

NOV 17 1913
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITORS

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
JAMES OSCAR BOYD
KERR D. MACMILLAN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD
JOHN DE WITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
JOSEPH H. DULLES

HENRY W. SMITH

VOLUME XI

1913

Published Quarterly for
THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW ASSOCIATION
by
THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, N. J.

analogous to the means whereby any other personality influences it"; "all that can be said is that the means whereby the Holy Ghost operates in the sub-conscious realm seem to be analogous to those by which any other personality can work in it—by means of impressions which have been received through the consciousness" (p. 385), Dr. La Touche himself confesses by adding in a footnote: "The fact that there is such a thing as the new birth, or change of nature, would, however, point to a special operation of the Holy Ghost, to use the old Puritan phrase, beyond consciousness." We do not quite understand what is meant when it is said that "manhood as such is not personality" (p. 387) or that "human personality is most truly human when most truly divine." (p. 388). These flies in the amber, however, do not in the least destroy the quality of the amber in which they are, here and there, imbedded.

We should note before closing that a valuable Appendix on "Consciousness and the Sub-conscious" from the pen of the Rev. Thomas Chatterton Hammond, M.A., has been added to the volume.

The printing of the volume is not immaculate. We have not been careful to collect the misprints, but we may note a few which we have chanced to mark on the margin: Page 25, line 7 from bottom; "Arbeitszeiles"; p. 141, line 7 from bottom, "our Lord Self-consciousness"; p. 153, line 14, "Geissen"; p. 193, line 4 from bottom, "allow" (for "deny"); p. 211 line 4, "Aufklarung"; p. 231, line 9, end, period (for comma); p. 285, line 16, a superfluous "the". So good a book should early go into a second edition, and perhaps the noting of these slips may help towards their correction.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Is Jesus God? An Argument by GRADUATES OF PRINCETON SEMINARY.
With Introductory Note by Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D. New York:
American Tract Society. [1912.] 16mo; pp. 152.

This little book, written by a number of students (not "graduates" as the publishers improperly say) of Princeton Seminary, owes its origin to an attempt by members of a class engaged in the study of the doctrine of the Person of our Lord during the session of 1911-1912, to give a reasoned answer to a series of inquiries, which, taken in sequence, raise the salient questions which must be faced in a historical investigation of the evidence for the Deity of Christ. These inquiries, in their order, were: Does the Christian Church teach the Deity of Christ? Has the Christian Church always taught the Deity of Christ? Do the New Testament writers teach the Deity of Christ? Do the Evangelists represent Christ as teaching His Deity? Did Jesus teach His own Deity? Is Christ God? As will be seen, essays on these subjects, read consecutively, will constitute a systematic argument for our Lord's Deity. Such a series of brief essays is brought together in this volume. There are nine essays in all, one each on the first three questions, two each on the last three—in which the argument culminates. These nine essays are written by nine several students, but,

though of such diverse authorship they fit well into one another and together build up their argument step by step, without break. They were written as class-room exercises during the Centennial session of the Seminary and have been published in commemoration of the celebration of that Centennial. They present a specimen of the kind of work done in the class-rooms of the Seminary, and it is hoped that in their published form they may prove useful.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture. By JOHN MONRO GIBSON, M.A., LL.D. With an Introduction by Principal Forsyth, M.A., D.D. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1912. Pp. 246.

This volume is one of the "Christian Faith and Doctrine Series", edited by F. B. Meyer. Dr. Gibson divides his discussion into three parts. Part I is introductory and deals with the Canon and the method to be employed in treating of the question of Inspiration. Part II is on "The Inspiration and Authority of Revelation", and Part III is on the "Inspiration and Authority of the Record", i. e. the Bible.

Dr. Gibson very properly distinguishes between the supernatural Revelation which God has made and the written record of that Revelation in the Bible. By the "inspiration of the Revelation" he means to say that it comes from God in a supernatural manner. How far, then, or to what extent, does Dr. Gibson believe that inspiration extends to the record of Revelation or the Bible? He rejects the theory of partial inspiration, and asserts that we cannot say that some parts of the Bible are inspired and others not (pp. 167, 168). It is rather a theory of graded inspiration which Dr. Gibson affirms, some parts of the Bible being supposed to be more inspired than other parts. This view rests, with Dr. Gibson, as it does in the case of most of its advocates, upon a confusion of the inspiration of the Bible with its saving efficacy as a means of grace. Dr. Gibson asks why it is that the Christian's Bible is more "worn" and "thumbed" at the Psalms and the Gospels than at Leviticus or Esther, apparently supposing that if all parts of the Bible are equally inspired, they must all be equally profitable as a means of grace. This is simply a confusion of two quite different matters.

Moreover, the entire discussion is vitiated by Dr. Gibson's identification of the Christian Church's doctrine of Plenary Inspiration with the mechanical or dictation theory which suppresses the human element in the Bible altogether. He is right in asserting that the Scripture is through and through human, but that by no means involves Dr. Gibson's idea that it is full of errors and mistakes. In short, Dr. Gibson has totally misrepresented the Church's doctrine of Plenary Inspiration.

His own view, moreover, he leaves wholly without clear definition. One may search the entire third part of the book without being able to find out what Dr. Gibson means by the "inspiration of the record".

In addition to this defect, his method is faulty. He accuses all