

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 3—July, 1905.

I.

THE NINETEENTH PSALM IN THE CRITICISM OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

IN the first part of the nineteenth Psalm, comprising verses 2-7, or 1-6 as numbered in the English versions, the Psalmist sings of the glory of God as displayed in the heavens:

- 2 The heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament showeth his handiwork.
3 Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge.
4 There is no speech nor language,
Their voice is unheard.
5 Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world.

In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,
6 Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.
7 His going forth is from the end of the heavens,
And his circuit unto the ends of it;
And there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.

In the second part the glory of Jehovah's law is first extolled:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 8 The law of Jehovah is perfect, | restoring the soul: |
| The testimony of Jehovah is sure, | making wise the simple. |
| 9 The precepts of Jehovah are right, | rejoicing the heart: |
| The commandment of Jehovah is pure, | enlightening the eyes. |
| 10 The fear of Jehovah is clean, | enduring forever: |
| The ordinances of Jehovah are true, | and righteous altogether. |
| 11 More to be desired are they than gold, | yea, than much fine gold; |
| Sweeter also than honey | and the droppings of the honey comb. |

as do the Catholics, may be true in theory, but very few Reformed theologians now insist on the presbytery *de jure divino*. Hence his criticism of the Presbyterian system seems unduly severe. He says: "It is a model of secular government; but it is more utterly lacking in Scripture authority, is more thoroughly opposed to the New Testament idea of the Church, than any of the rival forms of government which have been developed from *Catholic* principles" (p. 54).

This large liberty from legalism in polity he wishes extended also to creeds. He would enlarge the well-known statement to read: "The Protestant principle should now be: Whatsoever is *not necessary to salvation, whether in the Scriptures or out of them*, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith" (p. 66). He thinks Congregationalists and Anglicans lead in taking this position.

This work of Lowrie, especially if it shall lead to a study of the great work of Sohm back of it, is worthy of the attention of all Church leaders. Especially in these days of efforts toward union among the Churches, it would greatly facilitate progress if all matters of legal organization were to be regarded as belonging to the domain of Christian expediency and edification and not primarily to divine revelation. But here, as elsewhere, custom and prejudice, not law and organization, will be the chief obstacles in the way. It is hardly too much to say that the Episcopal Church, to which our author belongs, while holding no dogma of Church government, is the most relentless in insisting upon its own clerical grades as indispensable to Church order and work. It will be most gratifying if his work shall act as leaven in the hierarchical Churches; for in the great body of evangelical Churches there is really no question of dogma to be overcome in returning to what is called the charismatic Church of the New Testament.

Chicago, Ill.

HUGH M. SCOTT.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY. By W. BEVERIDGE, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. Crown 8vo: pp. xvi, 169. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price, \$1 net.

Mr. Beveridge has managed to put into this brief compass a clear, exact and brightly written account of the Westminster Assembly and its work. One of the features of the volume is the admirable pains that have been expended in making it easy to use. It is broken into short chapters, which are themselves subdivided into numbered sections, a list of which is given at the beginning of each chapter: the repetition of these section-headings in the Table of Contents provides a complete analysis of the contents of the volume. There is a sufficient index. A "Table of Dates and Events in the History of the Assembly" is inserted immediately after the Table of Contents. Four appendices supply documentary illustrations. One would think that the needs of most readers would be amply supplied by the readable and carefully framed narrative.

The matter of the book seems open to very few criticisms. The complicated question of the Committees engaged on the first draught of the Confession of Faith is very wisely passed over lightly (p. 108). Perhaps the phrase, "The Committee appointed in 1644 made its report on May 12, 1645," needs some modification in view of the doubt whether prior to May 9 there was one Committee or two charged with this business (see *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, April, 1901, p. 235). Possibly the sources of the Larger Catechism are not quite accurately stated (p. 138, cf. Mitchell's *Baird Lectures*, ed. 2, p. 434). Some confusion may be created in the uninstructed reader's mind by the remark on p. 106 to the effect that "the Scotch Confession of 1560 ignores the decree of reprobation," in connection with that on p. 120 to the effect that "the Westminster Confession, in contrast with the Scottish Confession, does not use the word *reprobate* in its Article on Election," and the exaggeration of this on p. 128 into "The Westminu-

ster Confession makes no reference to a *decree of reprobation*." In truth, of course, the Scotch Confession of 1560 does not ignore the decree of reprobation (see *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1901, pp. 67, 106, 123), nor does the Westminster Confession fail to teach it explicitly (chap. iii, §§ 3, 4, 7), although it does not make use of the term "reprobation." There is too decided a tendency to explain away the Westminster Confession's rejection of Amyraldism on p. 114 and pp. 128-129: this rejection is explicit and cannot be so set aside (cf. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, April, 1901, p. 276).

The remarks on p. 61 on the *jus divinum* of "ruling elders" in the light of "modern investigations" do not appear to us quite to meet the state of the case. That in every church it was the wish of Paul that a plurality of presbyters who shared in the government should be ordained, appears to us not open to question. That all of these "ruled" and only some of them "taught" seems clearly implied in such a text as 1 Tim. v. 17; from which text, therefore, at least a nascent differentiation of function among the presbyters seems capable of being inferred. Modern investigation does not appear to have set aside these conclusions, and Mr. Beveridge does not seem to think it has. But the natural inference to draw from them seems to threaten not the *jus divinum* for the ruling elder so much as the differentiated teaching elder,—the "minister," "pastor," or "bishop," as we may choose to call him. The fact seems, indeed, to be that the "ruling elder" is clearly *jure divino*; while the exclusive teaching elder may have difficulty in establishing his right on New Testament grounds. Indeed, it was just to establish his right that Dr. Lightfoot's immense historical learning was devoted in his famous essay. We ourselves think he fairly succeeded; and we are prepared to follow him in his discovery of warrant for the differentiated "teaching presbyter" or "bishop"—of course "parochial", since even Dr. Lightfoot did not find (or, for the matter of that, seek) a scintilla of evidence for the apostolic origin of the "diocesan bishop." In our personal opinion, therefore, the result of modern investigation has been to shift the onus of the question entirely. It has left the "ruling elder" with a clear *jus divinum* and raised a problem about the differentiated parochial "bishop" or "teaching elder."

In one or two phrases Mr. Beveridge has been led astray by the authorities on whom he has relied. "Modern theology" cannot be said to be "Christological" (p. 116) by any one who does not follow Dr. Schaff in his "mediating theology" (which is now passing, if it has not largely already passed, out of view), and then (like him) mistake his own theology for "modern theology." All theology is "theocentric"—on pain of ceasing to be "theology." It is very probably Dr. Schaff also or Dr. Mitchell who has misled Mr. Beveridge in misdefining "Infralapsarianism" (pp. 106, 127) as "putting the Fall under a *permissive* decree, and making man alone responsible for sin and condemnation." It is characteristic of Infralapsarianism no more than of Supralapsarianism "to put the Fall under a *permissive* decree," or "to make man alone responsible for sin and condemnation." Such questions lie outside the debate between these two parties of Calvinists, whose difference concerns solely the question of what is technically called "the object of predestination" in the soteriological sense of that word. The very terms are enough to indicate this: we cannot speak of Infralapsarian and Supralapsarian except with reference to another decree (namely, that of "election") as placed by the two parties in different relations to the decree of the Fall, which is therefore held in common by them both. Infralapsarians and Supralapsarians as such do not differ as to the relation of the decree of God to the Fall or as to the sole responsibility of man for sin (cf. *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1901, pp. 126-127).

It was doubtless inevitable in the circumstances that Mr. Beveridge should have something to say of the "Confession of Faith and the Free Church of Scot-

land Declaratory Act, 1892." But we are not sure whether the insertion of the long section (pp. 122-132) upon this subject does not mar the unity of the book, and throw a local and temporary coloring about it which it does not deserve to have. We think it a pity to place such stress on Lord Halsbury's amazing and amusing excursions into a domain evidently so unwonted to him as theology. His views were in no sense supported by the court, and stand out in history only as one of the curiosities of legal literature. But on the other hand, it seems hardly possible to acquit the Free Church Declaratory Act of bungling. None of our Presbyterian Churches which have passed Declaratory Acts of late can be said to have been happy in its work. The motives that have swayed them may be good, and the essential meaning of the Acts may be defensible: but what they have said has assuredly not been well said, and will not be permanently held to be creditable to the clarity of theological thought or the power of theological definition of their authors. The Church of Henderson, Rutherford, Gillespie and Baillie would beyond all question as zealously as the Free Church of Scotland have asserted the privilege and duty of the free proclamation of the Gospel, the responsibility of men for their reception of the Gospel, the condemnation of men solely for sin. But it would have asserted these things indefinitely better than the Free Church managed to express them in its Declaratory Act: and it may be safely predicted that not even a Lord Halsbury could have commented on their expression of them as this wonderful theologian has, not without some excuse, commented on the Free Church Declaratory Act. It is not merely Lord Halsbury who is to blame if the Free Church has been misunderstood. And his misunderstanding is not apt to be the only evil that will come from such a bungling piece of work.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN ITS FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

By the late WILLIAM HASTIE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Edited by WILLIAM FULTON, B.D., B.Sc., formerly Scholar and Fellow of the University of Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Svo; pp. xvi, 283. \$2 net.

This notable volume consists of the Croall Lectures delivered by the late Prof. Hastie in the Tron Church of Edinburgh in the spring of 1892. A variety of considerations induced the author to secure permission from the Croall Trustees to take his own time for the fulfillment of what, besides the actual delivery of the discourses, constitutes an indispensable condition for lecturing upon this foundation, namely, the publication of the work. And so it came to pass that Dr. Hastie, by delaying the appearance of his book from year to year in order to enlarge and verify his studies, was prevented by death from bringing out his *Lectures* in the very form in which he would have chosen to have them. A student and friend of his, Mr. Fulton, has, however, most admirably done the necessary editorial work. The most important references have been supplied; only here and there are slight gaps left in the chain of argument; and for the most part we have the very words of the lecturer himself.

We heartily endorse the wish which Prof. Flint expresses in his brief commendatory Preface, that the "work so long looked for" may be "widely and kindly received." Indeed, we cannot refrain from saying at the very outset, that we regard Dr. Hastie's exposition of the historic development of the Reformed theology as one of the clearest, strongest, and most valuable presentations of this theme that have as yet appeared in our own or in any other language. Almost every page reveals the author's superlative qualifications for the task he has undertaken. A genuine lover of the Reformed theology, he made it his life-work to investigate its genesis, to defend its principles, and to apply its truths to the