

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 42—April, 1900.

I.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

AT the very beginning of the discussion of the question of Authority in Religion, it is necessary to observe with some care that there is really no essential difference between religious knowledge and any other kind of knowledge. The conditions of knowledge, the laws of cognition, are not contingent upon the nature of the truth apprehended or upon the region of thought involved. The variable elements in the problem pertain rather to the accessibility or inaccessibility of the truth in contemplation, the mediateness or immediateness with which it presents itself to the mind, the readiness or inability of the perceiving faculty to respond, and the rational consequences that follow the perceiving act.

At the bottom of our inquiry lies the question whether we can properly be said to believe more than we know. To the question, thus put, no unqualified answer can be given. Everything must wait upon our definition of terms. And we no sooner attempt to define these well-worn words than we find that we are assuming certain whole systems of philosophy to be true and rejecting certain others as false. This being so, we must content ourselves with what we find to be the best prevailing usage and with adhering as far as possible to that. Augustine says, "*Credere nihil aliud est quam cum assensione cogitare.*" It will be noted that this conception is entirely general, and not merely theological. Kant makes belief to occupy a sort of middle ground between guessing, on the one side, in which we are conscious that the evidence is not convincing either to ourselves or to others, and

They are intended as simple presentations of the fundamental facts as to the Canon, Language and Transmission of the Old Testament for the inducting of beginners into primary Isagogics. As such, we think it only fair to say that they are conceived and executed in a manner that is worthy of all praise. A fine restraint governs the whole treatment, a clear and sound discrimination between established fact and more or less plausible (or unplausible) theory: the youthful mind is not overwhelmed with a *rudis indigestaque moles* of fact and fancy, or even of probable fact, or yet of ascertained *minutiæ*. The great and salient facts and considerations are plainly and simply brought forward, cleansed of all confusing details: and only such discussions are added as seemed necessary to throw out this one steady line of statement into proper relief. The scholar taking up the books may find the treatment primary, perhaps thin (from his point of view), a bit antiquated (he may even think). It is an unfair judgment. They are not addressed to scholars, but to beginners: they are not intended to be fresh, but fundamental; they are not wrought out in detail, but in outline. When judged according to their own purpose, we repeat, they are little short of models of their type of literature: and if they will not add to Dr. Green's fame as a scholar they will add to his reputation as a teacher. It is to be deeply regretted that Dr. Green's life was not spared to complete the *magnum opus* he had projected, and only fragments of which have seen the light—in *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* and *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*. The former of these books was written as a general introduction to a great work on the Pentateuch, of which *The Unity of the Book of Genesis* was to be the first part. The hand of disease was already laid on the great frame, however, and, on his publishers' advice, Dr. Green consented so to alter his plan as to issue these two parts as separate works, instead of as the opening portions of the great whole. The event proved the wisdom of the change. Only *dissecta membra* of the remaining sections of the contemplated treatise remain. Had we it all we should have a treasure of scholarship, a rock of Apologetic indeed. Meanwhile the one published fragment, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, offers to the school of destructive criticism a rock which it appears to find it more convenient to pass by than to attempt to remove from the path.—**General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture.** The Principles, Methods, History and Results of its Several Departments and of the Whole. By *Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D.*, Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. 8vo, pp. xxii, 688. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.) Everything said in the Preface of this massive volume as to the advance marked in it upon the *Biblical Study* of 1883 out of which it has grown and whose place it is to take, is thoroughly justified in the text. Dr. Briggs' well-known diligence, the wideness of his research, what may be called the acquisitiveness of his genius, never had a better illustration than in the evolution of this capacious volume. The old chapter on the Canon has swelled to two. That on the Text to four, as has also that on Hebrew Poetry. The treatment of the history of Higher Criticism has been continued, as Dr. Briggs says, "down to the present time"—including a most misplaced series of observations on his own trial for heresy, inserted apparently under the delusion that it constitutes "a necessary part of the history of the Higher Criticism," which the young student of the Scriptures cannot get along without knowing all about, even in the private animosities which it has engendered in Dr. Briggs' own breast. The treatment of the Prose Literature of the Bible has been greatly enlarged by the insertion of a detailed discussion of Biblical History and the Prose Works of the Imagination. New chapters have been added on "The Credibility of Holy Scripture" and "The Inerrancy of

Holy Scripture." This is a very imperfect *précis* of the enlargement and readjustment which the book has received : and it is entirely true that it has "not simply been revised, it has been made over in to a new one." Nevertheless the point of view and general spirit which characterized the old book remain ; and, in that sense, the book continues the same old one revised and enlarged. It is, after all, only by accretion that it has grown, gathering new material for the enrichment of its pages as the years rolled on. It presents a large and closely compacted mass of facts relevant to the whole sphere of Bible study. But the facts have not been gathered by the calm scholar in the dry light of science ; nor are they presented with the coolness of a purely judicial mind. Everywhere the heat of prejudgment and the flames of a burning polemic zeal have warped alike their collection, selection and presentation ; and opinion takes a larger place in the pages of the book than fact. Add the brusqueness of Dr. Briggs' style, the inconsequence of his composition ; the disproportion of his treatment, the lack of restraint both in his manner and in his use of his matter, his defective sense of form—and we have some of the causes why the real excellences of his book fail to make it an admirable volume. If Dr. Briggs could only have found, amid the blocks of "twenty years" and "a quarter of a century," which he has told us from time to time he has given to the study of this or that branch of research, another twenty years or so which he might have given to cultivating the art of self-restraint, on the one hand, and the art of orderly and proportional presentation, on the other, his remarkable industry and his great talents might have received their crown in a corresponding usefulness. As it is, as there is hardly a page he has written that we can read without instruction, there is hardly a page we can read without offence ; and he who commits himself to Dr. Briggs' guidance without checking every statement by a reversion to the sources of information will find himself led shortly into the bogs. The volume now before us, therefore, we think better in the hands of the teacher than of the taught : to the cautious and judicious reader who knows how to sift the material offered him, it will bring stimulus, and offer many useful suggestions ; for the helpless inquirer seeking assured knowledge it may prove a somewhat blind guide, with the usual results.

—**Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult.** By *Ismar J. Peritz, A.M., Ph.D.* (Harv.), Professor of Semitic Languages and Archæology, Syracuse University. Reprinted from the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1898, II). 8vo, pp. iv, 38. (The Author. Syracuse University, N. Y.) The primary incitement to this survey of the facts relating to woman's place in worship under the Old Testament period seems to have been the discussion in the Methodist Episcopal Church as to the propriety of the admission of women to membership in the General Conference. The ample proof that is brought for the participation of women, in Old Testament times, in the worship of Jehovah, though welcome in itself, seems from this point of view scarcely *ad hoc*. For their sharing in the "Cult" of Israel, as the author invariably calls it, in an official capacity, he has nothing to urge except the "serving women" at the door of the tent of Ex. xxxviii. 8, 1 Sam. ii. 22, and the "singing women" of Neh. vii. 67, Ezra ii. 65, eked out by the "prophetic women"—Huldah and Deborah and Miriam—under the supposition that the functions of priest and prophet were in early times combined—and the "divining women" of more dubious relations. Even supposing that his search for evidence of governing feminine religious officials in old Israel had been more successful, the inquiry of *cui bono* would be very much in place. Not to the Christian Church : for the author himself admits that the "later Levitical legislation" is unfavorable to the idea ; and had he prolonged his investigation into the New Testament he would have needs confessed that it is prohibitive of it. Nor to the critical scholar like him-