

S. M. Casey
1871
Berkeley

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 1.—JULY, 1887.

I. BERKELEY'S IDEALISM.

A splendid edition of Bishop Berkeley's works was issued, in 1871, by Professor Alexander Campbell Fraser, the incumbent of the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh—the chair once illuminated by the genius of the illustrious Sir William Hamilton. The elaborate dissertations in which the accomplished Editor expounds the Bishop's idealistic system, and the fact that they have emanated from one who has succeeded the great exponent and defender of Natural Realism, have had the effect of calling attention afresh to the principles of Berkeley's philosophy. In proceeding to discuss them we deem it important to furnish a brief preliminary statement of the main features of Berkeley's system :

1. The Denial of Abstract Ideas.
2. The Denial of the Existence of Matter as Substance. There is no such thing as material substance.
3. The Denial of even the Phenomenal Existence of Matter, separate from and independent of spirit: denial of Natural Realism. Material things have no reality in themselves. Whatever reality or *casuality* material things possess, is dependent and relative.
4. *Esse est percipi*: the so-called material world depends for existence upon the perception of spirit. A thing exists only as it is sensibly perceived.

225038

II. THE ANDOVER RENAISSANCE IN THEOLOGY.*

We have watched with interest and curiosity the growth of this youngest born of the theological family.

Its venerable mother, with natural partiality, baptized it *Benjamin*, but many of her best friends have challenged the fitness of the name, and predict in the child a veritable *Ben-oni*.

The infant has been somewhat slow to acquire the faculty of coherent thought and facility of connected statement; an interval which has proved a period of more than ordinary anxiety, because there were from the first, in its features, certain traces of resemblance that boded ill for its future influence. There was something suggestive of its Aunt, *Unitarianism*; now somewhat *passee*, but in the heyday of her youth quite a belle in her immediate neighborhood. There was also a suspicion of likeness to another relative, also a female, *Universalism*; an amiable and placid old lady, never very vigorous at her best and now decidedly decrepit. But perhaps the most pronounced and

* 1. OLD FAITHS IN NEW LIGHT.—By Rev. Newman Smyth, author of "The Religious Feeling." One vol., 12 mo., Pp. xii, 391. Second Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

2. THE FREEDOM OF FAITH.—By the Rev Theodore T. Munger, with a prefatory essay on "The New Theology." 16mo., Pp. vi 397. Thirteenth Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

3. THE CONTINUITY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: A STUDY OF MODERN THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF ITS HISTORY.—By the Rev. A. V. G. Allen, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge. 12 mo., Pp. xviii 438. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

4. THE ANDOVER REVIEW. A Religious and Theological Monthly under the editorial control of Egbert C. Smyth, William J Tucker, J W. Churchill, George Harris, Edward Y. Hincks, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., with the co-operation and active support of all their colleagues in the Faculty,—Professors John P. Gulliver, John P. Taylor, George F. Moore, and Frank E. Woodruff; and a large staff of contributors. Volumes i-vi, inclusive. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

5. THE HOMILETIC REVIEW, Vols. xi and xii. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

6. THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, Vol. ix. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph.

distinctive resemblance was that of a cousin, *Rationalism*; member of a larger family, though like its aforementioned kin, chiefly local in its influence; a still lusty lad and surprisingly popular for one so full of pertness and self-assertion.

These indications added anxiety to the interest with which the world waited for the first *articulate* utterances of the babe, and now that it has made its voice heard, we take opportunity to examine the message it brings us.

In some respects it talks well. Its advocates usually wield a facile pen; we know of no circle of writers who are more generally and uniformly fresh and entertaining. Even when differing most from them, we are constrained often to acknowledge that they have a very good way of saying a very bad thing; while their light is unquestionably often eccentric, it is with as little question sometimes attractively brilliant; nevertheless though men admire the comet, as a phenomenon, they decidedly prefer to set their watches by the sun.

It has proven itself apt in the appropriation of *taking* titles, *e. g.*: The New Theology; The Real Theology; The Theological Renaissance; Progressive Orthodoxy; Old Faiths in New Light; The Freedom of Faith; The Continuity of Christian Thought.

It is noticeable that each of these phrases embodies an argument, or more strictly speaking—and what to a large class is more effective—*veils an assumption*; a feature characteristic not of the titles only, but of much also that follows them. Closely akin to this *petitio principii* contained in its names and titles, is another characteristic with which we, in common with most critics, find grave fault, *viz*: a habit of using stereotyped phraseology in new senses. These writers ordinarily speak the dialect with which the church is familiar, they regularly employ terms with which the concensus of theological thought has associated certain definite, fixed ideas; but they use these old names in a way

“That palters with us in a double sense;
That keeps the word of promise to our ear,
And breaks it to our hope,”

A use misleading and deceptive to the general reader. One unversed in theology, unfamiliar with the reticulation, so as to

speak, of its correlated doctrines, is taken unawares and finds nothing objectionable in these "restatements of truth;" whereas those accustomed to view the truth as a system—like its blessed author's robe, one piece, without seam, woven throughout—and thus trained to foresee the inevitable raveling in the smallest rent, being competent to calculate the consequences of these apparently slight "readjustments," such persons astonish the general reader by the vehemence of their criticism; but they are vehement because indignant at a course which, pursued by theological writers, leaves a critic only the ungracious option of imputing culpable ignorance or willing dishonesty.

The error is generally negative, consisting not so much in what is said as in what is left unsaid. Sometimes there is nothing objectionable in the lines when there is much that is so between the lines. Occasionally when speaking most fair, the implication is most foul; we are greeted with all the elaborate courtesy of Joab, but like Amasa, we find concealed under it that subtlety which stabs under the fifth rib. This alas! is sometimes evident in its noblest and loftiest statements, *e. g.*: when setting forth its motive and its mission. It pleads for a theology less distinctly doctrinal and more devotional; a more distinctively *biblical* theology founded upon the plain and obvious teaching of Scripture naturally interpreted and taken in its natural connections; for an orthodoxy less formal and dead, more decidedly Christian, evangelic and aggressive; for liberty in candidly investigating and discussing vital questions; for readiness to receive and weigh the results of scholarship as exercised in the critical, exegetical and historical criticism of the Scriptures; for willingness to recognize and consider thoroughly the developments of physical science, etc., etc.—to all which we respond, Amen. There is nothing objectionable in it and, we may add, nothing novel or original. But what must we read between the lines? Nothing except the implicit charge that the *Conservative Theology has failed in all these respects*; that the distinctively doctrinal theology from Augustine to Hodge, is not biblical but the rather a wresting of Scripture to sustain a preconceived system; that it is hostile

to the devotional and practical, a dead conservatism imprisoning in the trammels of tradition the aggressive evangelism of a struggling, rebellious Christianity; that its policy is one of silence amid the pressing problems of the present, a blind idolatry of the past, a cowardly and servile adherence to a devotion which is the child of ignorance, the opposition of a superstitious fetichism to all the achievements of modern scholarship and the results of recent science!

If a man were to buttonhole you on the street and pour into your reluctant and astonished ear an earnest homily on the lasting and sacred obligation of the eighth commandment, unless grace were stronger in you than muscle, you would probably knock him down; nor could you, for so doing, be justly considered a foe to honesty. Just so; *the very raison d'être of this so-called Renaissance is an indictment against the theological thought of the world*; its soaring aspirations, its lofty manifestoes, are an insult, as gratuitous as it is insolent, to the sense and piety that have instructed and consecrated generation after generation; a theology that has proved its faith—the old faith and in the old light—by its works; sufficiently “spiritual” to develop scores of such characters as Rutherford, Payson, Newton, McCheyne; “evangelical” enough to bear, with large liberality and patient self-sacrifice, the banner of the Cross in a world-wide “aggressiveness;” with “sincerity” and “conviction” deep enough to seal its testimony with its blood; “Christological” enough to live with the Master and if need be to die for Him.

It would add a needed emphasis to the elevated claims of the New Theology to produce a few of its martyrs and missionaries!

This brings us to another characteristic, viz: The quarrel that these writers invariably have with systematic Theology. There is something amusing in the uniformity with which they lose their equanimity in the presence of this, their universal *bête noir*. They rarely lose an opportunity to throw a fling over or covert at it. This disposition was the first thing that attracted our attention and aroused our curiosity. We suggest a possible explanation in the fact that Systematic Theology inexorably clips

the wings of their erratic flight ; proves the plummet which sounds the shallows of their argument, the inevitable and pitiless detective of their sometimes brilliant, often illogical and inconsistent, always fragmentary, half-truths.

Of course Calvinism, being unquestionably the back-bone of all vertebrate theology, concentrates their hate. There is something really and richly ludicrous in the intensity with which the most advanced Liberals lavish the choicest epithets in their vocabulary of vituperation upon it ; their hatred of it is a very reliable gauge of their progress, so much so that we have long regarded Calvinism as a sort of theological *udometer* to show how much any article of the kind has been *watered*.

A third very marked feature of these various discussions, common to them all, is a conspicuous absence of that resort to the Word of God so characteristic of the Old Theology. "The sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God" is little wielded by these champions of a more spiritual and Christian Theology. This absence of Scripture citation seems passing strange in a school which claims, as one of its distinctive *differentia*, a pre-eminently biblical basis. We have some argument, many assertions, a multitude of assumptions, but rarely ever a Scripture text. The spirit of the Scriptures seems to be held in great reverence but there is scant appeal to its letter. They appear to write under the conviction that "the letter killeth ;" and not without cause, for so far as we have seen, there is not a single restatement, readjustment or reconstruction of theirs that can survive an appeal to the letter of God's Word.

We think that the exaggerated assumptions and wild assertions of the New Theology deserve more than a mere incidental allusion. What are we to think of the honesty of an author who writes and prints, in the *thirteenth* edition of a volume such an assertion as that "the theories of verbal, dynamic, plenary inspiration, concerning all historical and scientific reference, are none of them any longer insisted on?"

Now surely these writers know that the overwhelming majority of Christian ministers still hold this doctrine in its integrity ; that the deniers of it are the fussy few who are the

ecclesiastical Ismaelites of their respective Denominations, whose elastic Freedom of Faith allows them to interpret their creeds with the same liberality they exercise in the use of the stereotyped phraseology to which we referred a few paragraphs back ; whose "deepening sincerity" and lofty "spirituality" suffer them to draw the stipend of a church whose windows they break from the inside. Mr. Munger knows, or he ought to know, that such a statement published by a Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist minister would cost him his ecclesiastical head.

As the last characteristic to be referred to here, we note the many indications that this theological renaissance is largely influenced and colored, if not actually dominated, by Evolution.

The new light in which Dr. Newman Smyth views the old faiths is "The new light of the scientific truth of development ;" * or as the same writer says in another place, "We are gaining along the heights of faith broader views of redemption, in which we may hope to comprehend and harmonize the new scientific truths of the correlation of all things, and the laws of the development of the universe."† According to Mr. Munger, "It accepts the theory of physical evolution as the probable method of physical creation, and as having an analogy in morals."‡

Another representative writes as follows :

"The New Theology," says President Bascom, "identifies the government of God and history. It unites the past, the present and the future. One law, one method, one movement are in them all. Herein it feels the true force of the great thought of our time, evolution, the inner coherence and consistency of the divine procedure. The doctrine of a physical evolution has, thus, its completion and fulfillment in the spirit. * * * * The new theology is not revolutionary, but evolutionary."§

As a critic has well said, "It shows a strongly naturalistic temper much inspired by the scientific theories and culture of the day, which, in some respects, it seeks to express in theo-

(*) "Old Faiths &c.," p. 349. (†) "Cath. Presbyterian," vol. ix, p. 202. (‡) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 27. (§) "The Hom. Review,"

logical accomodation. It aims to harmonize, if not to identify, natural law with spiritual grace, to unite redemption and evolution, broadening the basis of the Christian verities by viewing them as part of the primeval order of creation."*

In pursuance of this purpose the new theology considers Revelation a process, Atonement a process, Incarnation a process, Regeration a process, Probation a process, Judgment a process. Love and grace are by law.

Professor F. H. Johnson gives us a very interesting series of articles on such subjects as Co-operative Creation, Theistic Evolution, Evolution of Truth, Revelation as a Factor in Evolution, The Evolution of Conscience.

To borrow an illustration: This "Real Theology," like another Aaron seeking to improve religion, has cast the golden ornaments of fancy into the moulds of exact science, and there has come out this — evolutionary. theology.

Before proceeding further we raise a question which the

 vol. xi, p. 206. (*) Ibid, vol xii, p. 281. See also p. 287. Cf. also, "Old Faiths, &c.," pp. 18, 33, 117, 231, 387. "Hom. Review," vol. xii p. 14.

The New Theology emphasises very much something which it calls the "The Immanence of God." Prof. Allen, in his *Continuity of Christian Thought*, makes it the central, fundamental doctrine of his Theology. "Deity indwelling in outward nature, but more especially in humanity, and above all in Christ;" "Deity revealed as an immanent in the life of nature;" "a living, spiritual presence, a God who is with us and in us, who is allied to humanity by an organic relationship;" "a relationship between God and humanity which had always existed indestructible in its nature, obscured but not obliterated by human ignorance and sin;" "a constitutional kinship with Deity, the image of God * * * * an inalienable heritage, a spiritual, or ethical birth-right which could not be forfeited."

Another writer (Hom. Rev., vol. xii, pp. 14 ff) discusses at some length the same topic in a sort of semi-scientific jargon, calling God the *anima mundi*! His lucubrations are, for some reasons, well worth reading.

On the whole this "Immanence" seems to squint towards a mild type of Pantheism.

See "Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 47, 177. Hom. Rev., vol. xii, pp. 14-16. "The Freedom of Faith" p. 60.

Andover Renaissance assumes is settled in the affirmative, which indeed lies at the basis of all their discussion :

Is there any such thing as Progress in Theology? That theology is a science we suppose few readers of this article will question ; of course analogy would lead to the conclusion that in this, as in other sciences, progress may be expected and should be desired. Not denying to theology progress in every sense of the word, and without delaying to discriminate carefully between development possible and impossible, legitimate and illegitimate, it will suffice the purposes of this paper to say somewhat summarily that, in the sense contemplated by the school of Thought under review, there can in our judgment be no such thing as Progress in Theology. For while theology is unquestionably a science, yet both its source and its method distinguish it from all other sciences. The sources of other sciences are hidden, to be sought out by diligent inquisition of nature with much toil and patience ; their method mainly inductive, to be tested, verified or corrected by manifold and repeated experiment. The source of theology, on the contrary, is a revelation the very purpose of which requires in the main clearness, and in all vital particulars simplicity ; its method is not inductive but hermeneutic or, more strictly, even exegetical. It is not only a revelation but an inspired revelation. The influence of this characteristic is decisive ; theology is a constant quantity because it is a supernaturally revealed and divinely inspired fact or system of facts. *Supernatural revelation and divine inspiration differentiate theology from all other sciences.* An incidental illustration of this fact, and at the same time test of its decisiveness, is to be seen in the invariable disposition of all advocates of progressive theology to kick against Inspiration. You will infallibly find that without exception every such writer must offer a "restatement" of the doctrine of Inspiration.

Another difference, and not unimportant either, between theology and other sciences, is the fact that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." *

* 1 Cor. ii. 14 of the whole of the chapter.

If mention be made of Natural Theology as a source affording opportunity of progress, we answer :

1. Natural Theology, as an independent source, is too fragmentary and defective to have any appreciable weight in this connection. As subsidiary to, and confirmatory of, revealed theology it is important and valuable. As a co-ordinate source, it is insignificant.
2. Natural Theology is not only fragmentary and defective, but apart from Revelation, it is entirely untrustworthy and even dangerous. It only embodies the views and "objectifies" the characteristics of its adherent, enlarging the scale to heroic size. The God of Natural Theology is simply a deified *man* with his errors, passions, prejudices, projected upon an infinite scale; as witness the gods of the Mythologies.
3. In the spiritual realm there is no such thing as *race* progress. In science, art and knowledge, we stand on the shoulders of centuries but in all that concerns our relations to God each man stands on his own feet, and his progress is strictly individual. The Progress of Society has never necessitated a reconstruction of Anthropology. Paul's anthropology is every whit as just, as exact, as *complete* in this "great and glorious nineteenth century" as it was in the dawn of the Christian age. The human race will never outgrow the Epistle to the Romans. This fact is strangely ignored in the abundant and eloquent references to the demands of general Culture and the necessities of advancing Progress.

To the charge of restraint of liberty, the claim for greater Freedom of Faith, our answer is that we see nothing narrow and feel nothing humiliating or restrictive in our view of this question.

$2 \times 2 = 4$. That is a fact; moreover, it is a *finished* fact; to believe it does not abridge the liberty of any mathematician; it would only lead to confusion to hold that in the advance of science 2×2 may equal five, and possibly, in the greater progress of the future, might actually reach the magnitude of *six*!

$2 \times 2 = 4$ is a finished fact, and no man can develop any other product than four out of it; but the applications of this finished fact are practically infinite; thousands of calculations daily illustrate it, from the child conning the multiplication table to the astronomer calculating the orbit of a star.

So of Theology; in exhibition, illustration and application, there has been, there ever will be, progress; in reconstruction, none may be expected, and we add, none is needed.

According to the New Theology, however, there seems to be not only abundant possibility of progress, but the most urgent need of it, and of a vast deal of it, too. It discerns a large field and occupies it with great confidence. Its claims are decided and its charges—for, as we have already intimated, the obverse of every claim is a charge—none the less so. These claims and charges are collected from a variety of sources; the Renaissance adopts no authoritative standards and calls no man Master; the school forms a sort of cave of Adullam, whereunto every man that is discontented with the established, conservative theology, or who hath any quarrel with his creed, hath gathered. As this fact may in all likelihood exaggerate the natural inconsistency of error, we need not be surprised if we should find a lack of absolute harmony. However much these various spokesmen may differ from one another in minor details, in one thing they are in loud and unanimous accord; they agree that theology is in a very bad way indeed, in exigent want of a renaissance, that there is urgent call for improvement. They confidently claim also that their Renaissance answers this call to the echo. Hear them describe it:

First and in general;

“It is a tendency towards a complete reconstruction of theology along the lines of a new science, a new interpretation and a new conception of human life. * * * * A protest against the despotism of all systems of theological thought that are based, and are now with increasing clearness seen to be based on a crude idea of revelation, a partial and defective exegesis, an *a priori* logic, and an inadequate apprehension of human nature. * * * It is an attempt to construct a theology that shall accord with the most spiritual deliverances of the Christian consciousness, and shall be adequate to all the facts of history and life.” (*)

“A movement which seeks to bring all theology up into a higher and purer light. * * * The endeavor to readjust to changed points of view, and to reform certain particular doctrines of the traditional Protestant theology.” †

“It rejoices in the emancipation of Christian thought from scholastic methods;” “brings home to our Christian life and literature a more confident belief in the immanence and nearness of the living God; *

(*) Hom. Rev. Vol. xi, p.202. (†) Cath. Presbyterian Vol. ix,

* * * a more truly human, a more divinely human, Christ-like sense of the character and infinite loveableness of God." (*)

"It is an endeavor to put all theology upon a Christological centre. It will work down, reforming all doctrinal statements, from a Christological conception of God."*

More specifically :

1. It claims for itself a somewhat larger and broader use of reason than has been accorded to theology. (†)
2. It seeks to interpret the Scriptures in what may be called a more natural way, and in opposition to a hard, formal, unsympathetic, and unimaginative way. (§)
3. It seeks to replace an excessive individuality by a truer view of the solidarity of the race. (¶)

It is historical and comparative rather than individualistic and provincial. (**)

It seeks *adequacy* in theology; that is, for breadth of view and comprehensiveness of statement. The theologies of the past are provincial in sympathy, if not in terminology. The essential unity and solidarity of the race has become a profoundly influential element in religious thought. A theory of God's relation to the world must be as broad as the world, or stand condemned by defect. (***)

4. This theology recognizes a new relation to natural science; but only in the respect that it ignores the long apparent antagonism between the kingdoms of faith and of natural law—an antagonism that, from the very nature of things, cannot have any basis in reality. (††)
5. The New Theology offers a contrast to the Old in claiming for itself a wider study of man. (††)
6. The New Theology recognizes the necessity of a restatement of belief in Eschatology, or the doctrine of Last Things. (§§)
7. It is more ethical, evangelical, spiritual and biblical as opposed to political, scholastic, rationalistic and dogmatic. (|||)
8. It is characterized by increasing frankness in the utterance of religious conviction; a deepening sincerity; a deepening spirituality; hopefulness, optimistic while the old theologies are pessimistic; "in them the doctrine of grace is overshadowed by a sharply defined and positive doctrine of despair—starting from the assumption that the world is a scene of a primitive moral defeat and disaster, they carry that assumption, with certain appalling dogmatic consequences, to the bitter end." (¶¶)

p. 199. (*) Cath. Pres. p. 202. (†) Freedom of Faith, p. 11. (§) *Ibid*, 16. (¶) *Ibid*, p. 22. (**). Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix, p. 200.

*** Hom. Rev., Vol. xi., p. 204. †† Freedom of Faith, p. 25. †† *Ibid*, p. 28. §§ *Ibid*, p. 35. ||| Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix., pp. 199, 200, 201. ¶¶ Hom. Rev., Vol. xi., pp. 202, 203, 204.

It magnifies the love of God rather than his justice, emphasizes the humanity of Christ and eulogizes the beauty of his example and the perfection of his life; concerns itself with social questions, in the effort to apply the principles of Christianity to the problems of modern civilization. It seeks to conciliate much earnest thought and life, which have been driven from the fold of ecclesiastical organization by the harshness of older tenets and the dogmatic severity with which they have been enforced. *

Upon reading such claims our first feeling is an impression of the wide and grand mission of this Progressive Orthodoxy; a feeling fast followed by wonder; wonder that there has been *any* piety or progress possible under the Old Theology. For, according to the necessary implication of the foregoing paragraphs, there has been scarcely sufficient salt in it to preserve it from corruption; how it has managed to survive long enough to become "Old" remains a mystery.

Let us, however, pass on to see how these claims of the New Theology are fulfilled, to compare the performance with the promise. We are furnished with some specimens of improved doctrinal statements, which shall be now submitted to the reader's judgment, and submitted in the exact language of the Reformers.

I. THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE.

We begin with this doctrine not because it is intrinsically and absolutely the most important, but because it is relatively most influential; it is elementary and fundamental; all other doctrines are governed by it, and are by it determined in both matter and form; determined by the degree of authority allowed to the Scriptures as compared with the *a priori* presumptions, conclusions, inductions of the human reason, the prejudices and passions of the human heart. On this account it is always economical to ask of any Theology first, what is its doctrine of Sacred Scripture. It will be found often a saving of much needless criticism and useless, because fruitless, argument. Under the guidance of this conviction we begin an analysis of the Renaissance by asking what is its doctrine of the Bible.

* Hom. Rev., v. xi.

The first symptom to be noticed in the study of this question is a disposition on the part of the Progressives, to compare, possibly to co-ordinate, with the Word of God, certainly to emphasize unduly, other methods of revelation. E. g. Of some subjects.

"God has taught us more from the slowly-unfolding Scriptures of His Providence than He has taught us in the Book of Revelation."*

"We should speak not so exclusively of the revelation of will, and the 'sheer authority' of an inspired word from God, etc., * * * and we dare not reason, from any Christ-inspired Scripture, upon the mysteries of grace and the hereafter in such a way, and with such unshrinking logic, as to establish the government of God upon the ruins of the thought of God which the childlike heart receives from the Gospel."†

Such expressions, though they might in themselves mean little, are nevertheless symptomatic; and when construed in connection with other statements, they become exceedingly significant, as the reader will at once have opportunity to judge.

We shall now present some extracts *in extenso*; ‡ and neces-

(*) Cath. Presbyterian, vol. ix. p. 197.

(†) *Ibid.* p. 201. See also, *Freedom of Faith*, pp. 47-69.

(‡) For the views hereafter to be discussed we are mainly indebted to a series of articles appearing as *editorials* in *The Andover Review* under the title of "Progressive Orthodoxy," afterwards published by Houghton Mifflin & Co., Boston, in a volume entitled and described, as follows:

PROGRESSIVE ORTHODOXY, 16mo., a Contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines. By the Editors of "The Andover Review," Professors in Andover Theological Seminary,

CONTENTS: I. Introduction; II. The Incarnation; III. The Atonement; IV. Eschatology; V. The Work of The Holy Spirit; VI. The Christian; VII. Christianity and Missions; VIII. The Scriptures; IX. Conclusion—Christianity Absolute and Universal.

The papers collected in this volume appeared first as editorial contributions to *The Andover Review*, a religious and theological monthly conducted by Egbert C. Smyth, William J. Tucker, J. W. Churchill, George Harris and Edward Y. Hincks, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary. They are republished substantially as first issued, with the exception of the first and seventh articles, portions of which only had previously appeared.

sarily so, because, in the absence of clear-cut definition—a virtue which the new theology abhors—we are compelled to extract its position on any doctrine from the general drift of its discussion; this and a desire to satisfy the reader that our judgment is not hasty or ill-founded, force us to be somewhat prolix in citation. We invite attention to the evident, though gradual, “progress” illustrated in these extracts. The attentive reader will be aware of decided and continual advance as he proceeds from paragraph to paragraph.

1. (The Bible) is not a revelation, but is a history of a revelation. (*) Revelation is not a disclosure of things to be done, or of bare facts pertaining to eternity, but it is rather an unveiling of the thought and feeling of God to men, in response to which they become sons of the Most High. (†)

(It is) a prime feature of revelation that it is *of* and not *from* God, a coming of God into the world by a process paralleled with human development, and the source of it. (‡)

Neither is the Bible a collection of sacred oracles. (||)

We have, in short in the Old Testament, the growing life, the maturing thought, the ripened fruit, of the Hebrew mind, and the Hebrew History. (§)

We must seek, then, knowledge of the distinctive quality and value of the Scriptures by studying God’s revelation given in history. (¶)

They (the Apostolic Epistles) belong to the apostolic teaching, and had for their immediate readers, and all future ones, just the claim which their authors had. Whatever is peculiar in their composition, or extraordinary in their value, is to be found in the apostolic teaching generally. For there is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as soon as they sat down to write, and that, in consequence, what they wrote had a different quality from what they said. (**)

He (Paul) takes pains to assure the Corinthian church that he uses an apostle’s spiritual force quite as resolutely and effectively in bodily presence as through the pen. (**)

We should not dwell on what seems to be so obvious but for the fact that the assumption of a special activity of the Divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching, is a most fruitful source of confusion in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is. (**)

(*) The Freedom of Faith, p. 18. (†) *Ibid.*, p. 13. (‡) *Ibid.*, p. 68, cf. also p. 59. (||) Old Faiths, etc., p. 36. (§) *Ibid.*, p. 41. (¶) Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 458. (**) *Ibid.*, p. 459.

A new type of teaching begins with Peter's Pentecostal sermon. The essential elements of all distinctively Christian teaching are found in it. They are said to be the fruits of the new life. * * * Paul says that the revelation of Christ, the source of his preaching and the ground of its authority, was given in his conversion. * * * The light into which he was born was that from which he taught; the revelation of which each apostle was the bearer is not, therefore, to be thought of as a set of religious ideas made over to him to be held as an external possession. He could not be himself without having it; he could not give it without giving his life with it. For it was in essence the personal experience of Jesus Christ in and through which he lived. (*)

The quality which chiefly distinguishes Scripture from all other Christian literature is the vitality of the teaching. Nothing else ever written shows personality so penetrated by the truth of Christ. (*)

2. It (the truth) must, at least, be expressed in words which man has made to convey his ideas, and which partake, therefore, of the limitations and imperfections of those ideas. Now if it had pleased God to produce a book of oracles by sheer and stark miracle, or to dictate the contents of one to a scribe or number of scribes, the teaching would not come more directly from Him than when a soul in vital contact with Him freely gives out, under the leading of his Spirit, the truth which is the element in which it lives. (†)

We can hardly believe, indeed, that the truth as it passed through the Apostles had such absolute purity as we must suppose it to have had if perfect beings had been the media of revelation. (‡)

Not that they alone (the Apostles) possessed the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. He is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in which He dwells, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic into which He has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries. (§)

(The Apostles, however, must remain the chief teachers.) We can see that their (the apostles') situation and their exceptionally exalted life make following teachers dependent upon any predecessor except Christ.

(Such advantages e. g. as—) their historical relation to the Incarnation; their relations to the previous history of the world and to its cotemporaneous life; their knowledge of Judaism from the inside; their pre-eminent endowment of the Holy Spirit.

We would gladly cherish the thought that other teachers might arise, from whom should flow even more copious streams of living water than those which welled from the hearts of the apostles. But we are

* Andover Review Vol. iv, p. 461. "The Freedom of Faith," p. 65. "The Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 59, 60. † Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 462. ‡ *Ibid*, p. 464. § *Ibid*, p. 465.

compelled to regard the circumstances of their lives as excluding such a hope. We cannot think the gift of the Spirit a sheer miracle of power. * * * * And we cannot help believing that the conditions of its bestowment existed in a degree absolutely unique in the days just following the Incarnation.

(Among those conditions are noted—) the amazing act of divine love just consummated; a surpassing influx of divine life into the world; the historic contact of the divine humanity of Jesus, etc., etc. *

The Synoptic gospels contain the apostolic tradition about Christ, gathered from various sources and wrought into narratives. * * *

Of purely miraculous communication, to these writers, of any other material there is no evidence. * * * We have ample guarantee of essential accuracy in the spiritual exaltation of the apostolic circle; preternatural vividness of their recollection; their spiritual sympathy with Christ's teaching.

(So much for the Synoptists and the Epistles; beyond a passing compliment to the fourth Gospel, the rest of the books of the New Testament are not discussed further than to say that—). The general consensus of the church has placed them in the Canon, and this consensus has the strongest claims to respect, though this judgment cannot add anything to the intrinsic value, etc., etc. (†)

3. (We are now prepared to hear Mr. Munger say—) The Theories of a generation ago are fast disappearing, verbal, dynamic, plenary, an inspiration covering all historic and scientific reference; none of them are any longer insisted on. * * * We are getting to speak less of the inspired *book*, and more of the inspired *men* who wrote it; the quality or force of inspiration lying not so much in the form, or even matter, of the thing written, as in the writer himself,—his relation to his age, the clearness of his thought, the pitch of his emotions, the purity of his spirit, the intensity of his purpose. (‡)

The mind accepts revelation because it accepts the substance of revelation, * * * it enters into the material of revelation and plants its feet there. The reason believes the revelation because *in itself* it is reasonable. Human nature—so far as it acts by itself—accepts Christianity because it establishes a thorough *concensus* with human nature; it is agreeable to human nature in its normal action. (§)

It is as legitimate for the reason to pass judgment upon the *contents* of revelation as upon the grounds of receiving it. (||)

This fulness of citation supercedes the necessity of formal statement, on our part, of the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture as held by the New Theology. Moreover, the progress is so decided and

(*) Andover Review Vol. iv. pp. 465-6. (†) *Ibid*, pp. 466-7. (‡) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 65. (§) *Ibid*. p. 12. (||) *Ibid* p. 13.

so great as to show for itself and thus renders detailed criticism a matter of supererogation. It may not be amiss, however, to remark very briefly :

1. That this doctrine as taught by the Church and set forth in the various standards of Christendom, has been decidedly "restated," much "readjusted," even radically "reconstructed." Whether such a *renaissance* deserves to be called "progress" or not, the reader may judge.
2. Revelation has been "historically developed" to such a wonderful extent that its oldest acquaintance would be excusable for failure to recognize it.
3. In this development Inspiration has vanished. In its place we have vitality, personality penetrated by the truth, exaltation of emotions, intensity of purpose, clearness of thought, spiritual sympathy, vividness of recollection.
4. As the inspiration was limited to the *men* and does not embrace the *book*, of course there is no guarantee of accuracy, even "essential accuracy," beyond that furnished by the foregoing characteristics. The book is not more perfect than the character, nor more accurate than the knowledge of the writers of it, nor more trustworthy than their memory.
5. From which result, necessarily, limitations, defects, imperfections; and a lack of such "absolute purity as the truth might have if proclaimed through the media of perfect beings"—(or, let us add as a possible alternative overlooked by the Progressive Orthodoxy, if proclaimed through the media of imperfect beings *guided and governed by the spirit of God*).
6. This Revelation having, then, no more claim than its writers had; and their claim based only on such qualifications as we noted above in (3); and these writers not alone possessing the spirit of wisdom and revelation, who is the same in every soul in which he dwells, and who has dwelt so abundantly in some souls since;—all this being true, it follows of course that, though these writers must from their peculiar circumstances remain the chief teachers, yet many successors may be expected as in some sense modifying, restating, readjusting, reconstructing and reforming their statements of truth and doctrine.*
7. If now, in addition to all these elements of limitation and defect, reason be authorized "to pass judgment upon the *contents* of the Revelation;" "to enter into its material and plant its feet there;" "to accept it only so far as it establishes a thorough concensus with human nature and is agreeable in its nature to human nature;"—

* E. g. *Schleiermacher*! See "Continuity of Christian Thought," pp. 383 ff. "Schleiermacher still utters the truth to which all that is highest in modern Christianity continues to respond," p. 397.

then the inevitable consequence is that whatever is mysterious to the mind or unwelcome to the natural heart may be, nay, *must* be rejected. In short, every man becomes virtually the maker of his Bible.

Surely this is "progress" enough to satisfy any one, but this is not all. We must digress a little at this point in order to consider the functions and influence of the *Christian Consciousness* according to the views of this Progressive Orthodoxy. Much emphasis is laid upon it by the advocates and representatives of our Renaissance. The Professor of Theology in Andover writes :

We can go farther and claim not only that the Christian Consciousness is the organ of increasing knowledge, but also that all statements and interpretations of truth, to be accepted, must commend themselves to the Christian consciousness. * * * * * It therefore has a kind of authority. Its authority is co-ordinate, but none the less real. Its function, then, may be considered both the development and testing of progressive theology. (*.)

The Christian Consciousness of to-day, which is itself a product of the gospel, cannot be contradicted by the gospel. Hence any theories which claim to be confirmed by the Bible, yet against which Christian sentiment protests, should not be accepted. †

Now all this sounds very clear—and if Progressive Orthodoxy will pardon us, very *dogmatic*—but before considering its functions we pause to examine this Christian Consciousness itself. What is it? We are familiar with Consciousness as set forth in Metaphysics and we have always recognized its authority, but *Christian Consciousness* is something new.

Surely it does not purpose profiting by a mere similarity of sound to gain custom through the credit of an established trademark of Psychology! It cannot denote simply the consciousness of a Christian; on the contrary it is referred to, and deferred to, as a sort of spiritual intuition; with those *semper, ubique, ab omnibus* attributes, which indeed could alone constitute it such. But if so, then how happens it that in the Professor of Theology at Andover the Christian Consciousness should differ so diametrically from its very identical self as exercising its

* Andover Review, Vol. ii, p. 345.

† *Ibid*, p. 348.

authority in the Professor of Theology at Princeton? In Andover e. g. it protests against Election, Original Sin, Imputation, Inspiration, &c., &c., while in Princeton it protests not less vigorously against Andover! Now between the two, who shall judge? Whose Christian Consciousness is to be depended upon? If, however, only the general *concensus* of Christian feeling is meant—which seems probable from the substitution of “sentiment” as a synonym in the close of the second extract—what then becomes of Progressive Orthodoxy? For it is a system which contradicts the overwhelming consent of Christianity, against which the predominant sentiment of Christians protests, and which has on its side only a beggarly minority in comparison. Verily it looks as if progressive Orthodoxy, in introducing this Christian Consciousness, had put a torch to its own tenement.

Without further criticism than the foregoing challenge of its right to any consideration at all, we return to our discussion by noting the influence of this so-called Christian Consciousness upon the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. Plainly in it we have the introduction of another arbiter. If not only “interpretations” but “statements of truth,” and *all* of them, must commend themselves to this Christian Consciousness before acceptance, it has ceased to be simply “co-ordinate,” it has become the ultimate appeal, the final authority. Hence we read a little further on, that nothing which contradicts it is to be accepted as biblical. For example: the doctrine of Election is under discussion, or that of Future Punishment; if objection is made, of what avail is it to cite Scripture, even though most clear and decided! If the Christian *sentiment* of your disputant protests, it ends the matter; your theory claims the confirmation of the Bible, but his Christian Consciousness cannot be contradicted by the Gospel; therefore whatever contradicts it, is not Gospel. Q. E. D! Anything against which Christian sentiment protests is thereby proven unscriptural. It need not be added that Christian sentiment will practically be always and only the sentiment of the individual concerned; and to argue with a sentiment is much like bailing out a cellar with a pitchfork.

If the reader will at this point refer to our *seriatim* summation of results, he will appreciate more fully the effect of this Christian Consciousness. Having divested the Scriptures of all authority save that which inheres in the character and position of its writers, their piety, intelligence and memory, their historic situation and associations; having weakened even its very credibility by the infinite possibilities of limitation, defect, imperfection and inaccuracy; it is demanded by Progressive Orthodoxy that *such a Scriptures* be further submitted to the arbitrament of human reason and the Christian Consciousness. When both of these judges "plant their feet in the material of Revelation," we fear the Word of God will spare the fate of the unhappy traveller between Jerusalem and Jericho.

And so we end our analysis of this doctrine of the Renaissance by adding to our summarized list a last result, viz:

8. There is no Bible.

With such views of the Scriptures it is evident that speculation will be unbridled in dealing with particular doctrines. Having gotten rid of the Old Theology's "unimaginative way" of interpreting the Scriptures, we may expect many and great improvements; for fancy is fertile, and an imaginative way of interpretation, which is moreover soft and sympathetic, can perform wonders. The way is now clear for any reconstruction that rationalism may demand, depravity desire, prejudice prefer, or a sublimated Christian Consciousness crave. From this point our pursuit will be after an *ignis fatuus*; but perhaps the reader's curiosity has been aroused sufficiently to awaken a desire to see how the Christian System fares under readjustment; what improvements are suggested by the Christian Consciousness; what Reason proceeds to do when it gets its feet planted in the material of Revelation.

If so, let us examine

II—THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE RENAISSANCE.

(The Incarnation is) the entrance into the world through a person of a moulding and redeeming force in humanity. (*)

(*) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9.

The divine gift to humanity is the Incarnation. (*)

The self-revealing, self-communicating Love of God, the Word and Son of God who created in the beginning, creates in "the fullness of the time" a nature which is the perfect counterpart of his own, its human side and means of realization, in order that divine revelation and impartation may reach their highest possible completeness, and may not be hindered even by the malevolence and guilt of human sin. (†)

Christ is not only the earthly culmination, but also the eternal source and principle, of revelation. He who created all things is *ipso facto* the Revealer. In the Incarnation He has carried revelation to its highest conceivable stage and mode, however augmented it may be in degree and power. (‡)

(The doctrine of the Incarnation) is seen in its truest light when it is regarded as the final and complete work of the first element, or energy, of God's love—the giving of self to the utmost. (§)

The Incarnation has absolute worth in itself, and is for God's own sake as well as for our sakes. It is not, in this view, an accidental truth of history, but a necessary truth of the divine love. (¶)

(The Incarnation is) the central and broadest fact of theology. (**)

Christian Theology * * * * finds its living centre in the Incarnate Word. Not God's sovereign will, not God's eternal decree, but God Himself—God in Christ—is the central truth and glory of Christian life and thought. From this return to the Christological centre of Christian Theology we are to gain, also, enlarged views of the fact of the Incarnation; of its central significance in the idea of moral creation; of its possible cosmical relations. (††)

The Incarnation, moreover, according to the New Theology, was more than all this; it was a "moral necessity" irrespective of man's sin and need. It forms a link in the great Evolution that plays so prominent a part in our Progressive Orthodoxy; the prophecy of nature and the prophecy of the human soul combine in one growing Messianic hope.

* * * If the divine creative process, ever advancing to more perfect works, should stop before He came, who is God's own image, Immanuel, God with us,—then the creative love of God would seem to fall short of its own purpose from the beginning, and fail of its own divinity. The necessity of love which began the work would not be satisfied to leave it unfinished and uncrowned. The creation without

(*) Andover Review, Vol. iii, p. 556. (†) *Ibid*, p. 559. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 562. (§) "Old Faiths," &c., p. 278. (¶) *Ibid*, p. 285. (**) "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9. (††) Cath. Presbyterian, Vol. ix, p. 202.

its supreme end, the creation without the Christ, would it not be a disappointment to God himself, for God is love? *
 The opinion, therefore, has reason in it that there would have been the Incarnation even if there had been no sin. †

It is evident that the Incarnation occupies a different and much more prominent place in the New Theology than in the Old. The character and the extent of this change will be more clearly seen in connection with its view of the Atonement. On the first page of the discussion of this doctrine we read :

The starting-point from which inquiry has usually set forth has been the sin of man. Man sinned, and the race became corrupted. Therefore, Jesus was born, suffered, and died, in order that man might be saved from sin. But this view is too narrow. It puts part of the truth in place of the whole. It virtually declares that if there had been no sin, we should not have known God in Christ. * * * * *
 * * * * * The principal defect, however, is that Christ is made contingent on sin, and that sin, therefore, appears to be not only more fundamental than Christ, but an absolute necessity, in order that God might reveal himself in Christ. †

Here we have at once the genesis, and the character, and the content, of the great distinctive feature of alleged progress in the New Theology, its so-called Christological basis,—the sense in which it is Christo-centric as opposed to a sin-centric Theology ; and the sum of the whole change, the amount of the mighty advance, that which is to prove the regeneration of existing Theology, is just simply and solely this, viz : *a substitution of the Incarnation for the Atonement.*

Progressive Orthodoxy lays its greatest emphasis on the *life* of Christ, whereas apostolic doctrine and preaching has surprisingly little to say of the life ; in it and in the Theology developed from and by it, the *death* of Christ is “the great central fact ;” in other words, the atonement, not the incarnation. Paul’s theme and his glory was not the manger but the cross. There is something astonishing in the persistency and perversity with which the writers of the Renaissance reverse the position and promi-

* “Old Faiths, etc.,” p. 279. † Andover Review, vol. iv, p. 58.
 ‡. *Ibid*, p. 56.

nence of these two doctrines. They have suspiciously little to say of the death of Christ. Dr. Newman Smyth (*) has a very interesting chapter on the uniqueness of Christ, his character, his mission, his method; but though he instances eight suggestive particulars, he fails utterly to mention that great peculiarity which distinguishes Christ most, according to our judgment, from all the sons of men, viz: *that he came to die*; that which in all other men was but the supreme, the inevitable catastrophe, was in his life the prime purpose, that for which he came into the world. One would never imagine this from the Real Theology's presentation of Christology, because in it the Incarnation has been substituted for the Atonement; and this substitution is born out of a low, inadequate perception of sin. *Here is the heart of the Renaissance.* The plausible pretext of this conception is the alleged incidental or accidental character of sin.

But granting that sin is incidental rather than fundamental, accidental rather than essential, it nevertheless remains true that an accident may very readily and necessarily become fundamental in the plans of life, and regulative of its habits. A man, *e. g.*, may fall and injure his spine; if so, the accident shapes the rest of his life in every particular; it is just as "fundamental" as if it had been premeditated.

Now it happens that by the Fall man's moral backbone, his spiritual spine, was broken; on this account a sin-centric Theology, if you choose to call it such, is ever afterwards the only sort adapted to his life. Man is a sinner. All his relations with God are determined, all his intercourse with Him, is governed by that fact. This is what brought Christ into the world. What might have been done, had there been no sin, we are not competent to determine, nor are we concerned to inquire; what we *are* concerned with, is the actual relation of the world to God; and the self-evident truth witnessed on every page of the Scriptures is, that what our author calls a "too narrow view," is precisely the view taught line upon line and precept upon precept in the Bible; the Bible is God's Revelation to sinners—man's ruin and God's remedy.

(*) "Old Faiths, etc." pp. 185-231.

If this is "too narrow," it is at least as broad as the Word of God, and that is broad enough for us. "It is a faithful saying and *worthy of all acceptation* that Christ Jesus came into the world to *save sinners.*"

As to the atonement more specifically, our author says:—

It is no longer believed that personal merit and demerit can be transferred from one to another. It is not believed that an exact quantity of punishment can be borne by an innocent for a guilty person. It is not believed that the consequences of sin can be removed from the transgressor by passing them on to another. (*)

There are two lines of approach toward the Atonement. One view considers Christ's relation to humanity as identified with it. This is "an organic relation"—"the race with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it." He has so identified himself with humanity that its burden of suffering rested on Him. * * * When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful. Christ realizes for humanity what it could not realize for itself. * * * Thus we can regard Him as our substitute * * * because He is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his. * * * The entire race repents or is capable of repenting through Christ. It renders in Him a complete repentance. He is the Amen of humanity to the righteousness of God's law, to the ill-desert of sin, to the justice of God's judgment. †

The other line of approach is from God to man. The punishment and consequences of sin make real God's abhorrence of sin, and the righteousness of law. The sufferings and death of his only Son, also realize God's hatred of sin, and the righteous authority of law; therefore punishment need not be enacted. **

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting; and he does this in such a way that God's abhorrence to sin is realized, the majesty of the law honored, the sinner and the universe convinced of the righteousness of the divine judgments. ††

His death is a new fact, an astonishing, revealing, persuasive, melting fact, in view of which it would be puerile to exact literal punishment of those who are thereby made sorry for sin and brought in penitence to God. ††

* Andover Review, Vol. iv, p. 60. † *Ibid*, pp. 61, 2. ** Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 63. †† *Ibid*, p. 64.

Starting from the human side we may say that God is the reconciled God, the forgiving God, because man in Christ, seeing God as He is, and sin as it is, is the penitent man, the believing man, the Christian man. Or reversing the order, and advancing to the ultimate fact that redemption originates with God, we may say that man is the penitent and obedient man because God in Christ is the reconciling and forgiving God. *

In the Atonement Christ the Son of man brings all humanity to God. No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself. In the Atonement God provided redemption for the world by realizing his holy love in the eyes of all the nations. †

Mr. Munger says of the Atonement: We are struggling towards St. Paul's and the Christ's own statement of it as containing the law and method of life for every man: "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." We are getting to read this truth as meaning Christ formed in us, a law and way of life ‡

We are now prepared to appreciate this readjustment of Christology. The Atonement is the Incarnation; the Incarnation is a revelation; and this revelation, a moral necessity. There is nothing transacted in the court of heaven; there is no transfer of merit or demerit; no exact quantity of punishment borne by an innocent for a guilty person; no removal of the consequences of sin from the transgressor by passing them on to another. What the sufferings and death of Christ accomplish is a revelation of the righteousness of God against sin, and at the same time a revelation of His love for the sinner. The Atonement "provides redemption for the world by realizing God's holy love in the eyes of all nations." The sufferings and death of Christ "realize God's hatred of sin, and the righteous authority of law; *therefore punishment need not be exacted.*" This moreover is done for the whole race, and as a race. Christ's relation to the race is organic. The Atonement affects its purpose through its astonishing, persuasive, revealing, melting influence, which influence leads man to adopt it as his law and method of life. It teaches man how to redeem himself, and the moral influence and effect of it render him capable of doing it.

And here we see the unmistakable features of our old acquaintance *Socinus*, peering through this "restatement;" our

* Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 65. † *Ibid*, p. 68. ‡ "The Freedom of Faith," p. 61.

boasted progress has landed us in the sixteenth century and the reformed theology of the nineteenth century is the discarded Socinianism of the sixteenth. Surely it is needless to cumber our pages with a refutation of it.

This reconstruction of Soteriology casts some light on the phrase "solidarity of the race," and paves the way, by means of "the cosmical relations of the Incarnation," for some readjustment of Eschatology.

In conclusion, let us see how our Renaissance provides for

III. THE APPLICATION OF THE REDEMPTION PURCHASED BY CHRIST.

The formal discussion of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is so very general and vague as to be entirely unsatisfactory; but there are here and there various hints, references and allusions, which, when combined, may serve our purpose.

If we start with the limitations of an arbitrary election we have a limited atonement and a limited work of the Spirit. * * * * Universal atonement comes in to break up the narrowness of the scheme. * * * * A universal atonement necessitates a universal work of The Spirit. *

It (the New Theology) does not differ essentially from the Old Theology, in its treatment of regeneration, but it broadens the ground of it finding its necessity not only in sin, but in the undeveloped nature of man, or in the flesh. It is disposed also to regard it as a process, involving known laws and analogies, and to divest it of that air of magical mystery in which it has been held; a plain and simple matter, by which one gets out of the lower world into the higher by the Spirit of God. †

It has been held simply as a moral necessity, having its basis in sin; but we are beginning to see that the Christ taught it also as a psychological necessity. We must be born again, not merely because we are wicked, not because of a lapse, but because we are flesh, and need to be carried forward and lifted up into the realm of the spirit, a constructive rather than a reconstructive process. ‡

Man may be translated from the dominion of merciless necessity into the life of freedom and love. The new and higher force is the revelation of God in Christ, through which the power of sin is broken and the penalty of sin remitted, * * * * ethical ends are secured by

* Andover Review, Vol. iv., p. 257. † "The Freedom of Faith," p. 33. ‡ *Ibid*, p. 61.

the revelation of God in Christ, and secured in such a way that God energizes in man and society for a moral transformation so radical and complete that it may be called salvation, redemption, eternal life, divine sonship.*

Christ suffering and sympathizing with men is able to awaken in them and express for them a real repentance.* * * * * Now the power of repentance, which, so far as it exists, is the power of recuperation, is superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and of present habit. †

Our readers will in all probability differ essentially from Mr. Munger when he states that such a view does not "differ essentially" from the doctrine of the Old Theology; they will think the ground of it so "broadened" that it includes the territory of *Pelagius*. Such a view evidently dispenses with the necessity of supernatural regeneration. The influences on the sinner are merely those of co-operative grace; regeneration is man's own change of purpose with reference to sin and holiness, wrought in him by moral suasion exercised through the influence of Christ's sufferings and sympathy; these sufferings and sympathy induce a repentance which is a power superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and present habit—a recuperative power. There is certainly no "magical mystery" about this, it is indeed "a very plain and simple matter;" there is no occasion for any one to ask, How can *these* things be? nor any reason for saying "thou canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth."

What has the *Renaissance* to say of Justification?

It holds to Justification by faith in the sense of a faith that, by its law, induces an actual righteousness—a simple, rational process realized in human experience. ‡

The same writer is reported as representing (in his published *Statement of Belief*, § iv) saving faith as consisting in a practical recognition of the fact revealed in the Incarnation, viz, that we "belong to the eternal order of God," and not to "the illusive order of the world;" defining faith as "the sum of those faculties in man through which he gets out of evil and the life of the world into the life of God."

* Andover Review, Vol. iv., p. 60. † *Ibid*, p. 62. ‡ "The Freedom of Faith," p. 9.

The secret, essential relation of the Christ to humanity, and of humanity to God, flows to us along this channel of obedient, inspiring love, and so we come to love our neighbor as ourselves, and God supremely. *

The great problem set before the faith * * * * the imperative need of every man is to get over from the natural and evil side of life to the Christ side, to give up worldly ways of feeling and acting, and pass into the Christly way; to die unto self and let Christ be formed in him. * * * * It is the secret of life, the key of destiny. How to bring it about is the question. It is an achievement, for it is nothing less, wrought, so far as we are concerned, by love to Christ, and by the service of love. * * * * Let us not strive to find any other path for individual or social regeneration; there is no other path. * * * * We must go by the eternally ordained path of love to Him * * * * and suffer his love to charm us into a kindred love. †

From these extracts it is perfectly clear :

1. That the ground of Justification is not the merit of Christ alone, perhaps not even chiefly; but, on the contrary, the conversion, virtue, obedience, service, of the believer.
2. Its condition is not faith, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation, but love; we are justified not by faith, but by love.
3. Justification is not forensic effecting a change in man's legal relations, but reformatory; a revolution in his character inducing an actual righteousness realized in human experience.
4. It is a *process*, not "an act of God's free grace.
5. It comes, therefore, nearer to sanctification than justification; with, however, this decided difference,—that while a work, it is not a work of *God's* free grace, but of man's.

The reader has doubtless anticipated the Eschatological improvements of the Renaissance. A cosmical Incarnation, a universal Atonement, a universal work of the Spirit, the solidarity of the race, and Christ's organic relation, and essential identity, with the race, all demand imperatively *a probation after death* for every human being who has died in ignorance of the Gospel; and, we think, for some others besides; but our concern at this time is not with the entire logical results of the foregoing doctrines; we discuss only such readjustment as the elastic facility of the New Theology feels called upon to furnish, and

* "The Freedom of Faith," p. 124. † Ibid, p. 126.

at this present writing, so far as heard from, they limit their *post mortem* probation as above indicated.

There is no evidence whatever that the race is divided into two great sections, one of which is dealt with on the basis of the Gospel, and the other on the basis of law and natural conscience—one on a basis of justice, the other on a basis of grace. (*)

Christianity itself starts the question * * * * what can the God and Father of men, who has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, be expected to do for His children before He deals with them in judgment?(†)

We may go so far as to say that it would not be just in God to condemn men hopelessly when they have not known Him as He really is, when they have not known Him in Jesus Christ.(‡)

The conclusion which most naturally suggests itself is that those who do not know God's love in Christ while they are in the body, will have knowledge of Christ after death.(‡)

Such views are the natural, even necessary, consequence, the logical consistent outcome, of preceding positions. They only emphasize the departure of the New Theology from the system of grace; they *reverse* the Gospel in making the purpose or effect of the work of Christ not that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth; but that God might be just and the condemner of him that disbelieveth. Redemption thus becomes a matter of *debt*, not of grace, something which is due to man before he can be justly condemned.

This probation has received more attention than anything else in the Renaissance. We the more certainly therefore pass it by. Besides this, our criticism of the general principles of the movement establishes clearly, we believe, the fact that the roots of this feature, which attracts so much public notice, are grounded in the very heart and soul of the whole system. We shall be greatly surprised if still more startling results are not reached.

From the character of its theology, we predict for this movement a progress, more or less rapid, through Unitarianism, Universalism, Rationalism, into *Agnosticism*. Thus far there has been a reconstruction of Inspiration, Incarnation, Atone-

(*) Andover Review, vol. iv. p. 67. (†) *Ibid*, p. 259. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 67. (‡) *Ibid*, p. 155. See, also, Hom. Rev. vol. xi. pp. 281 ff.; "The Freedom of Faith," pp. 23, 24, 36; 41 to 43; 335 to 341.

ment, Original Sin, Depravity, Election, Regeneration, Justification and Probation.

The New Theology is plainly not only evolutionary, but revolutionary. Our work has been mainly expository, only secondarily, and to a very limited degree, elenctic; we shall nevertheless rest here; and we lay down our pen with the confident conviction that no man having tested the Old will straightway desire the New, for he will say **THE OLD IS BETTER.**

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

III. THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

PART I.

This wonderful people, wonderful in their punishment, are still more wonderful in their preservation. It was declared that God would make an end of all the nations that oppressed them, but that He would not make an end of them. And this has happened. Where are their ancient oppressors the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, Macedonians, Romans, Goths and others? Gone, forever gone! But the Jew still lives! It was long ago predicted by Balaam: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." And how strictly has this been fulfilled from the beginning until now! They have lived under every sort of rule, mixed with every people under heaven, and yet kept wonderfully distinct, showing that God has not yet done with them as a nation. To repeat a figure, first used by us over 30 years ago: *Like the gulf stream in mid-ocean, projecting its current in a contrary direction to it, and preserving its waters in distinction from it.* "They have been spread over every part of the habitable globe; they have lived under the *regime* of every dynasty; they have shared the protection of just laws, and the proscriptions of cruel ones, and witnessed the rise and progress of both. They have used every tongue and lived in every latitude. The snows of Lapland have chilled, the suns of Africa have scorched them. They have drunk the Tiber, the Thames, the Jordan, the Mississippi. In