

Southern Seminary and Progressive Religion 1870-1940¹

Gregory A. Wills

BEGINNING AROUND 1900 the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary began

GREGORY A. WILLS is Professor of Church History at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Previously he served as Archives and Special Collections Librarian with the seminary's Boyce Centennial Library. Dr. Wills received the Ph.D. from Emory University. Besides numerous journal and dictionary articles, he is the author of *Democratic Religion: Freedom, Authority, and Church Discipline in the Baptist South, 1785-1900* (Oxford University, 2003). To coincide with the sesquicentennial anniversary of Southern Seminary, Dr. Wills is writing a history, titled *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1859-2009* (Oxford University, forthcoming).

promoting a distinctly progressive theology. Its central elements were a new view of the inspiration of the Bible and the belief that religious knowledge derived fundamentally from religious experience. These distinctive elements of Protestant liberalism undergirded the transformation of the theological character of the seminary's faculty during the twentieth century. Before the 1940s, the professors who led the transformation were Crawford H. Toy, Edgar Y. Mullins, and William O. Carver.

CRAWFORD TOY AND THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE

When Southern Seminary dismissed Old Tes-

tament professor Crawford Toy in 1879, it became the first American school to dismiss a teacher over the emerging liberal theology. Charles A. Briggs, the professor of theology at Union Theological Seminary who nearly suffered a similar fate a dozen years later, recognized Toy as modernism's first martyr: "The first to suffer for the higher criticism in the United States was C. H. Toy."² In 1877 Toy wrote a letter congratulating Charles A. Briggs—the two had studied together at the University of Berlin—on his inaugural address as professor of Old Testament at Union Theological Seminary in New York: "I am glad to find that we are in accord as to the spirit of Old Testament study, and rejoice that you have spoken so earnestly and vigorously on behalf of the spirit of broad, free, spiritual minded investigation. There is much work in this country for the advocates of such a view, and it will require patient and wise effort to dislodge the traditional narrowness that has obtained so firm a foothold in some quarters." Both men would be charged with heresy.

Briggs had the more celebrated trial. Toy was the first to suffer.³

American Protestantism was entering a new era. A new theology, known as liberalism or modernism, grew in response to growing skepticism about the validity of traditional Christianity. Developments in philosophy toward an austere empiricism fostered the skepticism. The principles of empiricist science seemed to undermine Christianity's claim to absolute truth and morality. Christianity's claims derived from historical events, the argument went, and eternal truth could not logically derive from historically conditioned occurrences. On a popular level, the traditional Protestant approach to the Bible, with its plain literal approach to the Bible's historical accounts, seemed increasingly implausible to many Americans and Europeans as the nineteenth century went on. The parting of the sea, the slaughter of the Amalekites, and the cursing of the fig tree, seemed not only an improper basis for moral absolutes, but seemed self-evidently fabulous.⁴

Although the philosophical objections damaged the credibility of traditional Protestant Christianity, the greatest damage came from science, from developments in geology, biology, and historical criticism. Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* overturned the reigning catastrophist model of geological formation in favor of a uniformitarian approach that lengthened the age of the earth and discredited the Bible's chronology of creation. Charles Darwin's 1859 *Origin of the Species* similarly overturned the prevailing creationist models of the origin of living things in favor of the gradual evolution of all species from primeval organisms. This cast doubt on the Bible's account of God's immediate creation of full-orbed plant and animal kingdoms. The science of historical criticism applied naturalistic rules to the analysis of the Bible's historical accounts and discredited the supernaturalistic elements of its history.

Advocates of the new liberal theology believed that it afforded a stronger defense of Christianity than traditional orthodoxy. A critical element of

the new theology was a new view of the inspiration of the Bible, which held that many of the Bible's historical statements were mythological. God inspired the Bible in such a way that its historical meaning could be false but its religious meaning true. The creation account in Genesis, they held, was historically false but religiously true. It taught nothing of the history of the earth or of living things. It rather taught God's fatherly love for creation. This approach allowed them to be critical of the Bible's history and at the same time endorse many of its traditional religious affirmations. Crawford Toy adopted the new view of inspiration because he thought that the old view was inconsistent with the facts of science and of the historical criticism of the Bible.

Toy's troubles began with Genesis. Since boyhood he had read books on geology. Before the 1830s, the reigning geological model held that the earth's geological features could be explained by violent upheavals and catastrophic change over a short period of time. This approach to geological development was consistent with the traditional interpretation of Genesis in which the earth was less than ten thousand years old. The new geology, promoted persuasively by Charles Lyell in the 1830s, held that the earth's geological features came about by gradual change at uniform rates over hundreds of thousands of years.⁵ Toy adopted Lyell's uniformitarian geology and was convinced that the earth was very old. Genesis, he concluded, taught on the contrary that the earth was quite young.⁶

But the problem was more than geology. In the early 1870s Toy adopted Darwinism. Toy's colleague John Broadus reported that Toy embraced evolutionary views after studying Herbert Spencer and Charles Darwin. In the 1870s Toy gave a public lecture advocating Darwin's view of human evolution.⁷ In 1874 he told his students that they should "not deny evolution on Christian grounds," for Christianity and evolution were compatible.⁸

Toy could no longer harmonize the Bible with science. If evolutionary views of geology and biol-

ogy were correct, then the Genesis history of the origin of the earth and of living things was false. For some time he could not reconcile Genesis with the accepted science. He feared the consequences. "What, then, would become of the Bible, its truthfulness, its helpfulness?"⁹ He could not repudiate the new science, but he was loathe to give up the Bible.

Around 1875 he solved the problem by adopting the new liberal view of inspiration. He reconciled science and the Bible by practically divorcing the divine and human aspects of the Bible. The divine aspect was the internal spiritual meaning inspired by the Holy Spirit. The human aspect was the outward literal meaning. Toy so divided the Bible's outward meaning from its inward that its outward meaning could be false but its inward meaning true. He held that the Bible was wholly true because it was true in its "real" spiritual intent, even though its historical, human assertions were in error. The Bible employed the primitive thought forms of the day to convey its inner spiritual truths. Genesis was wrong as science but true as religion. It erred on the when and the how of creation, but was right on who was behind it all. With this new approach in hand Toy could embrace the scientific claims of gradualist geology and Darwinian evolution wholeheartedly and at the same time retain his faith in a Bible that was true in its spiritual meaning.

The new view of inspiration had great interpretive consequences. It required a reconstruction and reinterpretation of the Bible. Toy adopted the reconstruction of the history of Israel advanced by the Dutch biblical scholar Abraham Kuenen.¹⁰ Kuenen held that both Old Testament and New Testament religion were like the other religions of the world, just "so many manifestations of the religious spirit of mankind."¹¹ God's "never resting and all-embracing activity" in all humanity put every religion on a path from lower forms to the "higher form of religion."¹² The correct "starting point of modern theology" was the "rejection of supernaturalism" in favor of critical research

of the religion of Israel based on the premise of its "natural development."¹³ On these premises Kuenen sketched out the ostensible evolution of Israelite religion, and redated the various Old Testament books based on the degree to which the book's perspective seemed to correspond to various points in the religion's historical progress.¹⁴ By this method Kuenen concluded for example that the Pentateuch's historical setting was incorrect, since its perspective reflected later religious developments rather than those of the time of Moses, who can not therefore have produced the laws ascribed to him, not even the Ten Commandments.¹⁵ Kuenen argued therefore that both the historical and ritualistic material in the Pentateuch developed in the postexilic era.¹⁶

Toy viewed Kuenen's reconstruction of the Old Testament as reverent and constructive. The prophets and the psalter provided the materials for a reconstruction of the history of Israel, and showed that the history contained in the Pentateuch and the historical books was not trustworthy as history. Over many centuries the prophets developed the religion of Israel: the strict monotheism, the "ethical" portrayal God as compassionate and personal, and the fierce patriotism. From this vital spiritual religion finally emerged the codified sacrificial system with its Levitical priesthood and liturgy. In the light of this new history, Toy saw the Old Testament in terms of the gradual development of spiritual religion, which consisted centrally in monotheism and an ethic of love and justice. The religious meaning of Old Testament texts inhered in their promotion of such spiritual truths.¹⁷

By 1874 Toy taught his students some of the conclusions of current historical criticism of the Old Testament. He taught them for example that the second chapter of Genesis had a different author than the first chapter because of differences of style and because each called God by a different name, the two chapters being gathered together by an unknown "editor."¹⁸ Genesis, he said, was not written by Moses but derived

from a Jehovist source and an Elohist source.¹⁹ Leviticus was not written by Moses, but was written later by someone in the spirit of Moses: “The genius given by Moses was elaborated in the after history of Israel.” In this sense, it could be called “the teachings of Moses.”²⁰ He told his students to interpret the various particular passages in terms of concepts of spiritual redemption: monotheism, sin deserves punishment, the need for a mediator, the promise of a messiah, and God’s intention to bless all nations. “All revelation is intended to develop redemption.” This notion of “spiritual redemption” furnished Toy with his “canon of interpretation.”²¹

Between 1874 and 1877 Toy revised extensively his understanding of the Old Testament’s history and interpretation. In 1874 he arranged his Old Testament lectures in canonical order: Pentateuch, historical books and Psalms, and finally the prophets. He spent half the session lecturing on the Pentateuch. But in 1877 he ordered them according to the critical reconstruction of Hebrew religion: historical books and Psalms, then prophets, and finally Pentateuch. He barely discussed the Pentateuch, which he now regarded as the work of the priests and of Ezra during the time of the exile, though Moses provided the germ.²² The Law, Toy told students, represented declension from the pure religion of the prophets—the Law “imprisoned” spiritual religion and produced formalism.²³ In 1874 he defended the unity of Isaiah, but in 1877 he assigned portions to three different authors.²⁴

In 1877 Toy taught students that the traditional messianic prophecies in the Psalms, Isaiah, Micah, and Joel did not refer to Christ, but that Christ was the fulfillment of all truly spiritual longings, and in this sense only the passages were messianic.²⁵ Over and over Toy told students that specific prophecies were not fulfilled and “never came to pass,” but they were fulfilled in a general way by Christ, because he represented spiritual redemption.²⁶ The prophetic promises of Israel’s national prosperity and the restora-

tion of the Davidic dynasty were “not realized in fact.” But such ideas reflected merely the “outward form,” the “framework of the spiritual thought.” The spiritual truth was underneath. The “true inward spiritual thought was wonderfully fulfilled in Christ.”²⁷ Toy interpreted the individual and national experiences of the Hebrews typologically, or rather allegorically. “Israel is the anticipation of Christ and his the fulfillment of Israel.”²⁸ The “outward framework of spiritual idea” was irrelevant, since the true spiritual thought conveyed within communicated God’s plan for spiritual redemption, represented most fully in Christ.²⁹ This was the “great principle of exegesis,” he told the students, to “pierce through the shell, framework” to discover the “real, religious, spiritual idea.”³⁰

In 1877 Toy also began cautiously to publish some of his conclusions based on the historical-critical reconstruction of the history of Israel. In an 1877 homiletical commentary, Toy wrote that Deut 17:14-17 probably originated in some oral tradition from Moses, but that 250 years later Samuel developed it into a constitutional form and wrote it down as law.³¹ In lessons for Sunday School teachers he wrote that the laws restricting temple service to priests came into existence long after Moses, perhaps in the seventh century B.C.³² Toy explained that an unknown writer drew upon existing materials and produced the book of Deuteronomy around 623 B.C.³³

One consequence of divorcing the human and spiritual elements was that Toy began to reinterpret the Bible’s accounts of supernatural events as natural events. Toy maintained that God acted through ordinary natural law—he guided history by his providence. Traditional orthodoxy held this also, but added that God sometimes accomplished his purposes apart from natural agency in a miracle. Toy however explained miracles as the spiritual interpretation of God’s acting through natural causes. He suggested that where the scripture said that leprosy broke out on Uzziah’s face while he burned incense beside the altar, that in

fact the leprosy was already there and the priests only then saw it for the first time and naturally regarded it as divine judgment.³⁴ He suggested also that the destruction of Sennacherib's army was not miraculous in the common sense, but that the "inspired writers" represented a "natural event as the work of an angel of God."³⁵

Toy came to believe that most of the passages quoted in the New Testament to establish the fact that Christ was the Messiah were not messianic in a traditional sense. For example, the New Testament quoted Psalm 2 several times as proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah. Toy however argued that Psalm 2 had no reference to a messiah, but rather spoke of God's promise of blessing to Israel through his "son," the king. Toy however wanted to save the truthfulness of the New Testament, so he concluded that although the New Testament writers erred regarding the meaning of Psalm 2, they nevertheless taught its spiritual meaning—"God's watchcare over his people"—and saw rightly that such spiritual truths had their fullest representation in Christ.³⁶ Toy interpreted Isa 42:1-10 and 53:1-11 as references to Israel, although New Testament writers understood them to refer to Christ. The New Testament authors misinterpreted the texts, Toy believed, but they still taught truth about Christ in a general way, for "Christ was by divine appointment the consummation of all God's revelation of truth in ancient Israel."³⁷ Indeed for Toy the entire history of Israel was the "anticipatory, predictive picture of the Messiah."³⁸ In a broad sense, Toy made every passage in the Old Testament messianic.

Toy explained to a friend in 1879 that New Testament interpretations of the Old Testament were frequently wrong. The New Testament writers often quoted Old Testament passages in ways false to their original meaning. Toy wrote that Paul imposed on Old Testament texts meanings contradictory to their real meaning. When Paul quoted Deut 30:11-14, for example, to prove that sinners are saved by faith and not by works in Rom 10:6-9, Paul's interpretation was "not valid."

The passage in Deuteronomy "means obedience to law; Paul makes it mean not obedience, but faith."³⁹ Toy held that such contradictions did not diminish the divine character of the Bible's spiritual message, which was "independent of all such externals. God permitted the prophets and psalmists to use the incorrect astronomy and geography of their day, and the apostles and other New Testament writers to use the incorrect translation and exegesis of their day, and in this human framework is the divine thought manifest and powerful. To insist on the framework is ritualism and fetishism."⁴⁰ The Bible's inner truth was effectively independent of its outward form.

In his resignation letter to the trustees, Toy summarized and defended his new views. The facts of the Bible, he wrote, convinced him that the "outward form" of the Bible was subject to mistake but this did not jeopardize its religious message. Moses gave the Hebrews some basic laws which later generations developed into the "Mosaic" law of the Pentateuch. Certain prophecies of Isaiah and Hosea did not occur as they predicted, but these statements were the "mere clothing of their real thought." The Old Testament historical writers composed their histories as Christ composed parables, in order to teach religious truth rather than factual history. But the historical assertions constituted merely the "framework or vehicle of a religious truth." Such defects were of the human element only. The Bible was the outward record of Israel's inner experience of God's care and guidance. Because they experienced God, their writings had religious power to inspire, encourage, and guide. Because they had this religious power, Toy recognized in them "a divine element."⁴¹

Toy claimed that his view was in full accord with the seminary's creed, the Abstract of Principles, and that it established divine truth more firmly than the old orthodox view. His teaching was "not only lawful for me to teach as professor in the seminary, but one that will bring aid and firm standing-ground to many a perplexed mind

and establish the truth of God on a surer foundation."⁴² This represented well the apologetic character of his emerging liberalism. For those who accepted evolution, uniformitarian geology, and the new critical view of the history of Israel's religion, such a view of inspiration was the only way to retain an authoritative Bible. Its inspiration and authority extended to spiritual matters, and therefore did not interfere with science or history.

Toy's resignation letter defended his views at some length. Trustees appointed a committee of five, who discussed the matter with Toy and learned his views in greater detail. They recommended that the board accept Toy's resignation because his views diverged significantly from those commonly held among Southern Baptists. "After a full discussion" the board voted sixteen to two in favor of Toy's dismissal.⁴³ They made no attempt to prove the unsoundness of Toy's views. Seminary trustee John Chambliss wrote that Toy was "astonished" that the trustees accepted his resignation.⁴⁴

Toy left the South, left Baptists, and finally left the church. His efforts to enlighten Southern Baptists generally largely failed. They held firmly to traditional orthodoxy. But the tide was about to turn, and the seminary would lead the way. A large percentage of the next generation of seminary professors adopted the new view of inspiration. Edgar Y. Mullins, William O. Carver, George B. Eager, Charles S. Gardner, and most of their successors took the new view of inspiration for granted. They followed Toy in seeking by "patient and wise effort to dislodge the traditional narrowness." Carver observed correctly in 1954 that Toy's "views would today not be regarded as sufficiently revolutionary to call for drastic action."⁴⁵

EDGAR Y. MULLINS AND PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

Edgar Y. Mullins, who became the seminary's fourth president in 1899, led Southern Baptists away from traditional orthodoxy in significant ways and reshaped Southern Baptist theology. He did so while maintaining a reputation for conserv-

ing the orthodoxy of the founding faculty. He for example established an annual Founders' Day observance at the seminary, but it served more as a monument to their memory than as a standard of measure. He recognized that the monument helped to cover the seminary's progressive values in the mantle of the founders.

Mullins viewed his approach to theology as "progressive as well as conservative."⁴⁶ It was in fact a mediating theology. Mediating theology was the dominant theological approach in Germany from the 1840s until the 1880s. It agreed with Schleiermacher's privileging of experience as the source of revelation, but differed with him by insisting on the objective character of that revelation. These two commitments formed the two fundamental commitments of Mullins's theology. But he elaborated on them in a unique way. He argued that Borden Parker Bowne's Personalist philosophy united the subjective experience to its objective meaning, and that William James's philosophy of pragmatism authenticated this union of experience and objectivity. Running through it all is a distinctly American privileging of the individual, whether in epistemology, ethics, or doctrine.

These commitments make Mullins one of the more difficult and most contested figures in American religious history. Progressive Southern Baptists have claimed Mullins as the chief originator of their movement, and conservative Southern Baptists have claimed him as an ally in theirs. Naturally, he rather belonged to both. Yale literary critic Harold Bloom called Mullins "the Calvin or Luther or Wesley of the Southern Baptists." He did not found the Southern Baptist movement, Bloom acknowledged, but he reformulated their faith. He was "their refounder, the definer of their creedless faith."⁴⁷ Historian Paul Harvey argued similarly that Mullins transformed the traditional Calvinist orthodoxy of Southern Baptist churches into a more progressive and experientialist faith.⁴⁸ Above all, it was a more individualist faith.

Mullins reshaped Baptist theology by combining the central idea of modern theology with

the denomination's conservative heritage, and by building a faculty who agreed with these principles. The new theology built upon religious experience. Calvin represented the old theology's emphasis on God's transcendence and objective doctrine. Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher represented the new theology's emphasis on subjective religious experience. "Calvin and Schleiermacher are the two great names which stand forth in the doctrinal history as most significant for these two standpoints."⁴⁹ Christianity needed both. Like Germany's mediating theologians of the prior generation, Mullins constructed a theology that united the objective knowledge of God with individual religious experience. Schleiermacher provided the central insight that religious consciousness connected human experience with divine reality. But Mullins sought a more secure basis for the objectivity of the knowledge that derived from experience by incorporating the insights of two of America's great philosophers, William James and Borden Parker Bowne.

Mullins had deep appreciation for William James. James taught philosophy at Harvard University and established his own philosophical tradition, pragmatism. James did what Mullins thought Christian apologists should do—he took the data of Christian experience seriously as a proper field of scientific study. James stopped short of concluding that human experience revealed anything other than the internal operations of the human consciousness. God, for James, was an important idea in human consciousness that provided the integration, hope, courage, and industry in religious individuals that made them healthy and productive members of society.

Mullins did not see pragmatism as a philosophy or a worldview. It had a more modest role. It was a test of truth claims. Mullins valued pragmatism as a method for evaluating truth claims, because it considered personal experience and volition as valid data for determining truth. Mullins held that used this way pragmatism established a theistic worldview. It established the validity of the

Christian's claims of assurance of salvation and of future blessedness in heaven. Jesus, Mullins said, "was the greatest of pragmatists," for "his approach to the whole question of truth and reality was pragmatic." Modern pragmatism was "simply catching up" with Jesus.⁵⁰

Mullins appreciated James in particular for his analysis of the role of religious beliefs in the psychological health and personal welfare of religious persons. James demonstrated that people's religious beliefs had measurable impact on their well-being. For a large class of persons, James argued, their religious beliefs answered the most basic needs of their soul and integrated their consciousness for meaningful and healthy existence in society. Mullins appreciated the popular liberal theologian Albrecht Ritschl for similar reasons. Ritschl's analysis of the role that doctrine played in the experience of Christians provided a compelling basis for doctrine in individual experience. Because the doctrines had personal value, Ritschl argued, Christians naturally held the doctrines to be true. But James's pragmatism had the advantage of a scientific basis, Mullins felt. James's analysis of religious experience was empirical and scientific. It examined the facts of experience. It had great apologetic value, Mullins thought, because when viewed correctly it provided empirical evidence of the truths behind Christian experience.

But Mullins found both James and Ritschl deficient, because they did not see this. Both accepted the limits of human knowledge imposed by Immanuel Kant's critique of reason. Ritschl did not move beyond religious belief as personal value. James, with minor exceptions, did not move beyond religious belief as pragmatically beneficial. Mullins however held that the religious experience of the Christian was a genuine encounter with the self-revealing God and that it bridged the gap between personal experience and divine realities. "In religious experience," Mullins said, "we have direct knowledge of the noumena."⁵¹ The Christian's religious experience involved essentially direct

knowledge of eternal reality.⁵² Mullins needed a philosophic basis for ultimate truth, which was more than James or Ritschl could provide.

The philosopher who had established the viability of this approach was Borden Parker Bowne, the founder of the Boston Personalist school. Bowne taught philosophy at Boston University from 1876 until his death in 1910. Bowne argued for a brand of idealism that began with the empirical data of personal experience and personal relationship, and united all reality in the personal mind of God. Belief in the existence of a personal God was warranted, Bowne taught, because it provided the most convincing and the most practical explanation of human experience.⁵³

Personalism was attractive to Mullins because it promised to solve the basic problem of empiricism, how to bridge the divide between the world of sense and the world of spirit. But it appealed to Mullins also because of its obvious apologetic value. It started with personal experience, with “the facts of life,” and yet transcended fact. It deduced “ultimate truth from empirical facts,” the facts of common human experience, of coexistence of persons, and of common reason. And finally, it led “directly to Theism.”⁵⁴ It is not surprising that Mullins called Personalism the “highest stage in the development of philosophic idealism,” or that he identified himself as an “ardent admirer” of Bowne.⁵⁵

MULLINS AND THE NEW SHAPE OF BAPTIST THEOLOGY

Mullins led Southern Baptists to adopt a new approach to theology. He reconstructed Christian doctrine on the basis of experience. “The Christian doctrinal system,” Mullins wrote, “arises out of the facts of Christian experience.”⁵⁶ This new basis for doctrine led him to recast many traditional beliefs. In his 1906 *Axioms of Religion* Mullins appealed to religious experience in a more limited way, as a proof of the validity of Christian truth claims. In his 1917 *Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression*, Mullins based all Christian

theology on experience. The result was a shift in emphasis that altered the contours of Southern Baptist religion.

Mullins’s “experiential method” for the construction of Christian theology was not new. Schleiermacher was the pioneer a century earlier. Mullins however, like German mediating theologians and some contemporary personalist theologians, gave experience more power than Schleiermacher had—it revealed facts. “Religious experience is the starting point of religious knowledge. Of course the facts concerning which we obtain knowledge exist independently of us. But we acquire truth about these facts through experience.”⁵⁷

Mullins promoted his approach to religion as empirical. He analyzed human religious experience. In this he was following in the train of liberalism generally, which since Schleiermacher had claimed that religion consisted in human experience. To learn about religion theologians had to study the religious subject, humans, not the religious object, God. This “turn to the subject” was the foundation of Christian liberalism.

But as many critics of liberalism had already pointed out, an analysis of human religion can not logically yield any knowledge of God or spiritual realities. This was the critical weakness in reliance on human experience. There were two common solutions and Mullins had recourse to both.

The first solution was the assertion that religious experience corresponded to and revealed eternal truths in the spiritual realm. The basis for this was the argument that the existence of spiritual realities was necessary to make sense of human experience. Human experience was rife with questions of meaning, longing for purpose, sense of conscience, recognition of good and evil, experience of sin and guilt, and the desire for forgiveness and redemption. These experiences were incomprehensible, even absurd, unless they corresponded to spiritual realities. The existence of God, the immortality of the soul, a divine standard of good and evil, and divine purpose and

destiny for humanity—such things must exist if humans were to make sense of their experience. “Faith in Christ is an act which takes for granted that the universe answers to the soul’s craving for deliverance from sin.”⁵⁸ Indeed, even the more basic experiences of personhood and freedom were unintelligible apart from belief in the existence of such spiritual realities.

This went beyond Kant’s a priori argument that it was practically necessary to postulate God’s existence based on considerations of conscience and freedom. In Kant’s argument, God’s existence remained a postulate and was not strictly knowledge. Mullins taught that Kant’s argument was valid, but that it fell short of what was needed, since it could establish only the phenomena or experiences of religion and not the noumena, the realities behind the phenomena. Kant’s argument neglected consideration of the fact of the Christian experience of God. “Our experience of redemption through Christ brings knowledge of the reality behind the phenomena. It brings direct knowledge of God.” The Christian’s experience was knowledge of the divine realities. The noumena remained beyond the reach of Kant’s pure and practical reason, but were accessible to Christian experience.⁵⁹

The second solution to the problem involved the doctrine of divine immanence. This approach, which Mullins shared with liberalism broadly, distanced doctrine. Traditional Protestantism placed true doctrine as one of the essential elements of the Christian religion, without which true religious experience was impossible. But for Mullins, as for liberal Protestants generally, religion was an experience rather than a doctrine. Doctrine was a natural development because religious experience yearned for expression. But the doctrine was derivative of religion, not constitutive. Religious experience was a fact and doctrine was an expression of the meaning or personal value of the experience. “Facts are one thing, meanings are another,” Mullins wrote, reflecting the popular Ritschlian distinction between fact and meaning.

“The doctrines are simply the statement of the meaning of religion.”⁶⁰ Mullins, however, unlike Ritschl, believed that the meaning in the theological statement was objectively true. Mullins having placed doctrine on a new footing, now gave it a new cast.

Mullins and the more progressive Southern Seminary faculty embraced liberalism’s middle way. It sought to establish a viable path between rationalism and orthodoxy. Rationalism was the great enemy, but traditional orthodoxy was also defective, since it was unscientific and could not answer the challenges posed by rationalism. As a mediating approach, liberalism tended to spread out across the spectrum. Some forms seemed nearly to slide into rationalism. Other forms seemed relatively traditional. Mullins and the faculty rejected identification as liberals. They called themselves by such identifiers as “conservative-progressive.” Mullins explained it this way: “I believe in progress in theological thought and statement, but I believe in the evangelical fundamentals.”⁶¹

Many Southern Baptist scholars, especially those at Southern Seminary, followed this mediating approach. It was sometimes pietistic more than philosophical, especially in the case of students. It divided the realm of physical science and historical criticism from the realm of religion. Humans lived in both the physical and the spiritual world, but they knew the realities of these realms by different means. They knew the facts of nature and history by observation and its reasonable deductions. But they knew the facts of the spiritual realm by personal experience—freedom, personality, and above all, consciousness of the divine.

What made them pietistic was their insistence that the two realms were entirely independent of each other. The facts of one realm could not challenge the facts of the other realm. This meant that scientists and historical critics of the Bible could have absolute freedom in their methods and conclusions, and they could never pose any threat to

the facts of the spiritual realm in religious experience. The approach enabled them to accept such findings of science as evolution, and at the same time to accept unqualified the Bible's account of direct divine creation. The two beliefs belonged to different spheres of reality. The two realms were coherent because God was the ground of both. God was immanent in both. His presence in the world's course ensured that its development and destiny coincided with the spiritual development and destiny of humanity. Augustus H. Strong, the president of Rochester Theological Seminary whose career and thought paralleled Mullins's in many ways, expressed clearly what so many Southern Baptist scholars felt: "Neither evolution nor the higher criticism has any terrors to one who regards them as part of Christ's creating and education process."⁶²

Mullins's wall of partition between scientific knowledge and religious knowledge introduced the profound tension between his acceptance of the methods of science and historical criticism on the one hand, and his insistence on traditional doctrinal positions on the other. At a popular level, Southern Baptists generally accepted Mullins's approach and erected the same wall, and they did not worry much over the apparent contradictions.

This was an attractive approach for the faculty's progressive conservatives, and for preachers in the conservative denomination who also valued the latest scholarship of the historical critics. Mullins himself erected a division between scientific and religious knowledge that encouraged the pietist approach.

The approach was vulnerable to devastating criticism. It implied above all that truth lacked unity. Both Carver and Gardner criticized Mullins for this approach. Carver described his own reaction:

He [Mullins] adopted and vigorously applied the principle of partition in the fields of thought and learning, and insisted on the "rights of theology"

to its own matter, method, and principles, as an autonomous sphere along with the philosophical and the scientific spheres, whose rights he was always ready to concede. I was myself, never able to use this method and in my department, and frankly said so. It was a method more useful for meeting conflicts current in the cultural thinking of the day and for adjusting progressive thinking to lagging conservatism than for what I regarded as the truer approach. For me, truth is a comprehensive unit. What is true in any sphere of thought and culture is to be recognized as actually true. No plea for "rights" in one field that conflict with "rights" in another field can yield true insight and permanent understanding. But for very many readers his method brought about a *modus vivendi* which enabled them to hold in suspension incongruities and even conflicts and contradictions between "truths" in different spheres.⁶³

Carver was right. Educated Southern Baptist preachers widely adopted Mullins's division of the spheres of knowledge. It permitted them to affirm broadly the work of scientists and historical critics without requiring them to adjust their traditional theology. Carver rejected pietistic mediating approaches.

WILLIAM OWEN CARVER, MISSIONS, AND MODERNISM

In the early twentieth century the seminary was already gaining a reputation as a "liberal" school. When Arkansan Perry Webb planned to enroll in 1919, someone asked him why he was going to "that liberal school."⁶⁴ The teaching of William O. Carver was the main reason for that reputation.

Carver exercised an extraordinary and enduring influence on the character of the seminary's teaching in the twentieth century. Carver's theology, like Mullins's, held that our knowledge of spiritual reality came through religious experience, which provided sufficient data for deriving reasonable conclusions about God, humanity, and

ethics. Carver's theology incorporated some personalist elements but was basically Ritschlian in its framework. It was neoromantic, neo-Hegelian, and historicist—which is to say that the Christian faith derived from religious experience, God was immanent in the world's historical progress, and true knowledge is historical knowledge, since eternal truth always arrived clothed in its historical conditions.

Carver's 1910 *Missions and Modern Thought* was an extended justification of the missionary enterprise based on the new modernist form of Christianity. Many scientists, philosophers, and sociologists argued that the era of religion was ending, and that humans no longer needed religion to explain the mysteries of the natural world—science had assumed that function. Humans no longer needed religion to give wholeness and meaning to their lives—psychology now did that. And humans no longer needed religion to form ethical values—sociology now did that. And anthropologists were arguing that the introduction of non-native Christianity into other cultures deeply injured societies whose ideals and practices had been constructed on the basis of other religious views. As a result of these developments, many leaders, inside and outside the church, questioned the value, and even the morality, of the Christian missionary enterprise.

Carver agreed that the traditional justification of missions no longer sufficed. Christian missions was formerly based on the premise that persons who did not repent and believe in the gospel of Jesus Christ would spend eternity in hell under God's judgment of their sin, Carver said, but now Christians understood that many non-Christians already knew God "in experience" and "in the processes of nature and history." Modern Christians could not believe that God would condemn anyone to eternal misery. Missions had to adjust to modern conditions of knowledge and society.⁶⁵ The modern church should promote the missionary enterprise "for the life of the nation, for the salvation of society, for the condition of the world."

The Christian message would save the world—that is, the social institutions of this world.⁶⁶

Religion alone, Carver felt could muster sufficient resources to save the world from ignorance, hatred, and injustice. It, above all human institutions and ideas, promoted the "advance of the race." Christianity was the "highest religion" and was "adaptable" to the state of progress in every society. "Christian civilizations," Carver urged, "are the highest, the most ethical, the most spiritual." Therefore, he concluded, every person who cared about human progress should "seek to promote the extension of the Christian faith." Other religions made positive contributions by striving for goodness, but "it is the Christian spirit alone that brings to their destiny these scattered strivings of the human heart." Christianity alone could civilize the world and establish justice, peace, and human brotherhood among the peoples of the earth.⁶⁷

But traditional Christianity, Carver argued, was outworn. Human history had outgrown it. But that was no discredit to Christianity. Christianity, Carver said, was universally adaptable and was adapting to the new conditions of the world.⁶⁸ What the modern world needed was a just and meaning social order, a better civilization. But only Christianity could bring civilization. The motive and aim of modern missions was to Christianize the world, so that Christianity would become in truth the one great world religion, and the nations of the world one great brotherhood. Christianity was the engine of progress toward this "true civilization."⁶⁹

The future of the civilization of the world depended upon the universal spread and dominance of Christianity. The motive for missions was not lost, therefore, when traditional theology disintegrated. Carver called for missions, then, not because souls were perishing daily into eternal misery apart from Christ, but because individual misery and social disintegration threatened to deepen in the modern world unless the world was Christianized.

But *Missions and Modern Thought* was not

about missions only. It was also an apologetic for Christianity, for the new form of Christianity adapted to the conditions of the modern age—modernist Christianity. The old theology, Carver said, had its origins in medieval social constructs. As human religion in the modern era drew closer to “the revelation of God in Christ Jesus,” the reconstruction of theology became necessary.⁷⁰ The old theology was too provincial and nationalistic. The times demanded a universal religion that interpreted God as the “God of all humanity” who through Christ, the eternal Logos, “lighteth every man that comes into the world.”⁷¹ A new theology was therefore inevitable in the modern world. Christianity had always been the most adaptable of all religions, while at the same time it always remained true to its essence. Modern Christianity was “only tearing down her house to build a greater, because new conditions are present.”⁷²

The new theology recognized that religion was basic to human existence and consisted in human experience of God. “Man is essentially and so permanently religious,” Carver wrote.⁷³ Carver described religion even as Schleiermacher had: “Religion is man’s God-consciousness.” God-consciousness consisted, Carver explained, of three basic sentiments: “a sense of dependence upon the super-human, the recognition of obligation to the super-human, and desire for fellowship with the super-human.”⁷⁴

To reconstruct Christianity, theologians had to recognize and preserve its genuine essence. Carver understood Christianity in modernist terms. He contended that religion was, in its essence, the experience of God’s love as the power to live for others. Although Carver held that God revealed himself in history by Jesus Christ, God had always been in the business of revealing himself in the hearts of humans, and did so still. Jesus was the Logos of God, the reason of God, and so enlightened every person. The Christian faith was fundamentally experiential.

But this did not isolate humans from real knowledge of God. Ludwig Feuerbach and other

critics of liberalism had argued that if all religion derived from human experience, then it could not transcend the merely human. It was trapped in its own subjectivity. But Carver, like Mullins and many liberals, overcame this criticism by asserting that God was immanent in human experience. Experience bridged the gap between sensation and thought, between matter and spirit. Religious experience and human freedom formed the ground of “personality,” which transcended the limitations of physical science. “God is immanent in the world,” Carver said, and therefore the forces of both natural and human evolution were “a progressive manifestation of God.”⁷⁵ The development of human knowledge and culture was therefore “the growth of religion.” God was in all things and was bringing his purposes to pass through all things. The new understanding of religion, humanity, and Christ, were but the “new unfolding of Himself” in the world.⁷⁶

It meant also that all religions, despite their ignorance of the fact, were leading to Christianity. All religions, Carver argued, were “more or less successful movements toward God.”⁷⁷ “The sacred writings of all the faiths” were “preparatory” to the full revelation of Christ. Missionaries saw first that the “Law of Buddha, the Analects of Confucius, the Bhagavad Gita,” functioned in reference to Christianity in the same way that the Old Testament did.⁷⁸ Thus “we now think of the religions of the world . . . as approaches to God.”⁷⁹ In sending out the gospel to all religions, God met “his own Spirit” leading people of “dim faith and imperfect religions unto himself.”⁸⁰

Every religion followed an evolution from primitive to more enlightened religion. “All religions begin with the impulsive stage,” and their real growth and pure development occurred “under the guidance of the inspiration of God.”⁸¹ This was true because God was immanent in the world process and in human progress. Human “experience in all the life and movement of the world” was God’s “immanent activity.”⁸²

Salvation in modern Christianity was living for

God and his kingdom. God destined humans to establish a perfect society based on brotherhood and selfless service of others. But humans did not attain such brotherhood until they realized and acknowledged God's fatherly love. "Brotherhood can have no sure foundation except in fatherhood."⁸³ Christ redeemed persons by revealing God's fatherly love. "His Son becomes our savior by revealing the Father love of God."⁸⁴ To live in the knowledge of God's fatherly love is true faith. The cross became the "greatest principle in the rescue and development of human personality" and the "mightiest principle in the evolution of character," because the cross evoked faith in God's fatherly love. It was God's purpose that humans should live in selfless service to each other and the cross revealed "the principle that he who would save his life must continuously lose it."⁸⁵ Jesus thus manifested God's fatherhood in his flesh, and for this reason he was called "Redeemer."⁸⁶

Carver urged Christians to adapt their faith to the modern conditions. Christians who ascribed authority to the Bible were missing the point, Carver felt. The true authority was not the Bible but the God to whom the biblical records bore witness. Scripture was an indispensable historical record of God's revelation to men, and recorded the writers' interpretations of God's revelation in their own hearts. The advance of Christianity required the "transfer of Christian authority from the Book to the soul."⁸⁷ Christians therefore did not need to fear the ravages of the historical criticism of the Bible. The "attacks on the New Testament" served only to make Christ "more resplendent and more certainly living." They proved that "Jesus Christ can not be taken away."⁸⁸

The realization of Christ's universal love in a world Christianity cast doubt on the traditional doctrine of hell. The new theology did not yet have a final answer, Carver said, concerning the destiny of persons who rejected God's call to acknowledge his fatherhood and live in brotherhood, but he suggested that it was time to dispense with the doctrine of hell. Persons who supported missions

from the belief that "the heathen are going to hell" needed to rethink the subject.⁸⁹ The truest conception of both the Old and New Testaments was in terms of its revelation of God's universal love for all persons. The Bible in fact did not associate the missionary duty with the doctrine of "eternal damnation," Carver argued. None of the apostles adduced "endless torment" as a "motive of his missionary endeavor. None were even "directly influenced by this." And although Jesus spoke of the "awful doom of hell," he "must have his true interpretation" translated into the "consciousness and consciences of all men."⁹⁰

The loss of the doctrine of hell would not diminish the motive for the missionary enterprise. "What we have lost of the 'tragic realism' of a literal hell," Carver explained, was more than compensated by the "task of bringing whole nations into their destiny of moral life." Modern missionaries were no longer moved by the "emotional enthusiasm of snatching a few souls from the eternal burning."⁹¹ All these modern developments were preparing the world for one universal religion for all men, a world Christianity, founded in the revelation of Christ in the hearts of all men and intended for the development of true personality and perfect society.⁹²

E. Y. Mullins and W. O. Carver promoted different visions of progressive religion. Mullins's was an evangelical liberalism better suited for gaining acceptance among traditionalist Southern Baptists. He sought to affirm both scientific truth, derived from empirical methods, and transcendent religious truth, derived from personal experience. Mullins convinced relatively few Southern Baptists to adopt his complete schema, but he convinced many leading pastors and future faculty of important elements of it, especially the experientialist epistemology. Mullins's experientialist faith had wide influence among Southern Baptists and reshaped their piety in significant ways toward pragmatism and individualism. It did not displace the older scripturalism and supernat-

uralism, but rather flourished alongside it. Carver represented a broadly Ritschlian approach that maintained certain central Christian beliefs, but interpreted the faith largely in terms of its ethical commitments. Toy first inspired educated Southern Baptists, mostly graduates of Southern Seminary, to adopt the liberal view of inspiration, but Mullins and Carver had wider influence. Mullins's approach conserved more of the old doctrine and had wider appeal among Southern Baptists generally. Carver's approach became the most popular among Southern Baptist scholars, especially after World War II, when the faculty's liberal convictions distanced them increasingly from the traditional orthodoxy of the founding faculty and from the conservative biblicism of the vast majority of Southern Baptists.

ENDNOTES

¹This article is adapted from parts of two chapters of my *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1859-2009* (New York: Oxford University, 2009 [forthcoming]). More extensive discussions of Toy, Mullins, and Carver can be found there.

²Charles A. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), 286.

³C. H. Toy to Charles A. Briggs, 19 Jan. 1877, Charles August Briggs Papers, Series 31, Ledger 5, Letter 773, Archives, Burke Library, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Briggs, *General Introduction*, 286. In the same letter Toy expressed surprise that Briggs held that the "last redaction of the Pentateuch was made before the Babylonian Exile."

⁴On the new theology, see Gary Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805-1900* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001); William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1976); Kenneth Cauthen, *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

⁵The first American edition of Lyell's *Principles of Geology* appeared in 1837; the first English edition

appeared in 1830.

⁶Toy, "A Bit of Personal Experience," *Religious Herald*, 1 Apr 1880, 1. See also C. H. Toy, quoted in A. J. Holt, Lecture Notes of C. H. Toy's Old Testament Class, 28 Sep 1874, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary ("The word day then can not mean a geological period").

⁷John A. Broadus, *Memoir of James Petigru Boyce* (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1893), 260.

⁸C. H. Toy, quoted in Holt, Lecture Notes, 9 Oct 1874, 155. See also, unattributed, "News and Notes," *Religious Herald*, 28 Jun 1877. The paper evidently did not publish Toy's article.

⁹Toy, "A Bit of Personal Experience," 1; Toy, "Genesis and Geology," *Religious Herald*, 6 May 1880, 1.

¹⁰Broadus, *Memoir of Boyce*, 260. See also George F. Moore, "An Appreciation of Professor Toy," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 36 (1919): 12.

¹¹Abraham Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State* (trans. Alfred Heath May; London: Williams and Norgate, 1874), 6.

¹²*Ibid.*, 9.

¹³*Ibid.*, 11-12.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 13-14.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 134-42.

¹⁶Toy esteemed Kuenen's work highly (Toy, "Kuenen's Life and Work," *Christian Register*, 21 Jan 1892, 4). For another contemporary estimate of Kuenen's role in Old Testament criticism, see T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), 185-94.

¹⁷See Toy, "Kuenen's Life and Work," 4.

¹⁸Holt, Lecture Notes, 151.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 168.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 182. In 1874 Toy held that it was "morally certain" that Moses wrote Exodus, though Moses could not have written all of it (*ibid.*, 168, 194).

²¹*Ibid.*, 162.

²²Hugh C. Smith, Lectures in Old Testament English by C. H. Toy, 1877-1878, 130-32, Archives and Special Collections, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS).

²³Holt, Lecture Notes, 148-246; Smith, Lectures,

1-139, 132 (quote).

²⁴Holt, Lecture Notes, 239; Smith, Lectures, 68.

²⁵Smith, Lectures, 44, 49-51, 58-60, 67-69, 118-24.

²⁶Ibid., 48, 56-57, 65-68, 108.

²⁷Ibid., 108.

²⁸Ibid., 125.

²⁹Ibid., 124.

³⁰Ibid., 125.

³¹Toy, Translator's note, in C. F. D. Erdmann, *The Books of Samuel* (trans. and ed. C. H. Toy and John A. Broadus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877), 136-37.

³²Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 9 Feb 1878, 87.

³³Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 12 Jan 1878, 23. As noted above, Toy held that Ezra gave Deuteronomy and the Pentateuch their final form around 400 B.C. See also Toy, *The History of the Religion of Israel* (Boston: Unitarian Sunday School Society, 1882), ix-x.

³⁴Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 9 Feb 1878, 87.

³⁵Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 2 Mar 1878, 135.

³⁶Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 8 Feb 1879, 87.

³⁷Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 12 Apr 1879, 231.

³⁸Toy, "Critical Notes," *Sunday School Times*, 19 Apr 1879, 247.

³⁹Toy to John L. Johnson, 16 Dec 1879, John Lipscomb Johnson Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹C. H. Toy to the Board of Trustees, May 1879, SBTS; Toy, "Full Text of the 'Paper' Offered with the Resignation of Rev. C. H. Toy, D.D., as Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary," *Baptist Courier*, 27 Nov 1879, 2. Also, Toy, "Dr. Toy's Address to the Board of Trustees of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary," *Religious Herald*, 11 Dec 1879, 1.

⁴²Toy, "Full Text," *Baptist Courier*, 27 Nov 1879, 2.

⁴³Minutes, Board of Trustees, Southern Baptist Theo-

logical Seminary, 7-13 May 1879; James C. Furman, chmn., "Report of Dr. Toy's Committee of Resignation," SBTS; The two who voted against dismissal, John A. Chambliss and D. W. Gwin, submitted a formal statement of protest against the board's action, which the board received. The statement apparently did not survive, as the trustee books of reports, with all such exhibits, were evidently lost for the period through 1888.

⁴⁴John A. Chambliss, "The Trustees of the Seminary and Dr. Toy's Resignation," *Baptist Courier*, 12 June 1879, 2.

⁴⁵William O. Carver, "Recollections and Information From Other Sources Concerning the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary," typescript, 27, SBTS.

⁴⁶Edgar Y. Mullins to Charles S. Gardner, 4 May 1907, Letterbook 31, 1906-1908, 340.

⁴⁷Harold Bloom, *The American Religion* (2nd ed.; New York: Chu Hartley, 2006), 215. Bloom concluded that "pragmatically he is more important than Jonathan Edwards, Horace Bushnell, and the Niebuhrs."

⁴⁸Paul Harvey, *Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities among Southern Baptists, 1865-1925* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1997), 152-55.

⁴⁹Edgar Y. Mullins, "Southern Baptists and the Changing Viewpoint," *Biblical Recorder*, 22 Apr 1903, 2.

⁵⁰Edgar Y. Mullins to Carl Murchison, 24 Sep 1912, in Letterpress Copy Book 42, 27 Jan 1913 – 28 Oct 1913.

⁵¹Edgar Y. Mullins, "Forty Years of Progress in Theology," ts., 20, box 39, Mullins Papers.

⁵²On Mullins's assessment of Kant, Ritschl, and James, see, e.g., Edgar Y. Mullins, *The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression* (Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1917), 193-96, 201-02, 225-26.

⁵³See Gary Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805-1900* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 378-81.

⁵⁴Edgar Y. Mullins, "Pragmatism, Humanism, and Personalism—The New Philosophic Movement," *Review and Expositor* 5 (1908): 510-12.

- ⁵⁵Edgar Y. Mullins to Frederick White, 22 Dec 1913, in Letterpress Copy Book 43, 29 Oct 1913 – 6 Oct 1914, 176.
- ⁵⁶Mullins, *Christian Religion*, 68.
- ⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 180.
- ⁵⁸Edgar Y. Mullins, “The Meaning of Religion, No. II—Certainty in Religion,” *Religious Herald*, 8 May 1919, 4.
- ⁵⁹Mullins, *Christian Religion*, 134-35.
- ⁶⁰Edgar Y. Mullins, “The Meaning of Religion,” *Religious Herald*, 1 May 1919, 4.
- ⁶¹Edgar Y. Mullins to Albert Waffle, 29 Apr. 1914, Letterpress Copy Book 43.
- ⁶²Augustus H. Strong, *Outlines of Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1908), ix.
- ⁶³William O. Carver, “Recollections and Information From Other Sources Concerning the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,” SBTS, 80-81.
- ⁶⁴Perry Webb Jr., in Transcript, SBC Peace Committee Meeting, 9-10 Jan 1986, tape 4, 7, Honeycutt Papers.
- ⁶⁵William O. Carver, *Missions and Modern Thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1910), 14.
- ⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 22-23.
- ⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 34-35, 37-39.
- ⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 40, 66-67.
- ⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 52-67, 136.
- ⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 227.
- ⁷¹*Ibid.*, 228-29.
- ⁷²*Ibid.*, 231.
- ⁷³*Ibid.*, 194.
- ⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 122-23.
- ⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 182.
- ⁷⁶*Ibid.*, 196, 240.
- ⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 315.
- ⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 255-56.
- ⁷⁹*Ibid.*, 288.
- ⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 299-300.
- ⁸¹*Ibid.*, 124, 131.
- ⁸²*Ibid.*, 158.
- ⁸³*Ibid.*, 169.
- ⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 155.
- ⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 164-65.
- ⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 165.
- ⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 250.
- ⁸⁸*Ibid.*, 254.
- ⁸⁹*Ibid.*, 296-97.
- ⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 301-06.
- ⁹¹*Ibid.*, 298-99.
- ⁹²*Ibid.*, 282.