

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

---

No. 49--JULY, 1899.

---

## I. SOME PERILS OF MISSIONARY LIFE.<sup>1</sup>

I suppose we all recognize that missionaries are the cream of Christians. They may say with Paul, in the whole length and breadth of his meaning, that unto them the grace has been given to preach unto the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii., 8). They are the bold and faithful spirits who bear the banner of the cross courageously to the front. We who abide at home, hope that we are at home by the will of God and to his glory; but we cannot withhold our admiration from those whom God has chosen to form the advance-guard of his conquering host. We recognize that these "picked men" are the *elite* of the army of the cross. Their bearing justifies this recognition. There is no body of men in the world of equal numbers who so thoroughly meet the trust reposed in them and the lofty sentiments entertained towards them by their fellow Christians.

So exalted is our well-founded appreciation of the character of missionaries in general that it comes with something of a shock to us to discover, as we are now and then led to discover, that even missionaries are, nevertheless, men, and are sometimes liable to the temptations, and shall

---

<sup>1</sup>An address to a body of prospective missionaries.

## 1VI. THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESBYTRIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, TOWARD MODERN "REGENERATED" THEOLOGY.

In the year 1810, Frederick William III, of Prussia, founded the University of Berlin. Whether the King had been influenced by his political troubles and reverses, or had been subdued by the sorrowful death of the universally beloved Queen, which occurred that year, it is certain that he had come to the conclusion that if a government would permanently prosper it must have its foundation, not merely in military power, but in the intellectual, moral, and religious culture of its people. The old University of Leipsic, established in 1409, had just passed its four hundredth anniversary; the University of Bonn, founded by the Maximilian Frederick, had not yet attained its quarter of a century mile-post, and was to be greatly enlarged by Frederick William III. in 1818. The new University of Berlin at once took its stand prominently along side its older competitors, the youngest, freshest, and, in some respects, the strongest of the three. Into it swept the waters of philosophical and religious thought which had their springs in writers of the centuries of the past, especially of the preceeding two hundred years; out of it emerged the streams, bold but by no means clear, which to this day are mingling with the Revelation of God, with

---

<sup>1</sup>The article embodies the substance of an address delivered before the Alumni Association of Columbia Theological Seminary, who adopted the following resolution: "Having heard with sincere pleasure the able, instructive and entertaining address of the Rev. Dr. Eugene Daniel, 'Resolved, That we hereby express to Dr. Daniel our high appreciation of and sincere thanks for this timely address, and that we request him to furnish a copy of the same to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for publication.'" The address was delivered before it was written. It is given for substance.

obscuring and contaminating power. The University of Berlin became at once a reservoir and a fountain. As preliminary to the matter of this article, it will be interesting to recall to memory some of the writers whose thoughts this university has attracted; and then, some whose peculiar views it has originated, developed and sent forth into the Theological world of the nineteenth century. This simple process will give conclusive suggestion as to the origin of that which Professor Dorner has called "Regenerated" Theology.

#### I. INTRODUCTORY.

For the purpose of this article, our preliminary survey need extend no further backward than to the fourth decade of the seventeenth century.

In the year 1632, at Amsterdam, began a life which was to have the brief duration of only forty-five years, the influence of which will probably live as long as thought lives. Spinoza was a Jew. His people excommunicated and anathematized him. Poor, he polished lenses and wrote books. Exiled from Amsterdam, he fled to The Hague, studied on and wrote on, until he became so eminent that he had the honor of declining the Professorship of Philosophy at Heidelberg. His study was to him the world, and he gave time, health and possible wealth, for the privacy of his chamber and the luxury of uninterrupted, severe thought. As a Jew, his philosophical speculation could not move in the atmosphere of Traditional Revelation. Spinoza could not write philosophy and fail to write of religion. He wrote both and joined them in wedlock.

There were three things in Spinoza's system which took mighty sweep.

First, he made religion to be essentially feeling, the love of God; while doctrines belong to Philosophy. Second, he held that the facts of the Bible are highly colored by its writers and that it is of first importance to distinguish

between the fact and its coloring ; or, as the modern critic develops the thought, that the Bible must be read with great "discrimination." Third, the heart and soul of Spinoza's Philosophical and Religious System was Pantheism. Of course it is not affirmed that this most fascinating of all erroneous forms of belief, found in Spinoza an originator. It is more than probable that Pantheism in one or another of its Protean shapes, arises spontaneously in the human soul, the shadowy distortion of truths made ghosts by sin and sin's darkening of the understanding; entering into every false religion on the globe. Even within the Christian Church, the plausible error found unmistakable expression in Scotus Erigena as early as the ninth century. But whilst all this is true, it is certain that Spinoza's mystical mind and patiently-brooding thought gave to Pantheism its widest and most powerful exhibition. With these three things in his hand, namely: (1) Feeling in Religion; (2) A Bible of Suspected Historicity, and (3) Pantheism, Spinoza will one day knock at the door of the University of Berlin. We shall see who will bid him enter.

Meanwhile, passing over a period of nearly fifty years from the death of Spinoza, we find ourselves at the birth-date of another philosopher whose genius and learning have left their impress upon nearly all the systems of the succeeding years. This was "the Sage of Konigsberg."

Immanuel Kant was born in 1724. It is said that during his long life of nearly eighty years, he never travelled farther than forty miles from his native city of Konigsberg. His father of Scotch descent and his mother German, he inherited the strict morality of the former and the simple frugality and thrift of the latter. Of slight and frail physique, one shoulder carried higher than the other, he stood while lecturing in the University of Konigsberg as one transfixed, his gaze fastened upon some one student, and his utterance sometimes, especially when discoursing of the sublimity of the "Categorical Imperative," vehement

and inspired. The "Critique of Pure Reason" was published in 1781; that of the "Practical Reason," in 1788. The literary atmosphere was then full of skeptical poison. Berkeley had published in 1710 his "Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge." Hume's "Natural History of Religion" had been issued in 1757. Gibbon had sent the first volume of his "Decline and Fall" to Hume about the year 1776. Voltaire had spent the years between 1750 and 1753 in Berlin, enjoying royal favor as the companion of the King. Paine's "Age of Reason" was to come forth in 1795. Kant wrote avowedly under the stimulus of a keen desire to confute the fallacies of Hume. It is well known that his "Pure Reason" but intensified the alarm it was intended to allay. The "Practical Reason" in large measure restored the confidence which Rationalistic negation had so much weakened. But from first to last, Christianity to Kant was but a system of transcendental moralism. Out of inborn faith in Duty, sprang faith in God, by whom devotion to duty must be rewarded. Original sin was accounted for by the hypothesis of an anti-mundane existence. The sole punishment of sin is that of its natural consequences. To be saved, we must undergo a "total revolution" which, however, need not be the fruit of any supernatural grace. Christ in his person symbolizes a reconciliation between man and God, effected through repentance, and Christ, in the Scriptures, represents "the agony of repentance."

Out of all this speculation of Kant, three things may be noted and borne in mind: (1) His contention that the essence of the Christian religion lies in rationalistic moralism; (2) his vague and peculiar allegorizing about Christ as being "the agony of repentance;" (3) his Soteriology, found in a reconciliation, of which penitence is the sole and exclusive basis. These things we shall meet, with modification, at another stage of this discussion.

Kant died just six years before the University of Berlin



was opened. But his philosophy had already been expounded in that city, and all the leading minds of Germany were acknowledging its power. No writer, either of metaphysics or of ethics, or of theology, can afford to ignore Immanuel Kant.

One of Kant's personal acquaintances and devoted adherents was Fichte, who died in Berlin in 1814. As is so often the case, the disciple went beyond the master, for Fichte pushed some of Kant's principles to extreme results. Says Dr. Noah Porter :

"Fichte accepted literally the principle of Kant that the forces of the concept are the products of the understanding, and applied it with logical rigor to its appropriate consequences, viz.: that *all the so-called forms of knowledge*, as contrasted with its matter, are furnished by the mind's own creative activity. \* \* Fichte would make the individual dependent upon the concept, at least for its form. Upon this theory the whole question respecting the relation of the concept to the individual object becomes entirely changed. Individual objects are themselves individualized concepts. Real things are the creations of the mind. The concept itself becomes an entity," etc.

Another writer describes the salient feature of Fichte's philosophy as follows :

"What Fichte attempts to prove is simply this: that between objects as they appear to human conception and as they actually are, there is no real difference since the forms of human cognition are identical with the action of the absolute intellect: that objects are the limit set by the absolute within itself in order to arrive at self-consciousness: that the absolute is at the same time subject and object, the ideal and the real. Reduced to plainer language all this would mean that God (the absolute subject, the great active and creative 'I') and nature (the 'Not I,' the aggregate of objects) are united in a similar manner as soul and body; that the absolute intellect pervades all and

everything, and that the human mind is an integral part of the absolute intellect."

These quotations will show that Fichte, in the development of the thought of the time, should have no mean position. In him the theories of Spinoza and of Kant plainly converge and unite. The result is a sort of rationalistic and mystical pantheism.

It needs only to be added that Fichte was made professor in the University of Berlin immediately upon its establishment in 1810.

The next potent personality to be noticed in these introductory references is Schelling, who was born in 1775 and lived until 1854. Before this man was twenty years old, whilst he was yet a student at Tübingen, his power of thought began to attract the attention of learned men. His earlier writings established for him a reputation for mystical pantheism, which his subsequent modifications of them failed to remove. Not dwelling upon these, nor pausing to call more than passing attention to his well-known doctrines of indifference and identity, of immediate and intuitive cognition of the absolute, it is more important to fix in memory that in Schelling begins to emerge that doctrine of Christ which his contemporaries and successors are to modify, partially reject, and yet largely develop. If Principal Fairbairn properly presents Schelling, the similarity of the views of that philosopher to the teaching of many modern theologians is too striking to escape attention :

"The eternal Son of God, born from the essence of the Father of all things, is the finite itself as it exists in the eternal intuition of God, appearing as a suffering God, subjected to the fatalities of time ; and this God, in the moment of his appearance in Christ, ends the world of finitude and opens that of infinitude, or of the dominion of the Spirit. The universalism of this truth is confirmed by the presence of the idea in religions before and without the

Christian, yet in forms that may be termed immanent as really present though imperfectly realized and prophetic, as looking towards a more perfect realization. And as universal, it is eternal, and so independent of all questions as to whether certain books be genuine or spurious, or certain histories are real or imagined. Christianity, as speculative and transcendental, must never be confounded with a series of empirical facts."

That sounds familiar! And the following also:

"The Spirit has its Iliad, its tale of struggle with brutal and natural forces, and then its Odyssey, when out of its painful wanderings, it returns to the Infinite. This is accomplished by a double act: on the one side, of revelation—God shows his heart, which is love; on the other side, of discovery—man sees it and surrenders freely his particular to the universal will. But in order to this, a Mediator in human form is necessary, 'For only the personal can heal the personal, and God must become man in order that man may come again to God.' He becomes man in the Archetypal Divine Man, who as in the beginning with God, is by his nature the highest peak or apex of the Divine Revelation. By this man, nature is transfigured to Spirit and God becomes a personal and intelligent Being. But who is this archetypal man? It can only be Christ but Christ conceived not as an individual, but as universal, ideal man; what is true only of collective humanity cannot be limited to the historical individual, though without this individual, the truth could not have come to be known. To conceive and embrace the ideal principle is to be incorporated with Christ, to be of his community, realizing his unity of nature and Spirit, participant, as it were, in his incarnation. His history thus ceases to be single and empirical, and becomes universal, the history of a Divine Spirit so incorporating itself with humanity as to organize it into a great body whose head is Christ. History conceived from this point becomes in con-



sequence of Christ, as it were, *the progressive incarnation of God.*" (Italics mine.)

Let the reader study this quotation. If in it Professor Fairbairn accurately sets forth the views of Schelling, it is very plain that this philosopher stands amongst the first who have "regenerated" the new Theology. Schelling was a Professor in the University of Berlin with royal favor and with renown in 1841, having written his "Philosophy and Religion" in 1804.

As in the case of Schelling, so in respect to Hegel, it is unnecessary that these passing references should dwell at all upon that which is best known as fundamental in his system—his Pantheism. The difference between Spinoza and Hegel is one of particulars. Spinoza made prominent one substance, with its two attributes of extension and thought, out of which, respectively, grew materialistic and intellectual Pantheism. Hegel made prominent this one substance as subject, and gave us a Pantheism more definitely spiritualized. But Pantheism was the basis of the philosophy of both. And with this so generally known, we may with Hegel, as with Schelling, pass to a specific development of Pantheism bearing directly upon the Christian religion.

Hegel put emphasis upon the theory that God, in order to self-consciousness, must objectify himself; must be eternally sinking his infinite in the finite, and then returning into himself again, as in an endless process. Out of this grew Hegel's thought of the Incarnation thus described by Dorner :

"Hegel, like Schelling, recognizes the idea of the Divine incarnation as the central point of Christianity; but this incarnation is conceived as an eternal incarnation, so that, as an eternal occurrence and occurring, it nevertheless expresses nothing but the eternal metaphysical relation between God and humanity, which is conceived as a unity of essence; only that *there exists a difference in the stages*

*of the consciousness* of this ever-existing and eternally similar unity of essence in God and man. With the historic side of Christianity and with the Person of Christ himself, this whole standpoint so endeavors to square accounts that it strives to trace lines of connection between the empire of eternal truths and the historic Christ, *in order to unite the two somehow in our consciousness or faith.* (Italics mine.) \* \* \* His is the first man in whom the consciousness has arisen of the actually existent unity of essence between God and man, and at the same time the consciousness of Divine relationship or Sonship, unmistakably combined with a power which kindles the same consciousness in humanity, and awakens within it *consciousness of its real nature.*" (Italics mine).

This, according to Dorner, is Hegel, and the Later Pantheistic Soteriology. Hegel was in the University of Berlin, first for eleven years as Professor of Philosophy and for two years as Rector of the University. He died suddenly of cholera in 1831.

Spinoza, Kant, Schelling and Hegel (not to mention Jacobi) have thus poured into the young university the streams of mingled Pantheism, Rationalism, Moralism, Transcendentalism, and Mysticism.

Let us next treat this reservoir as a fountain of Theological Doctrine. What teachers and what teaching has it sent forth?

Obviously, a beginning must be made with the first Professor of Theology that the University ever knew. This was Schleiermacher.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to disparage the greatness of this wonderful man. His varied talents were tried in many directions, and failed in none. Born the son of a Reformed minister (a chaplain), at fifteen years of age he was placed in a Moravian school; at seventeen, in a Moravian college, and at nineteen he entered the University of Halle, where he completed a two

years' course. His twenty-first year found him with no fixed religious opinions; but at twenty-six he took orders, and at twenty-eight he became chaplain of the Charity Hospital in Berlin, serving in that position for six years. At the age of thirty-six, he became Professor of Philosophy and Theology in the University of Halle; and at forty-two we find him pastor of Trinity church and Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Both these positions he continued to hold until his death, twenty-four years afterward.

At an early age, Schleiermacher studied, unto thorough assimilation, Spinoza, Kant and Fichte. He absorbed Plato whom he translated so well as to acquire for himself an extensive reputation as a master of Greek. He attached himself to what was called the Romantic School of Poetry.

Slight in form, stooping and even hump-backed, his eye was magnetic, his countenance was noble and full of intellectuality and benignity, and his movements were quick, as his manner was polished and winning. His power as a writer is said to have been even surpassed by his fluency and eloquence as a speaker. There must have been in him much that was lovable as to personal character and devout as to Christian spirit. Dr. Charles Hodge writes of him:

“When in Berlin the writer often attended Schleiermacher's church. The hymns to be sung were printed on slips of paper and distributed at the doors. They were always evangelical and spiritual in an eminent degree, filled with praise and gratitude to our Redeemer. Tholuck said that Schleiermacher, when sitting in the evening would often say: ‘Hush, children, let us sing a hymn of praise to Christ.’”

This man, so superbly educated, so lovable in personality, so devout in his “passion for Christ,” is now in the very center of philosophical speculations. Deism and atheism and all the fine-spun theories and sophistries of

the opening nineteenth century crowd around the chair of the Professor of Theology in this most conspicuous and potent place in all Germany. What shall be his message to a waiting world in the hour of its great spiritual birth-throes? Others have spoken as philosophers. What shall Schleiermacher speak as a theological interpreter of the Revelation of God?

The sad fact is that this man, with this splendid opportunity, yielded at once to rationalistic assaults upon the Bible. He refused to demand for that Book recognition as the inspired Word of God. The line was sharply drawn between human speculation and the Scriptures. Schleiermacher consented that the Scriptures had gone down.

Next, groping for an extra-Scriptural revelation, our theologian accepted one furnished him by the speculations of Idealism which he had so thoroughly absorbed. This revelation was human consciousness in general, but, specifically, Christian consciousness.

Schleiermacher did not reason to God from the contents of consciousness as to the intellect. Religion, to him, had nothing to do with doctrine. Nor did he follow Kant in emphasizing the moral consciousness as demanding that there must be a God. For Schleiermacher, religion was a matter of feeling—the universally conscious feeling of dependence upon God. "It was the immediate consciousness of the being of everything finite in the infinite, and through the infinite; of everything temporal in the eternal and through the eternal: it was to feel amid all action and suffering our very life as life only as it was in and through God." This feeling was both personal and collective; and so there was a personal consciousness and a collective consciousness.

Specifically, Christianity in all necessary aspects was not a Bible, not a doctrine, not a cultus, but a life, attested to by a specific consciousness of which Christ's consciousness was the archetype and God the Creator. In religion, the



all-important thing is the Christian consciousness. In the Saviour, the all-important matter is not what he has done, but what he is. The life infused into men by a creative act as to Christ develops itself by a natural process "which is to end in the full actualization of the Divine life in the form of humanity."

This is sufficient to show (1) that Schleiermacher's Theology, while earnestly seeking originality, is largely composite, the Theologian breathing unconsciously the very vital air of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte and Schelling; (2) that here is a source sufficiently large and full and bold to send out many streams of the "Regenerated" Theology.

It may seem not gracious, in any tracing of the literary development of the Regenerated Theology, to assign any prominent place to David Friedrich Strauss. The simple fact is, however, that one, at least, of the very ablest advocates of this Theology has given him such a position. This is Principal Fairbairn. This able author of "Christ in Modern Theology," whilst not approving Strauss in general, acknowledges to some extent his contribution to the new Theology.

And the debt to Strauss is far larger than even Principal Fairbairn would be disposed to admit. Through him, Berlin began to pour forth the waters of "Criticism."

It must not be forgotten that Strauss commenced life as a theologian. He was, in fact, educated at Tübingen. When scarcely twenty-three years of age, he went to Berlin to sit at the feet of Hegel and Schleiermacher. Soon afterward Hegel died, but not without giving an impress and impulse to the keen young student which developed into the lectures in the Hegelian Philosophy, afterward delivered in the University of Tübingen. But whether Strauss owed more to Hegel or to Schleiermacher may be questioned. The lectures of the latter aroused an interest and a semi-opposing activity which found result in "The Life of Jesus."

All things considered, one cannot be surprised that Strauss treated the Bible with so little respect. Had not the Masters of Philosophy done it? Had not the most able and prominent theologian admitted that he found little use for it? Had not the cry been "Back to Christ," but, not through the Word? "To Christ," indeed, but through a pantheistic philosophy, through an almost Deified, immanent Christ-consciousness: a mystical life-force, an energizing incarnation. It is a positive relief to find at last that somebody has some use for at least some part of the Bible.

The method of Strauss was simple and direct. Like those who had gone before him, he took the liberty of cogitating his own plan. Substantially, there were but four steps: 1. Frame a hypothesis. 2. Adapt the Bible to it. 3. Annihilate all the Bible that cannot be adapted. 4. Use as your weapon radical, destructive criticism.

Unconsciously, it may be, but not the less certainly, the general progress of the higher criticism has been along those four steps. The hypotheses may not be the same in all cases. The methods of adaptation or of destruction may be diversified. The extent and freedom of the critical spirit may differ in different writers. But the four steps indicated are solidly built into the fabric of the higher criticism, and the regenerated theology is a compound of the philosophy of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, the theology of Schleiermacher and the essential principles of the destructive criticism of Strauss.

Other writers to be embraced in these literary references are so near to us that they may be dismissed with brief but significant mention in a single paragraph.

Baur was an admirer first of Schleiermacher and then of Hegel. His relation to Strauss was at one time that of teacher to pupil. His theory as father of the Tubingen school is known to all. Dr. Charles Hodge studied at Berlin when he was about thirty years of age. He had

then served in the Seminary at Princeton as instructor for two years and as professor for four years. His theological grounding was already complete. He met error only to give it the strong refutation found in his superb systematic theology. Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield (Congregational) College at Oxford, Gifford Lecturer in the University of Aberdeen and Late Muir Lecturer in the University of Edinburgh, was also a student in the University of Berlin. His "Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History" was published in 1876. His "Christ in Modern Theology," issued in 1890, will be treated in this article as the most thorough and articulate statement of the new theology that this school has produced within the writer's knowledge. Fairbairn's influence upon Bruce is apparent in Bruce's Apologetics. Professor Charles A. Briggs and Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke were both students at Berlin, each at the age of about twenty-five. References to the writings of Dr. Van Dyke will be made further in this article.

With the aid of these writers, let us now see if we can determine what the "Regenerated" Theology is.

## II. THE REGENERATED THEOLOGY.

The term "Regenerated," as applied to Theology, is Dorner's. Dr. Hodge says that Dorner uses it in such a connection as to show that he means that Theology has been regenerated by Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher. Its broad distinctiveness is found in its claim that it is Christo-Centric. With great insistence, its advocates tell us that everything must be tested and determined by the consciousness of Christ. To the very natural question, as to how the Christ-consciousness is to be ascertained, the reply is vague and confused. It seems to be settled that the sayings of Christ are to be regarded as of paramount authority; yet, as to the genuineness even of these as reported in the Gospels, there is room for large difference of opinion and for the exercise of much critical discrim-

ination ; for, as Professor Bruce candidly tells us, modern scholarship has pretty generally settled that some of the Evangelists marvelously "idealize" and very "freely report" the sayings of Christ. This necessarily leaves us in a state of confusion and indecision as to what the "mind of the Master" really is. If we ask, where can the Christ-consciousness be found ? we are told, in the Christ-teaching. If we ask, how can the teaching be tested ? the reply is, by its fidelity to the Christ-consciousness. And so we seem to go round the circle.

Upon one thing, however, there is essential agreement, namely : that if genuine, the teaching of Christ is of far greater value and authority than any that the Holy Ghost may give us through any of the inspired writers of the Bible. The extent to which this comparison is made and this disparagement carried is simply shocking. Professor Fairbairn says :

"One thing is now beginning to stand out with a perfectly new distinctness, viz., the degree in which the mind of the Master transcends the minds of the disciples ; not the way they develop his teaching, but how they fail to do it ; the elements they miss, or ignore, forget, or do not see."

The apostles are represented as exhibiting a "falling off ;" as having a "more outward, less intimate," conception of God ; of "having lost, also, in some measure at least, the idea of the kingdom with all it implies to the human brotherhood, which expresses the Divine Sonship."

Similarly, in his Apologetics, writes Dr. Bruce : "It is the business of Theology to determine the affinities between the Galilean and the Pauline Gospel, but it is the privilege of religious faith to enter into life by the door which Jesus has opened, without stopping to try whether Paul's key fits the lock. The words of Jesus are words of eternal life, and no truth not spoken by him can be essential to salvation, however upbuilding to faith. His teaching contains in the smallest measure a local and temporary element."



And so Dr. Van Dyke: "How often Jesus quoted from the Old Testament to show that it was already old and insufficient: that its forms of spirit and rules of conduct were like the husk of the seed which must be shattered by the emergence of the living germ."

But Dr. Watson (Ian Maclaren) is "very bold." He calls the destruction of the Canaanites at God's command a "massacre." He says that the "Ten Words are only eclipsed by the Law of Love." He compares the words of Jesus with the writings of St. Paul and says "it must surely strike any one that the Apostle is less than his Master: that Paul's style is at times overwrought by feeling; that his illustrations are forced; that his doctrine is often Rabbinical rather than Christian, his ascetical treatment of certain subjects somewhat wanting in sweetness."

But now, with nearly all the Bible closed against us, except the sayings of Christ, and many of these sayings under dispute and doubt, we ask these modern writers to tell us: what is the Theology that this consciousness of Christ, so dubiously discovered, has so clearly revealed to them?

1. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to the Bible?

How confused is the reply! Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher who, according to Dorner, are the fathers of the regeneration, say that the Bible is wholly unnecessary. Philosophy or a Christian consciousness, a collective religious experience, can give us all we need. Wherefore then serveth the Bible? But the Higher Criticism modifies this sweeping all-destructiveness. It is error to hold that all the Bible must go. It is equal mistake to claim that all the Bible may stay. "Inspiration" is a term of very broad significance. Inspired men, in greater or less degree, may be found wherever the "immanent" "God-human" Christ may be found, everywhere, at sundry times.

As to the Books of the Old Testament, Jesus gave them

no comprehensive and authoritative approval as God's Word. He denounced some of them with vigor. The whole Levitical code was to him detestable Rabbinical Pharisaism. As Professor Bruce puts the matter, Jesus taught us to read the Old Testament with "discrimination"—that is, with suspicion, ending often in rejection. Dorner teaches that the Bible is historically accurate, only in so far as may be necessary to protect the essential revelation, the writer being liable to error in minor matters of fact. Professor Marcus Dods, of the Free Church College in Edinburgh, in the first chapter of his work on Genesis, takes even more freedom. Professor George Adam Smith, of the Free Church College, Glasgow, in his delightful and in many respects most instructive and suggestive work in Isaiah—a work written in fine style and with fascinating interest—tells us in no uncertain way what he and his school believe as to Prophetical inspiration. He says :

"To Isaiah, inspiration was neither more nor less than the possession of certain strong moral and religious convictions, which he felt he owed to the Spirit of God, and according to which he interpreted, and even dared foretell the history of his people, and of the world," \* \* "Isaiah prophesied and predicted all he did from loyalty to two simple truths, which he tells us he received from God himself : that sin must be punished and that the people of God must be saved. This simple faith, acting along with a wonderful knowledge of human nature and ceaseless vigilance of affairs, constituted inspiration for Isaiah. \* \* Judah shall be punished, Israel shall continue to exist. These were the certainties deduced from the laws. But for the exact conditions and forms, both of the punishment and of its relief, the prophets depended upon their knowledge of the world, of which, as these pages testify, they were the keenest and largest hearted observers that ever appeared."

These modern Theologians are thus shown to have for the Bible an exceedingly attenuated inspiration. Their

canonicity is entirely unsettled. The results of Radical Criticism are accepted with more or less general consent as the returns from the latest discoveries are made. Their Bible is appropriately in polychromic printing, its historicity doubted, its ethical integrity openly impugned by themselves; the very method by which its alleged composite authorship has been produced is admitted to be the product of men and times and processes of crude morality." It is simple justice to say that the Regenerated Theology has no definite Bible at all. The whole relation of the unsystematic system to the Scriptures is an illustration of the law which Dr. Van Dyke lays down for Theological guidance: "Definition is dangerous."

2. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to God? The answer to this question must lead us to uncover that which is urged as the regulative principle of the whole system. This, as is well known, is the Divine Fatherhood. However slightly Professor Watts may speak of Professor Fairbairn's elaboration of this theory, it is certain that the book, "Christ in Modern Theology," is written with subtle and fascinating power, and is an able and well wrought presentation of the doctrine under consideration.

The strength of the whole theory lies in a plausible and forceful speculation as to the God-head. The consciousness of Christ shows us Fatherhood and Sonship in the God-head, and the Fatherhood of God has a far higher and more comprehensive meaning than that God is the Father of the human race. Let us follow Professor Fairbairn in the earliest points of his discussion.

First a distinction is made between God and God-head. "God is Deity conceived in relation, over against the universe; \* \* but the God-head is Deity conceived according to his own nature, as he is from and within himself." The doctrine of the God-head must be revealed. When revealed, it can be made the basis of a doctrine of God.

This Revelation comes through the consciousness of Christ. This shows us Fatherhood and Sonship as eternal and essential in the God-head. "Fatherhood is the essence of God, therefore Sonship is the same; and both are realized in the only forms and under the only conditions possible where God is concerned—outside or above the categories of time and space, where all distinctions of here and there, before and after, alike cease."

Again, Christ becomes the son of man because he is the Son of God. "The filial relation to man is the temporal form of the eternal relation to God." As the ideal son of man, Christ embodies humanity, which has existed before the mind and heart of God as Son from all eternity. God is thus conditioned in his own Being. It is of his essence to be related and to be conditioned by Fatherhood and Sonship. Hence, it is of his essence to love and to create and provide for sons whom he can love, and who can love him. God does not love because he creates; he creates because he loves. This love is a "passion to create happiness, active and exercised." It presupposes a moral being for its object. Nature is but God's instrument, a medium between the Father and his sons. His delight is in his children. His good-will as the eternal Father had no beginning, and will have no end.

Thus in the new Theology, God's Fatherhood and Love are everything. The Divine sovereignty is not judicial or regal but patriarchal. Divine justice is never retributive or vindictory but always remedial and disciplinary and reformatory. God's attributes of omnipotence and omniscience and omnipresence are so far secondary that in the Incarnate Son they may be temporarily laid aside. Divine holiness is but another name for Fatherly love. In the new terminology, the omnipresence of God becomes the Divine immanence. The universal and necessary Fatherhood sweeps the whole field of Divine and human being. Says Dr. Watson:



"With this single word, 'Father,' Jesus instantly defines the relation of man to God, and illuminates Theology. He transfers the Divine idea from the schools, where they discuss the sovereignty of God, to the hearth, where the little children say 'Our Father' with understanding. \* \* What an astounding *gaucherie* it has been to state the intimate relation between God and the soul in the language of criminal law, with bars, prisoners, sentences. \* \* Take it at the highest it was the spirit of Moses."

3. We next pass to an exhibition of some of the peculiar features of this Theology as it respects Christology.

The doctrine of the incarnation as held by this school is almost paramount. It is entirely probable that many amongst us have failed to note the significance of certain constantly recurring phrases, such as "A Personal Christ," the "Historic Christ," "*the* Christ." It is not difficult, however, to make this significance manifest.

According to Schleiermacher, the personal Christ was immanent as a life-force in the Church and in the world. This did not mean the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, but of the Christ in his own proper personality. And after Schleiermacher, almost every writer of the new Theology has insisted that the incarnation is, as Dr. Watson says, "not an expedient, but a consummation." The redemptive power resides distinctly in the personality. Almost the whole saving virtue is made to stand in "the human life of God." Christ is the ideal man in whom the idea of humanity is realized, and yet Christ is God because man is one of God's existence-forms. In Christ the God-consciousness is complete and men are made in Christ in such a way that his consciousness becomes their consciousness, and they become God-manifest in the flesh. This "human life of God" is the vitalizing and organizing principal of the Church.

That Dr. Van Dyke approximates this mystical view of the incarnation must be evident to all who will read his

chapter on the Human Life of God. His doctrine of the Kenosis represents the Eternal Logos as divesting himself of his essential fulness that he may as God be less than God while living a human life. In the view of the author of "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt," almost any theory as to the "Method of the Divine humiliation" will suffice, so the end of the actual lowering of the essential Divinity of Christ is attained. It is a matter of indifference whether one hold that the Eternal Word entered into life without omniscience, or omnipotence, or omnipresence; or that having been born under deprivation of his Divine mode of being, he received more and more of conscious Divinity; whether we agree with Muller or Godet or Gore or Fairbairn or Crosby, "Life is now the regnant idea: personality its most potent expressiou. It is in the facts of life \* \* that we must seek our comparisons for the Incarnation and the very search will bring us face to face with the conviction that life in all its manifestations transcends analysis without ceasing to be the object of knowledge."

All this, if it means anything definite, in a book in which it is distinctly stated that "definitions are dangerous," simply means what Schleiermacher meant; that the Incarnate Christ is a life-force in process of development, but how we cannot tell. After all this vagueness as to the matter and manner of the Incarnation would not a little sober and sound "definition" be stripped of its tenor, and might we not hear, well pleased, the old Shorter Catechism ring out:

"Christ the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin; and thus He was, and continueth to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, forever."

4. Passing from the Incarnation, we next glance at the new Soteriology. The fundamental matter here is sin. What are we to think of it?

The new Theology does not view sin so much as an attitude towards law. The sovereign and inimitable righteousness of God and the infinite divine holiness are studiously not made prominent. The scriptures bearing upon God's relation to man as moral governor are ignored, or interpreted unnaturally, or altogether rejected. Even the "Ten Words" are disparaged, as by Dr. Watson, and the whole Levitical code is despised, as by Dr. Bruce, with a sigh over the luckless day when Ezra came back from the exile with a Rabbinical law in his hand. Sin is to be described in the terms of Fatherhood and Sonship. The nearest approach to a definition is given by Dr. Fairbairn :

"Sin is the reign of unfilial feeling in the heart that was made for filial love; and where this reigns, the created Sonship can never fulfil its end or the creative Fatherhood be satisfied with its unrealized ideal."

As the very impulse to create souls sprang from the Father's loving delight in Fatherhood and Sonship, to fail to be a son consciously in communion with the Father is "to deny to the creator the beatitude he was created expressly to give." And this is the essence of sin.

The term "Collective Sin," or "Common Sin," is preferred to "Original Sin." The race is a family, and as such is a unit, and its constituents are in a relation of "solidarity." The Collective Sin should never be thought of out of its relation to the "Collective Righteousness." The "tendencies" common to us all are "defects of nature, yet for them no man is condemned."

"This law of solidarity finds its supreme illustrations in the sphere of religion: *here creative personalities exercise their mightiest lordship.* (Italics mine). The names that in Theology embody good and evil for the race are Adam and Christ: through the one sin comes to be, through the other, righteousness. They are, because opposites, complementary and correlative." From this it is argued that the race was constituted both in Adam and in Christ, all

the subjects of the common sin share in the good as well as in the evil. Personal guilt is developed only by actual transgression. And as the essence of personal sin is a failure to have, consciously, God as our Father, and to recognize ourselves as his sons, Salvation consists in awakening our dormant consciousness of the filial relation. Such seems to be this peculiar theory. It smacks decidedly of Schleiermacher.

To the end that we may become conscious of the Divine Fatherhood, the Incarnation is held up as "a communication." The stress is constantly laid upon "the Personal Christ." The "Human Life of God" is viewed as a force, full of creative and energizing power. The mode of its working is so vaguely described as to perplex and bewilder us. Sometimes it seems to proceed by mere exemplification, as if the Personal Christ saves us by being our model, sometimes by teaching, as if the salvation is to come through the moral and philanthropic precepts of Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, out of which Watson would evolve his boasted creed; sometimes by mystical contact, a sweet friendship with the Personal Jesus: but always it is the Incarnation which is the force, the saving power, the consummation. The Cross is a form of "culture."

And let it be emphasized: this prominence given to the Personality of Christ is designedly in distinction from his official work, and inclusive of it only in the faintest way, if at all. This is explicitly avowed by Dr. Fairbairn in the following words:

"It is also characteristic that the determinative idea in the system which he (Paul) elaborated with so much dialectical passion, comes from the Personality of Jesus, *and not from the Messianic office.* (Italics mine). That idea was his filial relation, his Divine Sonship. What to him was the primary fact in the consciousness of Jesus became the constitutive factor of his own thought."

In the light of this quotation, it is obvious to what all



this insistence upon the Personality of Jesus in tending. Its full development is seen in the new Soteriology as to Christ's death.

If there is one thing which the new Theology seems to view with aversion even unto detestation it is the essential idea involved in expiatory sacrifice and in a satisfaction-rendering priesthood. Wherever sacrifice is referred to, it is spoken of simply in its sense of self-denial. The parts of the Bible which speak of justice as demanding satisfaction, and of Priesthood rendering it, are treated as if they were suspected of poison. An atonement made to satisfy Divine justice is spoken of as "Juridical," and every Scripture which proclaims that Christ's blood must be shed in satisfaction for human guilt, is either perverted, or, like the Levitical code, treated as a blundering and pernicious mistake. The death of Christ is held up as a mere illustration, an exhibition of the "passible" Father who makes the real sacrifice in order to show how unhappy he is because his children will not love him. Jesus died for us, not vicariously, but sympathetically: taking our place and standing in our stead, not really, but by a vividness of imagination, a conceptualistic imposition upon himself. The strongest presentation of this sympathetic theory of the atonement is made by Professor Dornier:

"In such deep compassion and sympathy, he feels their sin and guilt more than his own suffering. Nay, sorrow for them, this sympathy with not merely their wretchedness, but for their guilt and penal desert is, through his self forgetting devotion, his deepest suffering, the heart of that suffering." \* \* "He enters into this condemnation of theirs in feeling, sorrowfully acknowledging it to be just in his deepest soul, and so far subjecting himself to the Divine condemnation which he recognizes." \* \* "He is, therefore, a High Priest in sympathy."

From all this it is perfectly plain that the passion of Christ is viewed as a culmination of the Incarnation; and

that its effect upon us is moral and subjective, as its aspect toward God is that of a climax to the Kenosis, the "self-beggary" of the passible God-head.

5. The new Theology has no settled view as to the doctrine of endless punishment. Professor Bruce says that the Christ consciousness represents Christianity as optimistic for time and eternity and that the Christian apologist is not called upon to dogmatize as to the final destiny of the 'un-saved.

But it cannot be denied that the general tendency of the modern Theology is toward Restorationism. It is held to be inconsistent that infinite Fatherhood should fall short of an everlasting struggle against a severance or destruction of the filial relation.

Schleiermacher's position, as Dr. Shedd shows, practically amounts to saying that "hell is abolished by becoming used to it and that remorse is of the nature of virtue" which must ultimately relieve. Dorner concludes that the whole matter is involved in unfathomable mystery but hints at possible annihilation or an entire change into some other form of being. Dr. Fairbarin holds that if "at any point of space or moment of eternity God were to say certain sinners must, in order to vindictive and exemplary punishment, remain sinners forever," then he would, as it were, "concede a recognized place and function for sin." His conclusion is that if evil never ceases, the conflict of righteousness with sin "must go on forever." The very necessity that Regal Paternity should be merciless to sin "prevents penalty ever becoming merely retributive or retaliatory." And as the new Theology's hope is very long, so it is exceedingly broad.

Says Dr. Watson :

"It is surely a narrow mind and more—a narrow heart—that would belittle the noble sayings that fell from the lips of outside saints or discredit the virtues of their character. Is it not more respectful to God, the Father of mankind,

and more in keeping with the teachings of the Son of Man, to believe that everywhere and in all ages can be found not only the prophecies and broken gleams, but also the very Kingdom," such as Mogul Emperor Akbar, "Moslem Saints," Marcus Aurelius, and those whose "fine charity" is embodied in the legends of Abou-Ben-Adhem and the renunciation of Buddha.

### III. THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE MODERN THEOLOGY.

1. Our attitude is not one of ignorance. Of course the large proportion of our ministers cannot be regarded as making the new Theology a matter of special study. Our pulpits are kept free from the speculations of philosophy and the advanced notions of Higher Critics. This is as it should be. But it is also true that many of our ministers have a very definite conception of what the new Theology is. The books of these writers who belong to this school are not unfrequently found in the libraries of our pastors, and much in them is appreciated for general suggestiveness. And then, our religious papers are conducted by men of active minds, who know what the Theological world is doing. Our *Outlook* and QUARTERLY are not wanting in information as to developments in this line of thought, our Professors in our Theological Seminaries are abreast of the age, and the personal contact of our ministers with the Theological institutions abroad is not inconsiderable.

2. The attitude is not one of indifference. We comprehend that it would be unwise to let these movements awaken in us no interest. We know that far more is involved in these discussions than could be included in any agitations affecting only our denomination. These matters belong, not merely to Calvinism, but to the universal Christian faith. Questions affecting the Being of God, the Incarnation and Redemptive work of Christ, the integrity and trustworthi-

ness of the Bible, the Plan of Salvation, and the issues of eternal destiny, belong to every church in the world. We carry our share of interest in these vital matters.

3. This attitude is not one of arrogant intolerance or of uncharitable malice. With us, legitimate freedom of thought and of speech is fundamental. The church does not permit disapproved teaching in her name and by her authority; she makes no effort to prohibit any man from teaching in his own name, or by authority of his own church, whatever he believes to be the truth. The Christian lovableness of many who belong to this school of theological thought we fully appreciate; and whatever they have written that seems to us uplifting and true, we heartily enjoy. That there is much of this, we fully admit.

4. This attitude is not one of opposition to sanctified scholarship. The Southern Presbyterian Church has always upheld the standard of ministerial qualification and has always demanded that her teachers shall be able to teach others also. Criticism within proper limits is not interdicted. This by no means prevents us from being aware that critics, like ourselves, are not infallible.

5. This attitude is not one of stolid narrowness. It is true, we seriously object to much that is often implied in the word "broad." But we most highly value genuine catholicity. For this reason, we are slow to part company with our dead who died in the old faith: with the best element in the old Catholic Church; with the Reformers; with the creeds of Christendom; with our dear old Westminster Confession. The Bible is so good for us that we feel that we want it as broad and as long as we can keep it.

6. The attitude of our Church toward the Regenerated Theology is that of thoughtful, intelligent, positive, and, I believe, unanimous, rejection and antagonism. To a concise exhibition of the grounds of this opposition, attention is next invited.



1. The consciousness of Christ, as ascertained by the new Theology, is too narrow and too uncertain to serve as a basis of theological construction. There is not a shadow of evidence that the Revelation through the Bible should be thus limited. To refuse to hear God's Word through Paul out of alleged reverence for Christ, is but to imagine a conflict between the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity; or, since Christ was full of the Spirit that inspired Paul, to make the Spirit antagonize himself. The Bible to us must ever be not only the Word actually uttered by Christ, but also the Word which the Holy Ghost teacheth, by whomsoever uttered. To determine what this inspired word is, we are steadfast in maintaining, that the old commonsense way is the true way. The genuineness and authenticity of the Bible must be examined. Its testimony for itself must be heard and the value of that testimony weighed by the rules of evidence. Above all, the organic unity of the Scriptures the excellency of their matter, their fitness to be food for the soul, their efficacy in producing noble lives, their power to sustain in sorrow and in death, and their faithfulness in guiding to heaven, all must be considered. And having intelligently done this, we deny that the Bible is to be limited to the sayings of Christ, many even of these being disputed.

2. But now, coming to the actual teaching of Jesus, we differ most widely with our honored brethren as to the content of the mind of the Master. This difference emerges at every point along the whole line of investigation.

(1). When we ask Christ about the Bible, he does not say what these brethren represent him as saying. It is not a fact that he disparaged or condemned any part of the Old Testament. Christ honored the Bible as his Bible. He referred to it under its well-known divisions. He encouraged the people to search these Scriptures. He quoted them when living, when suffering, when dying. He cleared

their enactments of Pharisaic glosses, and reaffirmed them in their true meaning, correcting the traditional abuse and giving anew the genuine law.

Even Wendt, who denies the Pre-existence of Christ—substantially a Unitarian, but significantly in great favor with this school—admits without hesitation that the common impressions of the Jewish people concerning the Scriptures in Christ's time, were Christ's own impressions and belief, and boldly says that neither they nor he knew what they were talking about. Is it not astonishing that such high praise, with no warning, can be given to such a work as Wendt's "Teaching of Jesus," and this by Professors in chairs of Theology! These brethren, too, seem strangely silent as to what Christ had to say respecting the Revelation in the New Testament. Did the promises in the upper room amount to nothing as exhibiting the mind of the Master? Is it true that a Juridical, Rabbinical, ascetic celibate of a St. Paul could have so disastrously misled the Church after Christ had said: "He will guide you into all truth." "He will bring all things to your remembrance." With the Holy Ghost thus promised for this specific purpose, could John have "idealized" and suffered in his writing from "personal idiosyncrasy," from "environment," so that the verisimilitude of Christ's sayings flickers in ghostly uncertainty on the borders of belief and doubt, of truth and error? "We have not so learned Christ" or heard his testimony to the Bible, just as it was, as it was to be, and as it is. We are firmly persuaded with Dr. Storrs that this Jesus lays a hand of approval upon each of the Testaments, standing midway between the two, "predicted of the one, attested of the other, and the sure Witness of both."

(2) Again: when we go to Christ and ask him "what is God?" His reply seems to us far broader than is represented. At Samaria's well, he said "God is a Spirit" to be worshipped in spirit and truth. He made God the "Lord of

Heaven and earth," the awful Revealer, Concealer, Disposer. His favorite phrase was "the Kingdom of God," found on his lips not less than thirty or forty times in the Gospels. He put naked Divine condemnation over against human hypocrisy; and if against this, why not against other sin? It is true, he called God his Father, for so he was. It is true, also, that he taught that God is a Providential Father to men as men, and a Gracious Father to Christians. These truths are not denied. Why should they be? But, on the other hand, it is not true that God to Christ was Father and nothing besides. God to Christ was just what he is to himself and to all, and that is—God!

When we write our equation with God as its first member, the only appropriate second member is just God. "I am that I am." The universal, all-transfusing, all-surrounding element of God's Being was the same in Christ's conception as in all the Scriptures: and that was and is his awful Holiness. This gives character to every personality in the Godhead, to every relation and condition amongst the Persons, to every attribute in God, and to every act of God. It pervades the Divine essence. It glorifies every thought, feeling, and volition. The Father is the "Holy Father." The Son is the "Holy Child." The Spirit is the "Holy Ghost." If we may with any degree of propriety speak of anything as conditioning God in every conceivable relationship, attribute, affection, in his law, in his Gospel, in his Word, in his works, for all time and for all eternity, it is that of which the Cherubim chanted as they flew through the temple, covering face and feet, and crying so that the very posts on the threshold trembled: "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts." God's own awful oath is made upon his own Being *and Holiness*.

(3) In the next place, we cannot admit the new Theology's doctrine of the Incarnation to be an unfolding of the consciousness of Christ. Our primary reason is that it is no definite doctrine for us to accept. It may safely be pro-

nounced as not even clearly conceivable, and it is sure that no lucid expression of it has ever been made in human speech. Such a phrase as "the human life of God" simply obscures thought. If the Incarnation in Christ's representation of it is the "consummation" of Revelation, and apparently of all saving force and life, right here the thought should be the clearest, so that a man running might read it.

But here everything is in a bewildering, Pantheistic, Kenoistic mist and shadow simply impenetrable. These writers are wont to dwell upon the "simplicity" of Christ's teaching, with "silver iterance." Can any mortal discover the faintest trace of this characteristic in this mysticism? Now it is admitted that the Incarnation is mysterious. But the ordinary doctrine of it can be expressed in intelligible terms. Dr. Charles Hodge can be understood. So can the Shorter Catechism. The fact is a mystery, but the revelation of it is plain. Christ has two natures in one personality. Whatever can be affirmed of either nature can be affirmed of the person. The mystery here is in the thing; but there is not fatal obscurity in the expression of it. What Christ taught, we can easily know. He said, "I and my Father are one." "Before Abraham was, I am." "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father"; and again, "The son of man hath not where to lay his head." "I thirst." "This is my body." We can know what all this means. It means that Christ was God; that Christ was man; and there was just one Christ. This personality was unique. The fact that Christ was man, did not operate to take the human race unto Deity; or that he was God, to make God Pantheistically immanent in humanity. Christ's teaching is clear. But is Schleiermacher's? Is Dorner's? Can we find anywhere in Christ's teaching any warrant for Dorner's theory that when he was born as man, his Divinity as Logos was dormant or absent; that more and more of it was poured into him as he grew; that at last the human soul, receiving more and more of God's perfections, be-



come completely Divine? Did Christ reveal to Principal Fairbairn through his sayings, or by any other instrumentality, that when his Divinity underwent the Kenosis, the external or physical attributes of Deity, as Fairbairn calls them, such as omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence, were "veiled," or "restrained" by his moral attributes, resulting in "the limitation of God by the God-head." Remember, all this comes from men who are shouting "Back to Christ;" to Christ's simplicity. Where in Christ's consciousness did Dr. Fairbairn find authority for these following sentences occurring in his discussion of the Incarnation: "Schelling's Absolute Identity and Hegel's Absolute Idealism meant the same thing; and it has passed into current thought, philosophical and religious, as the Doctrine of the Divine immanence" \* \* God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated; man, the permanent (why did he not say eternal?) capability of incarnation?" Now, in all seriousness, the only possible ground on which this speculation might be offered as a Revelation through the Christ-Consciousness would be, that, through some racial union, Christ's consciousness was Schelling's and Hegel's consciousness!

(4). Passing now from the Incarnation, we next remark that this Union of Speculative Philosophy and Straussian Criticism, two relatives of blood kin, is seen to yield its most unhealthy offspring when we come to view its Soteriology. It vitiates the cardinal Gospel truth that is the heart of the Scriptural plan of Salvation.

Priesthood is regnant in all religious history. The soul of man, conscious of sin, echoes God's call for expiatory sacrifice, universally and everlastingly. Scientific speculation through John Fiske may sport with this deep deliverance of human consciousness as the product of ignorance and fear in the human mind not yet sufficiently revolutionized to cast off the fetters of superstitious dread and awe of the uncomprehended forces of destructive nature. But the

dominant fact of history, which is sin, gives concurrent testimony along with the dominant fact of religious consciousness as expressed in all worship through all time, and absolutely martyrizs the human race for the truth that guilt is universal and demands a priesthood with a sacrifice that shall satisfy the holiness of God. All the legions of the new Theology are hurled in avowed and most bitter assault upon the vicarious priestly offering of Jesus Christ as satisfaction to God's Justice, which is simply God's Holiness in relative expression and operation. Principal Fairbairn having quoted "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law," most strongly says:

"Certainly; but this was the law which the Jew loved, and which was thus forever abolished, not the universal law of God. He became 'a curse for us;' certainly, but under the same law, for by it he was 'hanged upon a tree.' But the law that thus judged him condemned itself: by cursing him it became accursed. His death was not the vindication, but the condemnation of the law. And this is the characteristic attitude of the New Testament writers."

Amazing exegesis! That law which the Apostle was writing about was older than Abraham, whose obedience to it, the Apostle expressly says, could not justify.

In this opposition to a sacrifice that satisfies justice is imbedded inveterate bitterness against the whole Levitical code. Says Bruce:

"Judaism (Leviticalism) cured that ["moral religious license"] by hedging the people in on every side by positive law, and the evil now to be apprehended was that the cure would breed a new and worse disease—dead, rotten-hearted legalism. It might even be affirmed with a measure of truth that the sinister reign of legalism began the day that Ezra appeared on Jewish soil, with the law in his hand."

Dr. Watson speaks of "The Culture of the Cross." He says that "Jesus did not describe his cross as a satisfaction to God." "He always spoke of it as a regeneration of

man." "The Gospels do not represent the cross as a judicial transaction between Jesus and God, on which he throws not the slightest light, but as a new force which Jesus has introduced into life." "The cross may be made into a doctrine, it was prepared by Jesus as a discipline." Dr. Van Dyke makes "the whole value of the atonement," in its "reconciling influence on the heart of man," and in its "exhibition of the heart of God," "depend on the actuality of the Incarnation." And so we are ever brought back to the dominant Soteriology of this whole School. The "Gospel for an Age of Doubt" has, as its distinctive element, "a Person." Fairbairn boldly adds in words what is involved in the teaching of all the others, "*and not the Messianic office.*" Whereas Paul said: "We preach Jesus Christ and him crucified," these Theologians would say: "We preach Jesus Christ" and "a life-force;" "culture;" salvation through a natural process of personal magnetism or a development of a race-incarnation.

This superficial combination of rationalism and sentimental mysticism can never supplant the sublime and common-sense truth as to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. Beside Thornwell's magnificent sermon, it is simply puerile. Every solitary utterance of Jesus condemns it. "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and *drink his blood*, there is no life in you." The agony of Gethsemane, with the shuddering horror of its bitter cup, its sorrowfulness unto death, rebukes these theories in awfulness of spoken and unutterable woe. The "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," shows that the "final idea of God" according to Christ, is God and nothing less. To God, as God, Jesus offers himself on the cross in a sublimity of worship that rocked the earth, darkened the heavens, rent the temple's vail, startled the dead and amazed the living in earth and heaven. The specific form of this worship was sacrifice. And the innermost heart of sacrifice as worship is, not merely scenic exhibition, not conceptualistic substitution by sympathy

working through phantasy, not disciplining exemplification, not a force-furnishing Kenosis; but expiatory satisfaction for guilt by the vicarious suffering of the substitute for the principal, the former, standing in the very law-place of the latter and bearing the suffering as just penalty: the whole transaction a voluntary homage to the majesty of law, to the inimitability of righteousness, to the Holiness of God, and to the amazing grace which provides in God's Son the willing victim, the adoring Priest, and the sanctifying Altar to be sworn by in covenant forever.

This is the Soteriological foundation of human hope as revealed in the Bible, from beginning to end. There is one God and one Mediator \* \* who "gave himself a ransom for all." He bore our sins. Our iniquity was laid upon him. God made his soul an offering for sin. He died for us, the just for the unjust. Though an Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God. He is the Propitiation for our sins. Abel's Lamb, Abraham's Lamb, Isaiah's Lamb, John the Baptist's Lamb, Calvary's Lamb; through all time and though all eternity, the redeemed of his blood must behold him as the Lamb in the midst of the Throne, and must cry: "*Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood.*" Touch that truth and, as we see the matter, you have put the coldness of ice through the Gospel's heart. This is the "Gospel for an Age of Doubt." And our time is ominously warning that the less of this very Gospel there be, the wider and deeper, darker and deadlier, will be the doubt. The Sampson that tugs at these pillars which uphold the temple at the place where mercy and holiness meet, may pull down the edifice upon those he deems his theological foes; but deepest under the ruin will be his own theological self.

(5). Finally: the "Regenerated" Eschatology seems to us full of perilous uncertainty. In the minds of many of the writers there appears to be no eschatological conclusion at all. To affirm that death ends probation and fixes the



state eternally, their theologians will not: to deny absolutely, they cannot. Would it not have been wiser and safer to be silent?

But here very bold speculation rushes in where angels fear to tread. The Fatherhood of God is represented as so possessed of love as to make it impossible to say that any moral chasm between God and the soul can be a "great gulf fixed." Now, between God and his child by grace, justified, adopted, born of the Spirit, there is a bond that neither death nor life can destroy. Forever blessed be his Name!

But can this be affirmed with any degree of confidence of that creative and providential Fatherhood which the fall and sin have so awfully transformed as to justify the loving Christ in saying to sinful men, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do?" "If God were your Father, ye would love me." Whose son did Jesus say Judas was? "The son of perdition." And what did Jesus say was his fate? "Lost!" What is the fearful import of a Divine utterance to the effect that "it had been better that he had never been born?" What did Christ mean by a loss of soul whose descriptive adjunct was "cast away?" By a "fire that is not quenched?" By "where the worm dieth not?" By "depart from me?" By "and the door was shut?" By "whither I go ye can not come?" By "it shall not be forgiven to him, neither in this world nor in the world to come?" By an everlastingness binding heaven and hell in an equal duration? The only conceivable way of breaking the force of these "Logia" is by applying, to each and all the quotations, the peremptory short-cut so often used by Wendt: "Clearly a gloss of the redacting Evangelist."

Christ says enough to warn us away from these speculations based upon personal relationships. He tells us of a relation closer than human fatherhood; for whose sacredness a man may forsake his father and mother and cleave to his

wife, and they be one. But between these two Jesus says that sin may dig a pit that in Christ's own judgment either party might be right in never attempting to cross. And that chasm might be, in depth and breadth, in exact proportion to the purity of the character or the intensity of the love in the party sinned against—the very purity of the love and the very love of purity burying the old relationship in a grave of moral ruin beyond possibility of resurrection; as when the noble Arthur, in knightly chastity, yearned over the golden haired queen saying: "Let no man dream I love thee not," but under a moral necessity rode away from her forever. I do not offer this as argument. It is offered as an illustration of a truth that obtains on earth and may obtain in heaven. And it is that (as amongst relationships) no man on earth can speculatively judge *how far sin may go in the awful work of moral divulsion*. If as dynamite, it can shatter the union that typifies Christ and his church; if as moral and spiritual earthquake, it can open a bottomless pit between God and some of his earliest sons, the angels who kept not their first estate, wiser will it be for us to cling to the faithful, the severe, but the loving and the true words of Christ, and dismiss all speculation as to what, *a priori*, so fearful an element in the moral universe cannot do. And with this, we bring the discussion to an end.

#### CONCLUDING INFERENCE.

If the foregoing pages have truthfully shown the literary origin of the Regenerated Theology, its composite form, its main characteristics and the real attitude toward it of the Presbyterian Church, South, then the discussion yields one inevitable inference: it could never advance the welfare of our Church, or the interests of peaceful Christian communion, for that Church to put herself in a position of responsibility for doctrines which, while she must disapprove, she would be powerless to control. If it should appear that her inner spirit toward the Regenerated

Theology is unique, her outward organism must be conformed and adapted to her real inward convictions.

That these "progressive" views are progressing, must be admitted. In consistently denouncing Systematic Theology, the Progressionists jointly in Europe and America are bending every energy and exhausting every resource of scholarship to build up a Systematic Theology! A Polychrome Bible, an Expositor's Bible, an International Critical Commentary, an Exhaustive Bible Dictionary, an International and Inter-Confessional Theological Library, all are in process of development under a motto set forth in the first sentence in the "Editor's Preface," to-wit: "Theology has made great and rapid advances in recent years." The prevalence of these views over Germany is well known. Their extensive existence in England under Canon Driver's scholarly influence is fully recognized. In Scotland, their advancement has been steady since the Free Church in 1881 pronounced that it was "neither safe nor advantageous" that Professor Robertson Smith should teach in the College of Aberdeen. In 1882 Professor Bruce's "End of Revelation" came up on complaint in the General Assembly. Principal Rainy moved that no action was necessary or expedient, and the motion was adopted.

Again in 1890, the teachings both of Professor Dods and Professor Bruce arose for consideration in the Assembly. That body "recognized the existence of causes for profound anxiety" in Professor Dod's writings but not for instituting process, and then adopted a paper elaborately affirming *its own* orthodoxy, which had not been called in question. About the same thing was done with regard to the teaching of Professor Bruce; only, the criticism was somewhat more severe and the warning a little more positive. This amounted to saying to these teachers: You are not sound but *we* are, and you can go on teaching in our name. And they went on.

In 1891, overtures asking for more definite expression

concerning both these Professors come up to the Assembly. The reply was that the Assembly did not deem it necessary to take any further action in reference to the matters referred to in the overtures.

In 1893 the Rev. Walter C. Smith, of Edinburgh, Moderator of the Free Church Assembly, in his address closing the sessions, said that the "Method of scientific criticism had already got a footing in the Church and had established a right to be there without injury to their belief in Christ or to their reliance in the sacred records."

In 1895, Dr. Drummond was reported to the Assembly. No action was deemed necessary, Principal Rainy declaring that ministers and elders were not equipped for the scientific questions raised and liberty must be allowed. And so, we suppose, endeth the chapter. Results: one teacher was silenced; two were admonished, but not silenced; the last was not admonished: and then came "liberty." But the Assembly had saved its own orthodoxy by declaring for itself that it believed what nobody had said it did not believe, and what its most prominent teachers in its Theological Colleges say is not true.

It is not my purpose to suggest a parallel to this history of ineffectual opposition farther than as an American Presbyterian possibility. The analogy in the course of proceedings as thus far advanced is striking. This article will close with no prophecy, but with a palpable fact. Whatever arguments of the past have held the Presbyterian Church in the South to her distinct organic existence, all of which remain in undiminished vigor, the overwhelming consideration to-day is fully expressed in the words that one of our prominent ministers, who has studied in seminaries, both at home and abroad, gave utterance to when he wrote: "Point strongly the moral that our church should bide as she is, for her doctrinal life may be at stake."

EUGENE DANIEL.

Raleigh, N. C.