

but conscientious examiners say regretfully, "I should dearly love to pluck that fellow to take a handful of conceit out of him." But he didn't. There are different kinds of cheek—bumptious, hustling, aggressive cheek of the Briggs kind—and cool contemptuous, assumption of superiority and infallibility, cheek, not by any means wanting among the anti-Briggsites. I have more patience with the impudence of the first than with the insolence of the second. Many men make up by assumption what they lack in brains and in Justry. Neither kind of cheek has any right in the Church, but Nature seems to have made it very hard for some men to be modest. Question for the Philosophical and Literary Society, "Should all cheeky ministers be adjudged guilty of heresy?" Define your terms gentlemen, and go ahead.

There is before me a paper covered volume of 126 pages, published by Robert Clarke & Co., of Cincinnati, entitled *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*. It includes two lectures or addresses delivered before the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Cincinnati, by Professors Evans and Smith of Lane Theological Seminary. They are on the side of Drs. Briggs and Herrick Johnson to this extent, that they oppose all deductive theology of the Hodge, Shedd, and Warfield type as unscriptural, and that, while reverently accepting the Scriptures as the Word of God, they hold the dogmas of verbal inspiration and Biblical inerrancy to be at least unproved, and to be a stumbling block and a hindrance rather than a help to the conviction of unbelievers and the conversion of the world. From the point of view of the authors, the papers are admirable, and the *Chicago Interior* calls that of Professor Evans "the most splendid polemic of the century." The conservative Presbyterian *Journal of Philadelphia*, says "Two papers more diverse in style could not be put within the same covers. Prof. Evans fairly coruscates; Prof. Smith is level, more like a conversational talk, unpruned. They agree in their promulgation of the Higher Criticism view, denial of verbal inspiration, assertion of the errancy of the Bible. *We regret the circulation of such errors* (this is the second kind of cheek, Talker), but it is time to have it decidedly settled whether professors under the shelter of our General Assembly shall be authorized to teach them, and this pamphlet will help to clear the air." If the belief in verbal inspiration is to be the test of a theological professor's fitness for his position, our Canadian chairs of Divinity must reject their occupants almost to a man. It is not a very Christian thing, to say nothing of its science, when individuals, claiming to speak for the whole Church, virtually declare, "we can't answer your arguments for we don't know enough, but we can gag you, and we will." With all his vagaries and loose methods of talk, Dr. Briggs is an earnest christian, a zealous Bible student, and a good Presbyterian, as are Dr. Herrick Johnson, Dr. Schaff, and Professors Evans and Smith. Their discussions in the line of Biblical Theology are what chairs in that department were founded for. To take it for granted that there