

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 52==APRIL, 1900.

I. THEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE.

Our age, on its religious side, has been characterized as an age of doubt. We are constrained to admit that there is a propriety in this characterization. Doubt with regard to religious matters is more widespread at present than it was in days gone by. This is not saying that the Christian religion has not a stronger hold upon men to-day than ever before, for it has. The mustard seed sown in the ground and springing up into an herb is growing yet, though already the greatest of all herbs. The leaven hid away in the meal is still permeating the mass, and will continue till the whole is leavened. The doubt of our age does not furnish sufficient ground to justify the believer in entertaining pessimistic views of the future. But there is none the less a widespread spirit of questioning and uncertainty concerning things religious. It is not confined to the student's cloister, but is found among the masses. It appears in a good deal of the popular literature of the day, and tends to create for itself a congenial soil, if that be not already found. But as has been remarked by those observant of the trend of theological thought in our day, while doubt is more general than it was in a former age, it is not of the same intensity. It is not so much a positive denial as it is an enquiry. A century ago unbelief was very sure of itself. It sneered at faith, and assumed a happy, even a lightsome attitude. But such self-complacency has largely disappeared from the theological world, and in its place there is more of earnest investigation.

EDITORIAL.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

Born at Groveville, near Princeton, January 27th, 1825, matriculated at Lafayette College at twelve, graduated with honors before he was sixteen, two years tutor there, graduated at Princeton Seminary in 1836, appointed instructor in Hebrew the same year, and remaining in the same department and the same institution for fifty-four years (1849-1851), when he was pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia—such are the external facts in the life of the great Biblical scholar, who has so recently gone to his reward, at the ripe age of seventy-five.

Two or three of the facts above stated might make the impression that he was a precocious and brilliant man, to whom hard tasks were easy. This was not the case. Dr. Green's career is one of the best contemporary illustrations of the immense results that can be accomplished by definiteness of aim, steadfastness of purpose, and hard work. He had a clear, strong, well-balanced mind, but he was not a genius, in the usual acceptance of that term. He became the greatest Biblical scholar in America, not by natural superiority of intellectual endowments, but by devout and strenuous study. When preparing for college he insistently and earnestly begged to be excused from the study of the languages on the ground that he had no aptitude whatever for them. This incident in the life of a man who became a world-renowned linguist is commended to the attention of those who are pushing the fixed curriculum to one side to make place for optional or elective courses on the supposition that boys at college best know what their own aptitudes are.

The real secret of young Green's perfect recitations in the class room, and of his leisure for chess playing and the reading of Tasso in French, lay in his fidelity and his systematic habits. He was not only prompt at every recitation, but he never missed college prayers in the chapel at five

o'clock in the morning, summer and winter. He made conscience of work. He was a servant of God in study. He early perceived the spiritual value of earnest intellectual toil and the truth of the exhortation which one of the early instructors in Princeton College used to address to his pupils: "Gentlemen, you will find the best preparation for death to be a really thorough knowledge of Greek grammar."

When he became a teacher the same high and serious temper made him intolerant of indolence and lack of conscientiousness on the part of a professed servant of God, and gave him the respect of all his students. The permanent regard of students is not to be won by indulgent and easy-going methods, by expecting little of them, but by inciting them to tasks that will develop their powers and by setting them the example of conscientious application. Dr. Green was not unjust, but he was exacting, and, though teaching the least attractive and most difficult part of the seminary course, the part that sometimes develops those mysterious diseases of the eyes which about the third or fourth week of the Junior year suddenly convince the candidate that he will never be able to see well enough to master Hebrew, he succeeded in making most of his men work harder for him than for any other professor, not by oburgation or passionate denunciation of idleness or stupidity, but by "the simple weight and insistence of his personality"—a modest, earnest, firm, hard-working, scholarly Christian man. One of his former pupils says: "There was often a prevailing sense of short-coming. In many *points*—we offend all." But they kept at it. The man in the chair was a splendid example of what could be done by keeping everlastingly at it. And they knew that, great as were his own attainments and uncompromising as were his demands upon them, he was not a mere scholar and they were not mere students of a language. He never forgot and never allowed them to forget that they were preparing to preach the Gospel, and that the measure of their faithfulness in the seminary would be the measure of their faithfulness in the ministry.

Moses Stuart, Addison Alexander, William Henry Greer—these three. But the greatest of these is Green. Because talent is better than genius in the class-room. Alexander's brilliant mind acquired knowledge with an ease and swiftness as of intuition, and hence, as has been said, he appeared to have no consciousness of a process in his appropriation of a language or its literature. The result was that it was not easy for him to set forth a methodical process of acquisition for the average man. In the lecture room he was copious, rapid, overpowering—too much so for the average man. Only the choice few could keep up with him. As the French officer said of the charge of the Light Brigade, "It was magnificent, but it was not war." Addison Alexander was undoubtedly the brightest star that ever shone in the Princeton constellation, but he was not the greatest teacher. It was Green who introduced method and system there in the study of Hebrew, and showed his students how any man of intelligence and industry could get a secure working knowledge of the language and become an expounder of God's Word at first hand.

"The great thing about William Henry Green," says Dr. Cuyler, "is the beautiful combination of docility and courage that has distinguished all his career." His modesty impressed everybody. I shall never forget the flutter into which I was thrown one day while teaching a class of ministers in Hebrew at the Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, when the door opened and the two greatest Biblical scholars in America walked quietly in and sat down—Philip Schaff and William Henry Green! I suppose I gasped. I know I felt as Dr. Peck said he did when Edwards A. Park entered his church in Baltimore and seated himself to hear him preach. I felt as a young lieutenant would have felt who, when descanting to his comrades on the art of war, had seen Napoleon Bonaparte and the Duke of Wellington join his little circle of auditors. I knew them both, and they had always treated me in the kindest and most cordial manner, but I was abashed, dismayed, scared. With an effort I recovered my composure and proceeded with the

work in hand. I knew that Dr. Schaff was nervous, inquisitive, aggressive, and that knowledge did not allay my agitation. But when my eye fell on the quiet figure of the Princeton Coryphaeus there was something so modest and sympathetic in his expression that I was reassured and braced. When a discussion arose, and I appealed to him for his opinion, and he supported in a quiet word or two the view which I had taken, I began to feel some measure even of comfort. I think that even if he had expressed a different view I should have been helped, so quiet, strong and gracious was his manner. I had long known the scholar. That day I began to know the man, and in all my subsequent meetings with him the impression deepened of his manly modesty and courage.

Dr. Green's courage was rooted in his faith and his zeal for the truth. When a graduate of Yale Theological Seminary talking to Archibald Hodge at Dr. Cuyler's table tried to make game of Princeton as fossilized, Hodge said to him: "The trouble with you Yale theological professors is that you only teach your students to think. Thinking sent Adam out of Paradise. In Princeton we let God do the thinking, and teach the students to believe." It was the great goodness of God to Princeton that, at the time when the central subject of theological debate was shifted from the domain of systematic theology to that of Biblical criticism, he gave the seminary in this department a man who believed with all his heart in a supernatural revelation, and who at the same time saw clearly that the conservative position must be defended by scientific processes. And perhaps the most valuable of all his eminent services to the church was his fearless use of the higher criticism. The careful words of Dr. Charles M. Mead are none too strong: "It cannot be doubted that among the higher critics who, with patient toil and profound scholarship, lead in the maintenance of sound views of the Bible and aim to strengthen the foundations of a reasonable faith, will always stand the name of William Henry Green." Six of the fifteen volumes which he has published deal with these problems exclusively. His

masterpiece in this line is his work on "The Unity of Genesis." Besides these fifteen volumes, he has published nearly two hundred review articles and pamphlets, philological, exegetical, critical, not counting the Expositions of the International Lessons which for nine years he contributed to the Sunday School Times. These figures will give some idea of his prodigious industry.

His courage was not less clearly shown in his occasional adoption of new views of interpretation than in his sturdy defence of old views as to the trustworthiness of the scriptures. He knew that his suggestion that the flood was not universal in extent, but only universal in the sense that it destroyed the whole human race, except the family of Noah, would seriously disturb many good people. He knew that his rejection of Usher's chronology of the pre-Abrahamic period, and his contention that the Bible gives us no information as to when the world was created or how many thousand years ago man appeared on the earth, would give pain to many. But, having satisfied himself that Usher and his followers had misinterpreted the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis, that links were omitted from these tables, and that they were never intended to furnish the basis of a chronology and could not be used for that purpose, he stated his conviction candidly and supported it with his customary wealth of learning and fairness of argument.

The estimation of his ability and general scholarship by those who had the best opportunity of knowing him was shown more than thirty years ago by his election to the Presidency of the College of New Jersey, which, on being declined by Dr. Green, was tendered to Dr. McCosh. What the faculty of Princeton College continued to think of him to the end, is shown in its congratulatory address at his fiftieth anniversary as a professor: "As an advocate of the higher criticism, his eminent learning has been ennobled by intelligent reverence for the Holy Scriptures and by true spiritual discernment in connection with that linguistic tact, literary skill and historical research which are requisite in the study of all ancient literature. The result is that he has

not disturbed the faith of the unlearned, while commanding the respect of scholars." The estimation of his character and learning by other scholars in the same department may be inferred from his selection as Chairman of the American Old Testament Committee. The estimation of his talents and attainments, by scholars abroad is indicated in the publication of some of his works in German and Spanish, and was fully and warmly expressed in the multitude of greetings sent him on his fiftieth anniversary from the great Universities of Europe. Many of these scholars did not agree with him in his critical views, but they could not withhold admiration for the simplicity and sincerity of his character, the greatness of his attainments, the courtesy and ability of his discussions, and the unity and power of his life—as scholar, teacher, author and man of God.

W. W. M.

THE DIGNITY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The dignity of an institution like the Presbyterian Church is as valuable as its peace. Loss of respect either from enemies or unruly children means loss of power. The hesitating and apologetic way in which our sister church to the North of us has dealt with the McGiffert case has bred contempt. Following hard on the announcement that Dr. McGiffert would withdraw from the church—Dr. Birch having appealed to the Assembly—Dr. Hillis, a member of Chicago Presbytery, not having taken the trouble, first, to ask for a letter of dismissal to a Congregational Association, thus caricatured and abused the church whose creed he had sworn to adopt and whose peace and purity he had vowed to study. The occasion was a sermon from Plymouth pulpit, Brooklyn:

"To-day one of our greatest denominations still includes that tremendous statement in its Confession of Faith, saying that certain men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death, being 'particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished,' and every young man who enters the Presbyterian Church has to solemnly swear to believe and