the word, and life, and spirit of Christ. . . . This is the final and decisive test of all utterances or writings known among men. . . . We go fearlessly, therefore, to the old inspiration, approving or rejecting, as it may be. If anything agrees not with these words of Christ in the Gospels, and with the life of God incarnate, as illustrating his words . . . we renounce and denounce it as evil. Our enlightened moral instinct rejects it unreservedly and forever" (p. 180). That is, as a German would say, the *Schriftprinzip* is discarded and the *Geistprinzip* takes its place; and this is the characteristic attitude of the "liberal" as distinguished from the "positive" theology.

Let us note but one inconsistency. The revelation of God in the words and life of Christ is taken as the standard by which Reason, or "our enlightened moral instinct," judges of God's revelations. But whence get we our knowledge of the words and life of Christ? From the very Scriptures which are thus subjected to "our enlightened moral instinct." Can we trust them in their record here? Dr. DeWitt evidently feels the weakness of his position at this point, and betrays a desire to claim for this record the "inspiration" which he has rejected for all the rest: "He who came from heaven to identify himself with men, gave his personal assurance that his words should be correctly reported" (p. 178). How does he know that? From this very discredited record! He must not tear down our castle and then seek to build himself a comfortable house out of the ruins. Or, if he does, we will press the point. Christ has, then, given His personal assurance that His

words shall be correctly reported? This is certainly a promise of *aid* in securing this *correct report*: and this is a *promise of inspiration*, in the old sense. The record of Christ's life and words, then, is plenarily inspired, and is trustworthy as a *correct* record. Yet the record of Christ's life and words is the very field in which those discrepancy-seekers most disport themselves, on the basis of whose findings Dr. DeWitt pronounces the record to be full of errors! Either, then, these "discrepancies" do not suffice to disprove the correctness of the record, or else the assumed promise of Christ that His words should be correctly reported, was never given or never fulfilled. Dr. DeWitt may take one horn of this dilemma; he is not entitled to take both. But, if he takes the former, he must return to the doctrine of plenary inspiration; while if he takes the latter he must "advance" to pure rationalism. Any intermediate position, dependent as it is on embracing together two contradictory propositions, must always be one of "unstable equilibrium."

It is a pleasure to escape from the noise of these polemics into the greater calm of Mr. Rooke's more didactic discussion. Mr. Rooke was president of a British Baptist institution, Rawdon College, near Leeds, and evidently performed the multiform duties imposed upon the president of an English Non-Conformist Theological College, with a scholarship, industry and inspiring enthusiasm that justify the affectionate admiration of his pupils which has given birth to this memorial volume of lectures. The brief In Memoriam sketch which is prefixed to them gives the reader the impression of a most attractive personality and a truly scholarly teacher; and this impression is deepened by the matter of the lectures themselves. They consist of three courses—on Psychology, Inspiration and Pastoral Theology—not a bad indication of the impossible encyclopædic task required of a teacher in this position. The editors have made the central course specially prominent in taking from it the title to the volume, and we shall naturally concern ourselves in the present notice with it alone, only premising that the other courses are equally attractive.

Mr. Rooke takes up the subject of Inspiration in a straightforward way, and develops his views upon it in an orderly, scholarly and thoughtful manner. The conclusions at which he arrives are not those at which we should arrive; and are not consistent with the premises with which he starts out. There are inconsistencies in details which no doubt would have been removed, in some cases at any rate, had the author himself prepared the lectures for publication. There are odd cases of special pleading and confusion in reasoning; as, for example, in the examination of 2 Tim. iii. 16 (p. 119), a text which Mr. Rooke seems to try to empty of all meaning; or in the definition of Plenary Inspiration (p. 147), in which he confounds things that differ in quite a *sortes*, with the effect of gradually reducing the idea of *fullness* to that of *sufficiency*, a linguistic feat paralleled only in some of the etymological equivalents of *Salmagundi*. But the warp and woof of the discussion are strong and reverent, and the reader is instructed even where he is forced to criticise or to reject.

Mr. Rooke starts, where he should start, with the Bible's claim for itself; and draws out, briefly but well, the salient facts in this matter:

"Our Lord and His apostles always spoke and acted upon the assumption that the Old Testament Canon, as a whole, was absolutely authoritative in matters of religion. From its utterances, and from its teachings concerning divine things, there could be no appeal. This is the unmistakable meaning of Christ's word in John x. 35, the literal rendering of which is, 'The Scripture cannot be loosed,' *i. e.*, cannot be set aside as no longer binding upon the conscience and the judgment. . . . The apostles all adopt the same tone in their references to 'the Scriptures.' Paul especially seems sometimes to speak of the Scripture as though it were a living intelligence and not a mere material book (Gal. iii. 8, 22). He distinctly calls these Scriptures 'holy' (Rom. i. 2), and

for Paul a saying of Scripture is apparently equivalent to a saying of God himself (Rom. ix. 17). It is, in fact, superfluous to prove that New Testament writers ascribed to the Jewish Bible exactly that supreme authority in matters of religion which Protestant Christians claim for the whole Bible. Every attentive reader sees and feels that this is simple statement of self-evident fact" (p. 98).

Here, certainly, is the proper foundation of our doctrine of inspiration; and, apart from an unjustified desire to limit the New Testament recognition of the authority of the Old to matters specifically of religion—a limitation not found in or justified by, but rather already refuted by the texts quoted—it is an admirable brief statement of the essence of the New Testament doctrine. Starting from this, Mr. Rooke seeks to preserve a constant reverence for Scripture in his discussion, to realize the import and the importance of the questions at issue, and to reject every theory which appears to him to render it impossible to look upon the Scriptures as the Word of God, a revelation in all their parts from God to man. Although he may lapse occasionally from this attitude (as, *e. g.*, on p. 167), and although he finally presents a theory of inspiration which is of a lower order, yet this effort keeps the discussion throughout on a high level.

The theory of inspiration which Mr. Rooke teaches is one which he calls "the theory of Sufficient Knowledge," and is, briefly, that God communicates sufficient knowledge to every writer of the Bible to enable him to produce that portion of the Scriptures committed to him. Here the whole stress is laid on *knowledge*, the possession of which by the instrument of revelation is conceived to be all that is needed and all that is given as a safeguard for the record. This is, of course, a denial of all inspiration, technically so called, altogether. We are distinctly told that after the knowledge was framed in the minds of the sacred writers, they might well be "left to put their religious knowledge on permanent record, and that record would be sufficient for the divine purpose in giving us a Bible" (p. 162). The writing of the Bible is specifically referred to God's merely providential supervision (p. 138), and it is fully explained that thus the need of supposing either an "impulse to write" or a "*suggestio verborum*" is dispensed with, inasmuch as "the knowledge of the sacred writers is regarded as a sufficient warrant alike for their writing and for our acceptance of what they have written;" and "if the knowledge of the sacred writers was sufficient for its end, in each case, these writers could be trusted to express themselves in appropriate words, and there was no need for the Holy Spirit to supply the form as well as the matter of their utterance in every case, or even to superintend and check that utterance in its spoken or written form" (p. 158).*

This theory is obnoxious at once to several very obvious objections. In the first place, it is plainly inconsistent with the fact that the agents of revelation, on occasions, lacked just the "sufficient knowledge," the giving of which is here made the very essence of the divine activity in producing the Bible (Dan. xii. 8; 1 Peter i. 10, 11; 2 Peter i. 20, 21). Hence, either they were insufficiently prepared by inspiration (in Mr. Rooke's use of that term) to receive the revelation, or the revelation was badly given to their inspiration, —or else the definition breaks down. Mr. Rooke's attempts to meet this objection (pp. 139, 158) seem to miss the point. Again, it is plainly inconsistent with the absolute authority attributed by our Lord and His apostles to the written Scriptures in such passages as are quoted in the extract given above from Mr. Rooke (John x. 35; Rom. ix. 17; Gal. iii. 8, 22). By these

*As a matter of curious interest, we note that Dr. Pusey propounded a theory practically identical with this, in his explanatory letter to the Bishop of Oxford, dated October 6, 1828. His biographer is not unnaturally anxious for the reader to understand that Dr. Pusey's early views on such matters were afterwards greatly regretted by himself. See Dr. Liddon's *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Vol. i, p. 184.

the authority of Scripture is shown to inhere even in its vocables, its tenses, its numbers, and its forms of speech, as God's words. We regret to say, however, that it is just that he may *not* occupy this attitude—the attitude of Christ and His apostles—towards the form of Scripture, that Mr. Rooke frames this theory of inspiration; it is even one of the arguments which he adduces in support of his theory that upon it “the imperfections which may be discernible anywhere in the form, or even in the matter of what has been written,” do not impair the reverence we give the Scriptures as the Word of God. The “discrepancies and blemishes” in the histories of the Bible, and the “moral difficulties” of the Bible, belong all, according to his theory, to the human form. In one remarkable passage, indeed, Mr. Rooke speaks as if much of the Bible's contents were not, after all, part of God's revelation to man, but just a body of documents collected to illustrate the history of the development of the moral or devotional life of Israel. When speaking of Jacob's prayer at Bethel and of David's Imprecatory Psalms, he says, “Such Prayers and Psalms are on record to show us the stages through which God's Spirit has caused the devotional impulses of His children to rise from the lowest ground of unregenerate selfishness to the purer regions of heavenly-mindedness and love” (p. 165). Such teaching is simply subversive of his whole theory of Scripture.

The following is a brief, connected statement of this theory, as a whole. “Holy Scripture, then, is the outcome and the written record of a long succession of operations by the Divine Spirit upon selected individuals whom it calls prophets. . . . Each separate portion of it is a ‘prophecy’ in the true sense of that word. . . . For every such prophecy, the soul of the prophet has been specially prepared in the sphere of spiritual consciousness, and this spiritual preparation we call Inspiration. . . . To the soul thus prepared some new aspect of the Thought or Will of God has been presented, and this objective presentation of spiritual truth we call Revelation” (p. 137). Inspiration is therefore (in this sphere) “the inward spiritual preparation of a man to know and to feel what God chooses to communicate of His Divine Thought and Will” (p. 131). Inspiration and Revelation are thus “correlative terms—twin factors of knowledge in some human consciousness, inspiration being the subjective factor and revelation being the objective factor” (p. 137). “The resultant of Revelation and Inspiration in a human consciousness is knowledge, which knowledge, as soon as it is expressed in words, orally, or by writing, becomes Prophecy; and Holy Scripture is only the organized aggregate of all the knowledge which God's providence has ordained should thus be perpetuated as the authoritative guide of man in spiritual matters” (p. 138).

As a result of this definition, Mr. Rooke declines to call the Bible an “inspired book” (p. 131), though he speaks of it freely as throughout a prophetic book and declares all its writers to be “inspired prophets.” In like manner, he even girds at those who speak of its earlier portions as “revelations” (p. 107), while yet he makes it throughout the product of prophets who had by revelation received “sufficient knowledge” to write it; and here and there pens most excellent passages in defense of the revelatory character of even its historic portions (pp. 162, 163). The fact is, that his theory makes the Bible the product of men who had been inspired to receive revelations, but provides no *nexus* between the revelations which they received and the book which they have produced. They were, by the interaction of Inspiration and Revelation, given Sufficient Knowledge; but we are given no guarantee that that Sufficient Knowledge is embodied for us in these records. The “Sufficient Knowledge” is represented as its own guarantee. Mr. Rooke no doubt shows a consciousness of the difficulty which

here faces his theory, and sometimes passes the gulf with a bound. When speaking of the origin of historic Scripture, he writes :

"The process which has thus given birth to the historical parts of Scripture is the same process which has given birth to the Psalms, the prophecies, the doctrinal epistles, viz., *first*, the preparation of a human soul by a special energy of the Holy Ghost ; *second*, a presentation to that prepared soul of truth which was previously unknown, either in itself or in its proper relations and effects ; *the result being that the inspired man breaks forth into words which faithfully embody the divine thought which God has willed to communicate through him to the world*" (p. 163).

No doubt, no doubt, we say : only on Mr. Rooke's theory there is no reason to believe it. Let us not get confused with words and definitions ; define "inspiration," the word, as we may, we must come ever back to this question, What guarantee have we that "the divine thought is faithfully communicated to the world ?" We are careless what name is applied to it ; but we must have a recognition of the fact that there is a divine element in the communication, guaranteeing its faithfulness, as well as in the reception of the message.

Mr. Rooke wisely remarks that every theory of inspiration has its corresponding theory of the Canon. His theory of the Canon is distinctly a mystical one, and one would think would harmonize better with the "illumination" theory of inspiration which he rejects, than with his own theory of "sufficient knowledge." He says quite boldly that "the Church collectively has been inspired to recognize the entire Bible as the permanent organized record of God's dealings with man in the way of grace" (p. 140) ; that "the Canon, as a whole, came into being exactly as each separate book in it originated, with this one distinction, that each book is the outcome of knowledge in the mind of an individual man, that knowledge having resulted from inspiration combined with revelation, while the Canon, as a whole, is the monument of knowledge in the mind of the collective Church, that knowledge having resulted similarly from the spiritual preparation of its members, combined with the presentation to them of certain books which they recognized as having divine authority" (p. 145). Thus the Church as a whole, by virtue of its possession of the Spirit, is inspired in the same kind as the writers of Scripture ; and the Canon rests in the last analysis on "spiritual instinct" (p. 141). On such ground we should be bound hand and foot, and handed over to the tender mercies of that modern subjectivism which Mr. Rooke knows very well how to estimate (pp. 148, 156). The odd thing is, that he knows also the true principle of the Canon ; he tells us that at A.D. 170 we find the Christian Church in possession of practically our New Testament, "and professing to have received it by unquestioned tradition from its inspired authors" (p. 171). Oh ! that's the point ! Why cannot we see, then, that the principle of the Canon is not canonization by our spiritual instinct, but reception as a gift from the inspired authors ? The Bible is primarily authoritative because it has been given to the Church as its code of law—its "rule" or "Canon"—by the authoritative founders of the Church, the apostles whom Christ appointed. It is immediately authoritative, because it was given to the Church through these apostles by God, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. If we deny or neglect first the gift by the apostles, by which we have the Canon, and then the inspiration of God by which the apostles wrote, we are left without any objective authority at all, and the only logical standing place is in pure subjectivism.

It is exceedingly evident that it is a sheer impossibility to frame a doctrine of inspiration which will preserve the Bible as the authoritative revelation of God, on such lines as those laid down by these three little books. And this for two very obvious reasons. The attempts begin by conceding the very thing to be safeguarded : the trustworthiness of the record. And they proceed

by discarding renewedly this very thing to be safeguarded : in neglecting and then discrediting the Bible's own testimony to itself. It is as clear as daylight that the goal to which they tend, and at which they will all sooner or later arrive, is the rejection of all "external authority," and the erection of the human spirit, in one form or another—under the name of reason, or Christian experience, or the Christian consciousness, or the inner light, or the testimony of the Spirit—into the sole test, the sole norm, ultimately the sole source of truth. There is, on the other hand, but one course for consistent Christian thinkers in determining their doctrine of inspiration : to go straight and humbly to the Bible, "rejecting nothing, selecting nothing and scorning nothing," but simply transcribing *its* doctrine of inspiration. It may, of course, turn out that the Bible's doctrine of inspiration is not true. But it is the only Christian doctrine of inspiration. And when it falls, all that has any claim to be distinctive Christianity—which rests on the Bible, its only trustworthy source—falls with it. Perhaps we can do without any doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures, when we no longer attach importance to what those Scriptures teach.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

Theological Propædæutic. A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic and Practical, including Encyclopædia, Methodology and Bibliography. A Manual for Students. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Part ii. 8vo, pp. xii, and from 234 to 536, with a Bibliography by the Rev. Samuel Macaulay Jackson, M.A., D.D., LL.D., pp. 60. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.) The first part of Dr. Schaff's *Propædæutic* was noticed in this REVIEW for October, 1893 (Vol. iv, p. 683). This second part chanced to come to our hands on the very day on which the death of its distinguished author was announced in the daily press. It is not a book which can serve as his monument, not even alongside of his really monumental *Church History* and *Creeds of Christendom*, or of those great editorial undertakings like the American edition of Lange's *Commentaries* which embalm his memory among us. It is not even a book which is fitted to increase his reputation. It bears of course the impress of his special qualities, of diligence and skill in the gathering and use of a very wide material ; the general tone of the book is that of the quiet mastery of his matter to which Dr. Schaff's readers are accustomed ; not only is the whole subject treated with obvious care and with broad learning, but the book is filled with wise remarks and helpful hints ; in particular the notes on the literature of the several branches and subbranches of theological science are a marvel of selective judiciousness. The reader feels that he is in the hands of a wise guide in all these matters. Nevertheless the book falls short of being a satisfactory manual of its subject. It is encyclopædic rather than organic in its structure, and of quite unequal value in its several parts. It is not free from the occasional intrusion of irrelevant matter which is marred by a polemic spirit ; and it is not as a polemic divine that Dr. Schaff commands our greatest admiration. Even in his great works, Dr. Schaff has not always been able to keep his personal theological point of view from coloring his treatment of fact and opinion. In the present volume he permits himself to go out of his way more than once to attack forms of doctrine which were distasteful to him, with argument and almost with vituperation. Thus when he speaks of the Protestant doctrine of inspiration—which moreover his own Church has just judicially affirmed to be an essential element of its faith—he calls it "the (imaginary) inerrancy of the original autographs" (p. 319). He even turns aside from his proper subject to insert a