

and Bürger; still to me is the reality of miracles sealed by the miracles of grace which I saw with my own eyes in the congregations of this blessed valley. And the faith which I professed in my first sermons, which I could maintain in Niederfrohna and Lunzenau, remains mine to-day, undiminished in strength, and immeasurably higher than all earthly knowledge. Even if in many biblical questions I have to oppose the traditional opinion, certainly my opposition remains on this side of the gulf, on the side of the theology of the Cross, of grace, of miracles, in harmony with the good confession of our Lutheran Church. By this banner let us stand; folding ourselves in it, let us die.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

---

PROFESSOR CHEYNE.

THE writer of this brief article must at the outset distinctly disclaim all title to criticise Dr. Cheyne's books, and he has not sought to inform himself of any facts in his life that are not matter of common knowledge. His object is simply to illustrate the nature of Professor Cheyne's work for sound biblical study in this generation by a sketch of the attitude which the Church of England, as represented by her authorized teachers, has assumed towards the question of inspiration and the criticism of the Old Testament. The statement is intended to be purely historical.

The importance and significance of German criticism was first clearly recognised in the Church of England by Hugh James Rose, whom Dean Burgon has described as "the Restorer of the Old Path." Rose, after spending some time in Germany, in 1824, returned home alarmed and shocked. In May, 1825, he was select preacher at Cambridge, and

delivered discourses on the state of the Protestant Religion in Germany, which were heard and read with interest and concern. Strangely enough, Dr. Pusey replied on behalf of Germany. The matter is so important, and it has been so slurred over and misrepresented by Dean Burgon in his *Lives of Twelve Good Men*,<sup>1</sup> that it must be treated with some fulness.

Dr. Pusey's *Historical Inquiry into the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany* appeared before his appointment to the professorship of Hebrew in Oxford. The drift of the book is that rationalism is due to the absurdly excessive claims of orthodoxy. To quote: "False ideas of inspiration, introduced by the imaginary necessities of the argument with the Romanists, contributed to the same result. From the first assumption, that the whole of Scripture was immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit, was derived a second, that all must be of equal value; to prove this it was supposed that the same doctrines, the same fundamental truths in Christianity, must be not implied but expressed by all, a theory which must of necessity do much violence to the sacred text, while it overlooked the beautiful arrangement, according to which the different doctrines of revelation are each prominently conveyed by that mind which was most adapted to its reception (love by St. John; faith by St. Paul; hope by St. Peter; faith developed in works by St. James), and thus the highest illuminations of inspired minds, each in the fullest degree of which it was capable, are combined to convey to us the vast complex of Scripture truth. Yet greater

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i., p. 134.—Experience has shown the writer that in reading Dean Burgon's biographies it is especially necessary to "verify your references." After the testimonies borne to Dean Burgon by those who knew him, it is impossible to doubt his good faith; nevertheless his statements are to be received with the utmost caution. The fact that the history of the Oxford movement has been as yet written only by men who were more or less partisans, makes it imperative for those who wish to understand it to go back to the pamphlets and magazines of the time.

confusion must obviously be the result of the same theory when applied to the Old Testament. The difference of the Law and the Gospel, which hitherto had been so vividly seen, was obstructed, the shadow identified with the substance, the preparatory system with the perfect disclosure. Not content with finding the germs of Christian doctrine in the Old Testament, or those dawning rays which were to prepare the mental eye for the gradual reception of fuller light, but whose entire character could only be understood by those whose approach they announced, they not only considered prophecy as being throughout inverted history, but held that all the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity were even to the Jews as much revealed in the Old Testament as in the New, and that the knowledge of the doctrines was as necessary to their salvation as to ours. . . . Less important, lastly, though perhaps in its effects more immediately dangerous, was the corollary to the same theory of inspiration, that even historical passages were equally inspired with the rest, and consequently that no error, however minute, could even here be admitted. Yet the imparting of religious truth being the object of revelation, any further extension of inspiration would appear as an unnecessary miracle, as indeed it is one nowhere claimed by the readers of the New Testament." Pusey goes on to say that this "palpable perversion of the doctrine of inspiration" prepared the way for the indiscriminate rejection of the doctrine itself, and that Scripture as a result of it was not expounded even in the divinity schools.

Rose replied in 1829. His answer took the form of a letter to the Bishop of London. It is more effectively written than Pusey's book, but shows much keenness of feeling, and in parts obviously misrepresents Pusey. For one thing, he does not squarely meet Pusey's position on inspiration, but rides off with an impassioned affirmation of the inspiration of the gospels. More effective is the

charge against Pusey of having borrowed the substance of his book from Tholuck's lectures.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Pusey was now Regius Professor of Hebrew, and took time over his reply, which appeared in 1830. He writes with much calmness of manner; and while admitting crudities, stands by his main position. He had previously replied very coolly to the charge of plagiarism from Tholuck by pointing out that large passages of the book were not from Tholuck; that Tholuck had given him permission to use his lectures, but not to publish his name; and that he had made an acknowledgment sufficient to cover his debt. But he adheres strongly to his rejection of a doctrine of inspiration condemned by Secker, Lowth, Tillotson, Van Mildert, and Blomfield, but affirmed by the eminent Scotch theologian, Dr. Dick, in these terms: "A contradiction which was fairly chargeable to the sacred writers themselves would completely disprove their inspiration." Against this Pusey says that the question of credibility must be settled before that of inspiration can be discussed, and that the old theory had shown a tendency to produce among laymen one precisely opposite, one which falls as far below as the former far exceeded what may be collected from Scripture.<sup>2</sup>

Whether Dr. Pusey anywhere repudiates the chief doctrines of his early volumes I cannot tell. But his

<sup>1</sup> Mr. de Soyres, in an able article on Tholuck, recently published in the *Guardian*, hardly does justice to Pusey on this point.

<sup>2</sup> Dean Burgon, in his *Life of Rose* (p. 134) has the following very loose sentence: "Pusey's religious views underwent a very serious change about the same time; and shortly after his two learned and interesting volumes were by himself withdrawn from circulation." I do not know what evidence there is of a change of religious views on the part of Pusey; but that there was no change in his attitude to biblical criticism is clearly shown from the preface to his book on Daniel, where he declares that forty years before he had satisfied himself of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, which he indeed formerly accepted on the authority of our Lord. He admits that his early books were crude, but speaks of them as withdrawn thirty years before—much later than Dean Burgon suggests.

labours as a professor were simply to establish the Jewish and early Christian tradition in biblical criticism. His activities in various directions were incessant, but not "of a nature to enhance the reputation of a Hebrew professor." The controversies about the Bible died down. Those who had been troubled by them were reassured by translations from Hengstenberg, Keil, and other German writers of approved orthodoxy. Very little genuine study of the Old Testament was carried on in the Church of England. The atmosphere was however disturbed by the appearance of *Essays and Reviews*, of Bishop Colenso, and, may I add? of the *Academy*.

*Essays and Reviews* is now forgotten, but it did something, and a chapter on its history need not be uninteresting. It raised the whole question of inspiration and the Old Testament, not perhaps wisely, but distinctly. Dr. Rowland Williams, the brilliant and fiery Welshman, who wrote one of the most obnoxious essays, was not a sound philologist, and his books are almost obsolete. But his whereabouts is shown in that very remarkable and little-known volume, *Defence of the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D.*, by James Fitzjames Stephen, of the Inner Temple,<sup>1</sup> one of the ablest treatises on inspiration in the English language. The eloquent advocate says, referring to the enemies of biblical criticism, "If they could catch but one glimpse of the nature of the book they so ignorantly defend, instead of attempting to proscribe science and criticism, they would welcome them as the ministers of God for the good of their souls, as the appointed means of displaying to mankind in their full glory the power of the Bible and of religion to bless mankind here and to save them hereafter." Williams was victorious; the clamour soon declined. The real worth of *Essays and Reviews*, looking back upon it now, is not great; and Diestel's severe criticism in the *Jahrbücher*

<sup>1</sup> Smith, Elder & Co., 1862.

*für deutsche Theologie* is still the best. But the alarm it produced was increased by the publication of Colenso's books on the Pentateuch, the earlier parts of which obtained a wide circulation. As time passed on this declined; and although Bishop Colenso gradually acquired a mastery of Hebrew and of German criticism, yet in the judgment of such men as Kuenen and Wellhausen, the earlier parts of his work are the most important, as the author brought a fresh arithmetical eye to the early records, and produced his results with sharpness and reality, while he had not the faculties of a great critic even when learning came to him. Colenso was replied to on every hand, and that generally with contumely. It was felt however that hard words were not sufficient, and the *Speaker's Commentary* was arranged for, while Dr. Pusey undertook the defence of the Book of Daniel. This was considered satisfactory: the orthodox school of Germans, including Delitzsch and all the writers accessible to the English public, was with the English conservatives; few young Hebraists of real power were appearing in England; and the offence of heterodoxy seemed to have ceased.

In these circumstances Dr. Cheyne's life-work was begun. He had with prescient eye resolved to devote himself to Hebrew literature, and had received undying impulses from Ewald as well as much instruction from others in Germany. He returned to Oxford, and began immediately to produce original work, which called forth high encomiums from the foremost Germans. His powerful influence on the general public was exerted through the *Academy*, a journal started by Dr. C. E. Appleton, one of the truest benefactors to English literature in our time. Appleton, who had been much in Germany, was impressed with the insularity and poverty of English culture, and set himself, with heroic confidence in a people yet unawakened, to provide an organ of criticism,

planned on the lines of the *Literarisches Centralblatt*. Dr. Cheyne became one of his closest helpers, and organized the theological department into thorough efficiency; securing as contributors, not only such men as Lightfoot and Westcott in this country, but all the leading theological writers on the Continent, including Diestel, Lipsius, and many more. Not a few who began to study theology about twenty years ago will never forget the impulse given them by the *Academy*, and most of all by the fresh, fearless, and brilliant criticisms of Dr. Cheyne himself. I do not wish to "resurrect" articles which the learned author may be inclined to regard as freaks of youthful audacity. But we learned from him that the *Speaker's Commentary* was not a satisfactory reply to Colenso; that Dr. Pusey was hardly level with Keil, while a comparison with Delitzsch was out of the question; that even English heresiarchs were of as little account as the most orthodox. He was the first to expound the Grafian theory of the Pentateuch, which has engaged scholars so much of late years and almost broke up a Scotch Church, stating the case for and against with a clearness never surpassed. Meanwhile he was working at his *Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged* (1871), which led no less a man than Diestel to pronounce him "a master of scientific exegesis."

For years after he pursued a course of unslackening industry, producing along with Dr. Driver an edition of the A.V. with various renderings and readings from the best authorities, one of the best aids existing to biblical exposition. But a revolution was taking place in his ideas. The critical movement had met with a serious check, as it appeared, first, that it involved literary pretensions which could not be allowed to any critics, and especially to critics of an unspiritual and unimaginative type. Matthew Arnold did good service in dwelling on the value of internal evidence on questions of disputed

authorship; and in insisting that on the literary and moral value of the biblical writings Hebrew and Greek learning gave no necessary right to speak. It was obvious further that the deductions drawn from the results of criticism were such usually as to destroy the whole foundation of supernatural religion, as in the case of Bishop Colenso. Passing through a period of deep religious feeling, Dr. Cheyne gave full weight to considerations such as these, and produced (1880-1884) his great book on Isaiah, which is perhaps thus far his highest achievement, and in which he strove to speak "a piercing and reconciling word." This book was warmly welcomed by Franz Delitzsch and others, and was thought by many to signify a much more radical change of critical position than it really did.

After some years of ministry in Tendring, where he was busy in all his spheres, Dr. Cheyne returned to Oxford as Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture; and has published his books on *Job and Solomon* and the Psalms, which have already taken their place among the classics of exegesis. He is for three months of every year in residence at Rochester as one of the canons, and has gained great popularity as a preacher in the cathedral pulpit. He has been able to reconcile with marvellous felicity the two great aims of his life: to advance biblical knowledge, and to teach it to his countrymen as they are able to bear it. This very specially appears in his last volume, *The Hallowing of Criticism*, which contains some fresh and bright cathedral sermons on Elijah, and a paper read at the Church Congress which these illustrate.

I have been obliged to omit many names, such as those of Dean Stanley, Dean Perowne, the Nestor of English Hebraists, Dr. Quarry, and others, which would have been placed in this sketch had more space been attainable. The prejudice against biblical criticism has practically disappeared in the Church of England, as is shown by the recent



---

remarkable discussion at the Church Congress, notably the speech of the Bishop of Manchester. Men like Dr. Driver, Dr. Cheyne, Dean Perowne are at one in their view of criticism with New Testament scholars like Bishop Lightfoot, Canon Westcott, Archdeacon Farrar, and Dr. Sanday. All are profound believers in supernatural Christianity. Perhaps it is not too much to say, that largely through Dr. Cheyne's influence scholars are now working at the Old Testament in firm confidence of bringing out results at once reconcilable with the attitude of Jesus to the Old Covenant, with the faith of the Church in Divine revelation, and with the surest conclusions of scholarship and science.

EDITOR.

---