

law of righteousness upon which the moral universe depends. Well, we know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich.

Was this act of our Lord Jesus Christ an improper act? The modern conscience seems to say yes. But only when it is looked upon as the act of an outsider. But our Lord was never weary of telling us when He came that He came as the Son of our Father, and that all He did the Father did in Him. He made clear that He was no outsider, but bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. He made clear that He came not only as the Father's Son, but as the Son of Man. He came not as substitute simply, but as representative, and that not by arbitrary choice, as one of a rebel regiment might be chosen to suffer for the sins of the whole regiment, but as actually Himself the regiment, so made one with us that humanity is

comprehended in Him. He is more than our substitute. He is more than our representative. He is identified with us. Yes, that is the word; not substitution, not representation, but identification; so that 'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.'

There is one thing more. This identification means death. It means spiritual death. There is no escape from that. Is there any desire to escape? As David would have shared Absalom's social death had he gone out to Geshur, so our Lord Jesus Christ shared our spiritual death by identifying Himself with us in our sin. For God made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us. And we must give the cry on the Cross its value: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'

Charles Augustus Briggs.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, LL.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

PROFESSOR CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS was a man of positive convictions, and he was always perfectly frank in stating those convictions. Thorough in the investigation of the grounds for an opinion, when he once satisfied himself of the truth he embraced it with his whole heart. What he could not understand was the levity of those who defended their alleged faith with superficial reasons. The strength of the expressions which he used in characterizing such levity sometimes obscured the fact that he was a man of great sweetness of disposition and of great modesty in his estimate of himself. These qualities were most clearly revealed in the home, and friends who were privileged to enter that circle were charmed by the perfect harmony which reigned there. Complete affection, conjugal, parental, and filial, bound all the members together. To say more than this would be to violate the sanctities which are now

more than ever precious to the memory. But the sweetness of disposition and modesty of bearing were equally manifest in a larger circle made up of colleagues and personal friends. The volume published in his honour on his seventieth birthday commemorates the impression made upon these friends, many of whom were his pupils. It speaks of 'the stimulus of his untiring energy, his patient research, his fearlessness in proclaiming truth, his warm personal sympathy, and his quick response to every demand made upon his stores of knowledge and the treasures—often unsuspected—of his warm and valiant heart.'

These personal qualities were rooted in an unusually deep and earnest piety. His friends knew that he lived in the presence of God. Let us say at once that in the best sense of the word our friend was a High Churchman. He believed in the Church as a divine institution founded by

Christ Himself. This belief he held concerning all the more closely organized denominations, holding that all are parts of the true universal Church, and that all possess valid ordinances and effective sacraments. This Church (existing in all these separate denominations) is the divinely commissioned instrument for the salvation of men by the preaching of the Word, and by the administration of the Sacrament. The importance of ordination is that it makes the minister the organ by which these means of grace are brought to sinful men. In all this Dr. Briggs was in fullest accord with the doctrine professed by the Churches themselves. The standards of the Presbyterian Church formulate this view with all desirable distinctness. The logical conclusion drawn by the standards of the Church, and heartily embraced by Dr. Briggs, is that in the rite of ordination the Church is acting for Christ. Its work is ministerial and declarative; the act of the ordaining officer (bishop or presbytery, as the case may be) is the act of Christ Himself.

The deep and unaffected piety of which I have spoken and the High Churchmanship went together. That is to say, Dr. Briggs's spiritual life was nourished by the ordinances of the Church, and by the thought-forms in which the tradition of the Church has crystallized itself. As we very well know, this is not always the case. The Quaker finds the inner light sufficient and can dispense with external sacraments. Many pious people in our own day find the official creeds of their Church a hindrance to piety rather than a stimulus. In other words, it is becoming increasingly clear that the Spirit of God works when and where and how He pleases. We have now to do with the man ecclesiastically minded, one who finds that the way of salvation is entrusted to the visible Church, outside of which (according to the Presbyterian standards) there is no ordinary means of salvation. Dr. Briggs's piety was in closest connexion with historic Christianity in its organized form, either Presbyterian or Episcopal. The deep and thorough consecration which he made of himself in his early manhood was a consecration to Christ and His Church, we might say to Christ in His Church. His wide erudition, the admiration of friends and foes alike, was acquired in order to serve that great historic institution, and the marvellous intellectual activity which scarcely knew a break in fifty years of study and

teaching, all centred about organized Christianity.

The extent of Dr. Briggs's erudition is indicated, though imperfectly, by the titles of his published works, and by the variety of subjects on which he lectured during his professorship. He was equally at home in exegesis, in Biblical theology, in Church history, and in the comparative study of the creeds. At no time was his work simply critical and destructive. He desired to magnify his office as a teacher by building up the faith of the Church. Even the address on 'The Authority of Holy Scripture,' which was made the ground of attack on him, was a defence of the Scriptures instead of an attempt to minimize their importance. Coming into the ministry a short time before the reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, he desired to promote unity by instructing the reunited Church in the historic sense of its own standards. To his mind the issues which had divided Old School and New School were of minor importance, but he knew that both branches had neglected important doctrines of their own system. This he set forth in the book entitled *Whither?* which pointed out these defects. At the same time he would have such questions settled not by ecclesiastical process, but by calm and scholarly discussion. The founding of the *Presbyterian Review*, in which, as in the conduct of it, he was specially active, was intended to promote just this sort of discussion, and so to bring the Church to a better knowledge of the great Evangelical and Presbyterian tradition.

That there must be progress in theology he very well knew. Fully acquainted with the critical method as applied to the Bible, he saw that the Church must adjust herself to the results of that method. But to his mind this did not mean anything revolutionary, for he found that the theology of the Westminster divines was more in accordance with the facts of Scripture than was the more rigid theory of inspiration advocated by some American teachers. John Owen, indeed, held the more rigid theory, and his attack on Walton's *Polyglot* showed that his theory was as inimical to textual criticism as it was to literary criticism. Liberty had been secured for textual criticism because the facts were too plain to be denied even by the most conservative. This was shown most strikingly in our own time when the defenders of inerrancy were compelled to locate the alleged

inerrancy in the 'autographs' instead of in the present text. To a man as well informed as Dr. Briggs, the facts brought out by the higher criticism were equally telling. Hence his books on the study of Holy Scripture and on the higher criticism of the Hexateuch. These books are a demonstration that a man may be thoroughly acquainted with modern Biblical scholarship and heartily accept its results, and yet retain the orthodox belief as formulated in the great creeds of Christendom. Any negative or agnostic deduction, such as some critical scholars feel compelled to make, had no place in his thinking. Even the reserve which some of us who stood with him feel concerning the forms of antique thought which are contained in the creeds was foreign to his mind. He was in earnest in contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

The incomplete bibliography of Dr. Briggs's works published in 1911 shows about two hundred titles. When we reflect that during the years when these books and essays were written the author was actively engaged in teaching, that during a considerable part of the time he was editor of an important theological review, that he was frequently called upon for lectures and addresses outside the classroom, that he was compelled to take part in various ecclesiastical bodies, we get some conception of the tireless activity of the man. In fact, his power of concentration was unusual and his application was constant. This intellectual activity was more like that of the late President Harper than that of any one with whom I am acquainted. It made him the admiration and the despair of his friends. The thoroughness of his work will be realized when we note such a fact as this: in preparing his commentary on the Psalms he elaborated a complete critical text of the book. The amount of labour he gave to the biblico-theological articles for the Oxford *Hebrew Lexicon* can be appreciated only by one who has attempted the same sort of work.

We have already noticed his attitude toward the so-called Higher Criticism. His interest in this department of study is indicated by the fact that about half the titles in the list of his works are concerned with the Scriptures. This indicates the thing most significant in his career. It was his good fortune to introduce modern methods of Biblical study to American theologians. His first

published article (except a translation from the German) was entitled 'Biblical Theology.' This was published in the *American Theological Review* just after he had entered his professorship (1870). The title of the article was significant of the new attitude toward the Bible, but the Church paid no heed, and the review in which the essay was published soon ceased to appear. The reunited Church was for the moment resting in the belief that controversy was over and that, doctrine being settled, it could give itself wholly to practical work. Dr. Briggs at any rate was under no illusion, although ten years passed before the attention of the Church was aroused. During these years he was carrying on his work as teacher, and under the lead of his elder colleague, Dr. Schaff, was translating and enriching commentaries from German sources. Then came the founding of the *Presbyterian Review* in which, as has been said, he was active from the start. In the first volume (1880) he published a discussion of the Robertson Smith case. To the next volume he contributed an elaborate article entitled 'Critical Theories of the Sacred Scriptures in Relation to their Inspiration,' and the following year he gave us an article on 'Biblical Theology.' In 1883 came 'A Critical Study of the History of the Higher Criticism, with Special Reference to the Pentateuch.'

This is not the whole story. These articles were part of a series contributed by various scholars, and designed to lay before ministers and thoughtful laymen the facts concerning the modern attitude toward the Bible. Both conservatives and progressives were represented, and the significance of the series was that it claimed the right within the Presbyterian Church to discuss questions of criticism unhampered by dogmatic considerations. How revolutionary the discussion appeared to many minds is shown by the attitude of the so-called religious press, and by the ecclesiastical agitation which followed, culminating in judicial process. It is scarcely necessary to remark here that the final effect was to secure the independence of criticism as a legitimate science, and to free exegesis from subservience to dogmatics. The credit of this advance belongs in large measure to Dr. Briggs.

Next in importance to this work of introducing the critical and historical study of the Scriptures to the American Churches, and in line with it, was the enlightened planning of the two series known

as the 'International Critical Commentary,' and the 'International Theological Library.' It would be too much to say that at the time when they were projected English-speaking theologians had ceased to produce original work. But there was undue dependence on German scholarship. And this was a one-sided dependence. The prejudice against German rationalism led to the ignoring of much important work done in that country of specialists. The elaborate 'Foreign Theological Library' of T. & T. Clark, for example, avowedly embodied the works of conservative scholars only. Professor Briggs and his coeditors felt that the time had come for English and American theologians to undertake more independent work, or, where they were doing such work, to make it more widely known in their own world. Hence the plan of the two Libraries which have measurably fulfilled the design of the editors. The breadth and comprehensiveness of the scheme will be realized by any one who reads the prospectus. It is safe to say that without the suggestion and encouragement of Dr. Briggs the greater part of the American contributions to the series would never have appeared. He was the one who took the initiative, and others followed his lead. The catholicity of the editors is seen when we notice the number of denominations to which the contributors belong, and the considerable difference of views which they express. The whole series is a testimony to the belief of those who planned it, that freedom of discussion is the very life-breath of scholarship, without which progress is impossible in theology as in all the sciences. Of the value of Dr. Briggs's own contributions to Biblical scholarship it is unnecessary to speak at length. The Hebrew lexicon for which he prepared many important articles is an indispensable help to him who would read the Old Testament in the original; his *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* has opened the eyes of several generations of students to the nature of the Bible and the task of its expositor; his *Commentary on the Psalms* is the most exhaustive that we have in English, perhaps the most thorough that exists in any language; his *Messianic Prophecy* gives an historical view of a subject on which erroneous views have long been held by professed theologians. Nowhere else had English readers found that which the title of this work well describes as 'A Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the

Order of their Development.' The eight editions through which his book has passed show that it met a felt want. I have no desire to intimate that this book or any of the others is final. Dr. Briggs himself would be the first to repudiate the idea that this or any book could be final. It is enough to say of any book that it has nobly served the generation for which it was written.

Passing over Dr. Briggs's contributions to Church history, the value of which is universally recognized, let me speak briefly of one book which roused some discussion at the time when it was published and which was made the basis for part of the indictment brought against the author. This is *The Bible, the Church, and the Reason: The Three Great Fountains of Authority*, published in 1892. The purpose of the book is sufficiently indicated by its title. It is directed against the exaggerated claim often formulated in the words: 'The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.' Two considerations probably led the author to his defence of the three fountains of authority. First of all, history shows that the three factors have always been concerned in determining the creed of the Church. The creed, however strictly it professes to be based on Scripture, is the expression of the faith actually held by the Church. Moreover, the creeds have arisen from the application of the human reason to the data given in Scripture and in Christian experience. There is a great difference between the Sermon on the Mount and the Nicene profession of faith. How has this come about? Evidently by a process of reasoning. The three fountains have actually co-operated therefore in giving the Church its standards of belief. To this must be added the second fact, namely, that the insistence on Scripture alone as the fountain of authority has brought about the divisions in the Church which we regard with so much misgiving. Every one of the Protestant Churches asserts its belief in the Bible as the infallible rule of faith, yet each has a different system of doctrine. This divisive effect of the Protestant principle is well known to the historian, for he sees that the times when the verbal infallibility of the Bible was most strongly insisted upon were the times when the various Churches were indulging the bitterest polemic, not only Protestant against Catholic, but one Protestant denomination against another. One who searches for a basis of unity therefore must look for something more than the Bible alone.

This, I think, was the decisive consideration with Dr. Briggs. As a good historian he allowed weight to the facts just stated, but his heart was drawn toward the unity of Christendom, desiring above all else that the communities which bear the Christian name should become one great organization, one body of Christ, one army marching against the forces of evil and bringing the thoughts of men into obedience to the one Lord. If such an organization ever comes into existence it cannot take the Protestant position that the Bible alone is the source of authority, but must recognize that Christ still speaks through His living ministers, and that He speaks in the sanctified reason, the God-given organ of intelligence. It was therefore an ardent desire for the unity of Christendom which animated this book. And this same desire called forth those later publications which have brought the author's real conservatism more distinctively into view. These are: *The Incarnation of the Lord* (1902), and *The Fundamental Christian Faith*, which came from the press just before his death. The statement in the Preface of this last-named work may be cited here as his message to the Churches on the subject of unity. After

speaking of the reactionary and the radical tendencies of our times, he goes on to say:

'There is also the wholesome irenic tendency which seeks to reunite the separated Churches on the basis of the fundamental principles of historic Christianity, without intruding upon denominational preferences or private opinion in other matters. These principles of faith are to be found in the ancient creeds, the official expression of the faith of the ancient Church, to which all Churches which are legitimate descendants of historical Christianity adhere.'

It is not the purpose of this paper to enter upon a discussion of a host of questions which are suggested by such a statement as this. All I have tried to do is to present a just estimate of the man whose ardent desire inspired these words, and whom I was privileged to call my friend. Having served his generation by the will of God he has now fallen asleep, leaving us not only his written words as a rich legacy, but as a richer inheritance the memory of his courage, his patience, his warm sympathy, and his loyalty to the great Head of the Church, whose he was and whom he served.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS AND I PETER.

ROMANS XIII. 1.

Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God.

I PETER II. 13, 15.

Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake. For so is the will of God, that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Two practical questions of urgent importance forced themselves upon the converts to Christianity in the early centuries—their relation to the world, its practices and customs, and their relation to the State. It is the latter question that is briefly discussed by St. Paul and St. Peter in the two passages which have been taken for the text. Their words are few, and were designed to meet the particular circumstances of that age; but they contain

principles which apply to all times, and appeal to motives which can never be obsolete or outworn.

At the outset the texts obviously recognize the truth of Christian citizenship. While teaching that the citizenship of all who believe in Christ, as he elsewhere affirms, is in heaven, the Apostle Paul also lays stress upon their duties and obligations in the present life as members of a State, and discusses what is the true attitude and sphere of the Christian citizenship; and St. Peter follows the same lines. Their treatment of the subject may be comprehended under two ideas—that of loyalty, and that of free service.

I.

THE LOYALTY OF THE CHRISTIAN CITIZEN.

Christianity has been at times reproached with neglect of a large department of human duty. It