

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1861.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The State of the Country.*

THERE are periods in the history of every nation when its destiny for ages may be determined by the events of an hour. There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated. When the question to be decided turns on moral principles, when reason, conscience, and religious sentiment are to be addressed, it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear, to endeavour to allay unholy feeling, and to bring truth to bear on the minds of their fellow-citizens. If any other consideration be needed to justify the discussion, in these pages, of the disruption of this great confederacy, it may be found, not only in the portentous consequences of such disruption to the welfare and happiness of the country and to the general interests of the world, but also in its bearing on the church of Christ and the progress of his kingdom. Until within a few years there was no diversity of opinion on this subject. It was admitted that the value of the union of these states did not admit of calculation. As no man allowed himself to count the worth of

ART. III.—*The New Oxford School; or Broad Church Liberalism.*

Recent Inquiries in Theology, by eminent English Churchmen: being "Essays and Reviews," reprinted from the second London edition. Edited with an Introduction, by Rev. FREDERIC H. HEDGE, D. D. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860.

The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation. A Third Series of Essays. By the Rev. BADEN POWELL, M. A., F. R. S., F. R. A. S., F. G. S. Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans & Roberts. 1859.

VARIOUS types of doctrine have, in successive periods, had place or ascendancy in the Anglican church. When it disowned allegiance to Rome, and erected itself into an independent national organization, its faith was substantially that of the Reformed churches on the continent. Joined with them in a common reformation from Papal heresies and abominations, it was essentially one with them in that great system of faith which was the life of this Reformation. This is sufficiently conspicuous in the Thirty-nine Articles, and in the testimonies of her great divines, and her noble army of confessors and martyrs, who at this time adorned her annals. On the ecclesiological side, however, the English church retained more of the ritual and hierarchical element than her continental sisters. The reigning monarch was made her temporal head. Her liturgical services also retained certain expressions which savoured of an *opus operatum* efficacy in the sacraments. The consequence has been that this church has usually had two adverse parties struggling for the ascendancy within her pale—the Evangelical, who interpret the liturgy according to the articles; and the Ritualistic, who construe the articles according to the liturgy. Under and between these classes, all varieties and grades of doctrine and practice have had place in that great communion. Neither tendency has been at any time wholly extinct, although the predominance has oscillated from one side to the other.

After that early predominance of the Augustinian system of

doctrine, with its correspondent spirituality and holiness of life, which attended and followed the primitive organization of the Reformed Anglican church, the ritualistic element began to develop itself in overpowering strength. In the person of Laud it found its Pontifex Maximus. He inaugurated a superstitious ritualism to shelter and hallow voluptuousness and licentiousness of life, along with a remorseless and bloody persecution of the non-conformists, the followers of the faith and practice of the Reformers, who framed the articles and liturgy of the church. The ejection of these holy men from her pale was the consequence. Here was, to a great extent, the seed of those dissenting bodies of Christians which surround and harass, but cannot be won to it.

This state of things, however, could not last long. With the gradual advance of toleration, came increased freedom in religious thinking, and its publication. The licentious living which had become allied with the punctilious observance of certain Christian rites, superstitiously prostituted to its protection, conspired with other causes to produce a bountiful crop of infidelity and deism. Indeed, deism became the genteel creed, as clearly appears from the famous passage in Butler's advertisement to his "Analogy," in which he says: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious. Accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were, by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

Antagonistic to this fashionable deism, arose that great school of apologetic divines and thinkers who gave tone to English divinity during most of the last, and the early part of the present century, and of whom Butler and Paley are representative examples; the former, of those who elaborately argued the intrinsic reasonableness, or freedom from unreasonableness, of Christianity, whatever might be the evidence of its truth; the latter, of those who elaborated the miraculous and other

evidence of Christianity, whatever be its reasonableness. But, subject to such exceptions and qualifications as every such general observation requires, it is to be observed that this school was not only apologetic, but moralizing, and, to a certain extent, rationalizing. We mean to say, that the preaching and other religious teaching of this period centred largely upon the moralities and proprieties of life—the ethical relations of man with man, and for this world; and that, so far as it ascended to the sphere of religious duty, it enjoined this rather in the way of dry and frigid inculcation of duties, than of presenting the evangelical springs, supports, and grounds for its performance. The sermons of Butler, Blair, (for this spirit was not confined to the English church,) Paley, and innumerable others, read more like ethical instructions with a Christian aspect, than Christianity proper, as a supernatural method of saving the soul—the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation. This characteristic, which peers out even in the very titles of their sermons, involved, in its own way, a rationalizing element. They sought to prove the reasonableness of Christianity, not so much in the eye of cultivated and philosophic reason, as in the view of the common sense and conscience of men. They were prone, therefore, to expatiate, not so much on those supernatural mysteries, gifts, and requirements of revelation, which are clear only to faith and spiritually illuminated reason, as upon those moral or religious duties which are their own evidence to the average conscience of society. They expatiated, often with deep philosophy, and oftener still with elegant rhetoric, on the great excellence and utility of these virtues to individuals, to society, for this world, if not for the next. And they magnified Christianity as giving to these virtues the support of distinct and emphatic Divine requirement, of greater or less Divine helps to their performance, and, above all, of the sanction of eternal rewards and punishments. This style of thinking culminated in Paley. With him the grand discovery made to us by revelation was the certainty of a future state of eternal rewards and punishments, while the only sure attestation of revelation is miracles, which he marshalled in support of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures with matchless skill

and power.* This view, moreover, tallied with his partly utilitarian and partly Epicurean theory of the nature of virtue, which he defines to be "the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, *for the sake of everlasting happiness.*" He illustrates the nature of obligation by saying, "I am obliged to keep my word, because I am urged to do so by a violent motive, (namely, the expectation of being after this life rewarded if I do, or punished if I do not,) resulting from the command of another (namely, of God.)" In attributing a rationalizing tendency to this school, we mean it in a negative and qualified sense. We do not mean that they impeached the inspiration or authority of Scripture, or that they explained away the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation; but that they emphasized the humanly moral virtues, while supernatural regeneration, gratuitous justification by faith in the vicarious merits of Christ, living to God through Christ living in us, were more or less overlooked or attenuated. We cannot help thinking, as we read Paley, that his conception of Christian holiness is the sum of those virtues which make up his ideal of a genuine English gentleman; while the chasm between the spirit of his writings and those of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, of Leighton and Jeremy Taylor, or of Cecil and John Newton, is immense. The exaggerated caricature of Coleridge, in regard to this type of preaching, is not without meaning—that it valued Christianity chiefly as an "aid extraordinary of the police."

In the earlier half of the last century, however, the great

* The following conclusion of the fourth chapter of Paley's *Moral Philosophy* has been lauded, says Coleridge, by Dr. Parr, "as the finest prose passage in English literature :"

"Had Jesus Christ delivered no other declaration than the following—'The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;'—he had pronounced a passage of inestimable importance, and well worthy of that splendid apparatus of prophecy and miracles by which it was introduced and attested; a message, in which the wisest of mankind would rejoice to find an answer to their doubts and rest to their inquiries. It is idle to say that a future state had been discovered already: it had been discovered as the Copernican system was: it was one guess among many. He alone discovers who *proves*; and no man can prove this point but the Teacher, who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God."

awakening connected with the labours of Whitefield and the Wesleys, not only raised up a powerful organization without the church, which interdicted their labours, but infused a new current of spiritual life into the Establishment itself. It reared up a body of evangelical preachers and Christians, who have maintained their position, with varying numbers and influence, until now. They have not only held up the gospel-standard themselves. They have exercised an influence on their adversaries, and done much to raise their preaching above the dullness, inanity and stagnation of mere frigid moral essays or exhortations. While these two classes, with various intermediate shades of opinion, thus held possession of the Establishment, reciprocally acting upon each other—the evangelicals, from their greater catholicity largely known as Low Church, and the others, from their exaltation of the outward church organization and hierarchical exclusiveness known as the High Church, the Oxford Tracts appeared. On their character it is needless to dwell. They are so recent, so memorable for the principles they maintain and the effects they have produced, as to be familiar to all. It is enough to say, that they undertook with signal earnestness and ingenuity to twist the whole framework of the Anglican church, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, into accord with the few shreds of Popery still left in the liturgy. It was simply an attempt to romanize the Establishment. In regard to the authority of tradition, the infallibility of the church, the apostolic succession and authority of the ministry, the *opus operatum* efficacy of the sacraments, the confessional, priestly absolution, the most trivial, superstitious rites and fantastic mummeries, these tracts were a laboured effort to restore the Papal doctrines and practices which had been cast off at the Reformation. The fruits of this movement have been extensive in the revival of Popish practices in the English Establishment, and the secession of a large body of its ministers and members to Rome. The comparative novelty of the principles avowed, together with the extent and continuance of the welcome they received, prove that their propagators were but representative organs to articulate and develop the latent and struggling views which had already taken, or were ready to take, root in the minds of large numbers.

More recently, the counter extreme has appeared in the party which appropriates to itself the title of "Broad Church," some of whose productions we have placed at the head of this article. In the radical character of its principles, the zeal, ability, scholarship, and culture of its organs and expounders, it is quite a match for the Tractarian party. Whether they represent an equally prevalent style of thinking in the establishment, remains to be seen. We trust and pray not. And we are sure, that as we proceed authentically to expose their peculiar tenets, our readers will sympathize with us.

These principles are sufficiently declared in the volumes above-mentioned; the first of which presents the views of this school on various subjects, and from various authors, while the second treats a single topic in a more elaborate and exhaustive manner than was possible in the single article on the same subject by the same author, in the first of these volumes, occupying only one-sixth the space. The author of these is the celebrated Baden Powell, of the University of Oxford, who has died within the year, and has often addressed the public with ability on this and related topics—the immutability of the Order of Nature, and the consequent impossibility of miracles. The "Essays and Reviews" collected in the first of these volumes are as follows: 1. "The Education of the World." By Frederick Temple, D. D., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen; Head Master of Rugby School; Chaplain to the Earl of Denbigh. 2. "Bunsen's Biblical Researches." By Rowland Williams, D. D., Vice Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Lampeter; Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wilts. 3. "On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity." By Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., &c.; Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. 4. "Séances Historiques de Genève. The National Church." By Henry Bristol Wilson, B. D., Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts." 5. "On the Mosaic Cosmogony." By C. W. Goodwin, M. A. 6. "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688—1750." By Mark Pattison, B. D. 7. "On the Interpretation of Scripture." By Benjamin Jowett, M. A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. Thus it will be seen that two are Professors in Oxford University, one in St. David's

College, Wales, while another is the successor of Arnold at Rugby. Baden Powell has been long distinguished alike in physical science and theological discussion. These Essays have been republished in this country under the editorial supervision of Dr. Hedge, one of our most distinguished Unitarian divines, who contributes a commendatory introduction. He describes the theological spirit of the Broad Church, articulated in these volumes, as "listening, if here and there it may catch some accents of the Eternal Voice amid the confused dialects of Scripture, yet not confounding the former with the latter; expecting to find in criticism, guided by a true philosophy, the key to revelation; in revelation, the sanction and condign expression of philosophic truth." Language could not more clearly or positively deny the authority and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, or set up human philosophy as the ultimate standard and test of truth by which the Bible itself is to be tried. And we are constrained to say that this is a mild representation of the sceptical tone of these writers—all which, without further prelude, we will proceed to demonstrate from these books. And first, let us note their deliverances in regard to that branch of theology which is theology in the strictest sense—their views of the being, nature, attributes, word, and works of God. Says Dr. Williams,

"The profoundest analysis of our world leaves the law of thought as its ultimate basis and bond of coherence. This thought is consubstantial with the being of the Eternal I AM. Being, becoming, animating, or substance thinking and conscious life are expressions of a Triad which may be represented as will, wisdom, and love; as light, radiance, and warmth; as fountain, stream, and united flow; as mind, thought, and consciousness; as person, word, and life; as Father, Son, and Spirit. In virtue of such identity of Thought with Being, the primitive Trinity represented neither three originant principles nor three transient phases, but three eternal inherencies in one Divine Mind. The unity of God as the Eternal Father, is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity; but the Divine Consciousness or Wisdom, becoming personal in the Son of Man is the express image of the Father; and Jesus actually, but also mankind ideally, is the Son of God. If all

this has a Sabellian or almost a Braminical sound, its impugnors are bound," &c.* It would not be easy to find blanker Hegelianism. It simply maintains the "identity of Thought with Being," as at once the "profoundest analysis of our world," and of the evolution of the Absolute into consciousness and personality, in the person of Jesus, in man, in nature. It is, so far as we can see, undefecated Monism or Pantheism. In like manner, Dr. Temple says: "Man cannot be considered as an individual. He is, in reality, only man by virtue of his being a member of the human race. . . . If, then, the whole in this case, as in so many others, is prior to the parts, we may conclude that we are to look for that progress which is essential to a spiritual being subject to the lapse of time, not only in the individual, but also quite as much in the race taken as a whole. . . . This power whereby the present ever gathers into itself the results of the past, transforms the human race into a colossal man, whose life reaches from the creation to the day of judgment. The successive generations of men are days in this man's life." P. 3.

This is not mere rhetoric, nor mere medieval Realism, which, indeed, by logical necessity terminates in the doctrine of one substance pervading all classes and individuals, which are its modes or manifestations; but, taken in connection with other deliverances by these writers, it must be regarded as that type of Realism, which is born of and presupposes the modern Monistic or Pantheistic hypothesis.

To the same effect Professor Powell tells of "the structure of the infinite universe, in which we can infer no final design or purpose whatever; which is *perpetual* in its adjustments, offering no evidence of *beginning nor end*—only of continual orderly changes. . . . When the astronomer, the physiologist, the geologist, or the naturalist, notes down a series of observed facts or measured data, he is not an *author* expressing his own ideas—he is a mere *amanuensis* taking down the dictations of nature; his observation book is the record of the thoughts of *another mind*; he has but set down literally what he himself does not understand, or very imperfectly. . . . That which it

* *Recent Inquiries*, pp. 98, 99. When we give a page without specifying the volume, our reference will be to this book.

requires thought and reason to understand, must be itself thought and reason. That which mind alone can investigate and express, must be itself mind. And if the highest conception attained is itself but partial, then the mind or reason studied is greater than the mind or reason of the student." *Order of Nature*, pp. 237—240. What does all this intimate, if not the perpetuity and eternity of nature, and its identity with the Absolute Mind or Reason? So, in his *Essay on the Study of the Evidences*, he says, "the simple but grand truth of the law of conservation, and the stability of the heavenly motions, now well understood by all cosmical philosophers, is but the type of the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature." *Essays*, p. 151. He asserts "the impossibility even of *any two material atoms* subsisting together without a determinate relation; of any action of the one on the other, whether of equilibrium or of motion, without reference to a physical cause; of any modifications whatsoever in the existing conditions of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of *eternally impressed consequences, following in some necessary chain of orderly connection*, however imperfectly known to us." This self-evolution and self-sustentation of nature, this impossibility of aught but "eternally impressed consequences," following in a necessary chain, virtually makes Nature and Fate supreme. They are either superior to or identical with God. Which of these is meant will be indicated by the scope of the quotations which precede and follow. At all events, if any room is still left for a personal God, who is sovereign in Nature and Providence, it will soon disappear before the quotations which follow. He insists that all philosophy, physical and metaphysical, "is generalization, and therefore implies universal order; and thus in these sublime conclusions, or in any inferences we make from them, that principle must hold an equally prominent place. If we indulge in any speculations on the Divine perfections, we must admit an element of immutable order as one of the chief. The firm conception of the immutability of order is the first rudiment in all scientific foundation for cosmo-theology. . . . The difficulty which presents itself to many minds, how to reconcile the idea of *unalterable law* with *volition*, (which seems to imply some-

thing changeable,) can only be answered by appealing to those immutable laws as the sole evidence and exponent we have of supreme volition; a volition of immutable mind, an empire of fixed intelligence." *Order of Nature*, pp. 245—247. All this is ostensibly directed to prove the *a priori* impossibility of miracles. But if good for this purpose, it is good for a great deal more. It will prove all supernatural divine interposition impossible;* and not only this, but all supremacy of any sort on the part of God over nature, such as is implied in creation and providence, is thus ruled out. All which, as we shall soon see, the author too well understands. He adopts Hume's theory of cause and effect, which resolves them into mere uniformity of antecedence and sequence, (*ib.* p. 140,) and describes it as "involving the rejection of the idea of efficient power, as among the last lingering remains of the old mysticism." *ib.* p. 228. He further says: "From what has been before observed, it is readily seen how little satisfactory the simple and positive view of causation must be to the imaginative and mysticising tendency of the human mind, which is ever seeking some conception of efficient power, instead of a necessary connection in reason and generalization *only*."

"It is to this tendency that we may trace the lingering disposition to dwell on the old antithesis of 'first cause' and 'second causes.'" *ib.* pp. 233, 234.

We just pause to ask how it is that the human mind is ever "seeking some conception of efficient power," unless it be pre-conformed to this idea; and if so, then is it either not pre-conformed, even in its normal workings, to spend itself on delusions and unrealities, or does not the idea of efficient causation represent an eternal and necessary truth—the occurrence of events and changes being once granted? Does not his theory exhibit the human mind as a fallacious and unreliable organ of knowledge? Does not night as well as the sunrising always precede day? Why, then, do mankind univer-

* "From the very conditions of the case, it is evident that the *supernatural* can never be a matter of *science* or *knowledge*." *Order of Nature*, p. 232. The italics are the author's. "The supernatural is the offspring of ignorance, and the parent of superstition and idolatry; the natural is the assurance of science, and the preliminary to all rational views of Theism." *Id.* p. 248.

sally and intuitively pronounce the former, not the latter to be the cause of day, unless efficiency is of the very essence of causality, in the primary and universal intuitions of the human mind? Of course, if there is no first cause, as distinguished from second causes, or no cause efficient to produce what before was not, creation becomes an impossibility. God, man and nature are either identified, or, what is very much the same, we are turned over to an atheistic hylozoism, with Matter for our only God.

In perfect symphony with all this, he tells us (*ib.* p. 222) "the radical fallacy lies in the assumed idea of *sudden formation* out of nothing," and (*ib.* p. 229) denies "the alleged sudden supernatural origination of new species of organized beings in remote geological epochs." In still more portentous terms, the conception of creation is pronounced a contradiction. He says:

"Even without referring to that metaphysical *conception*—or, more properly, metaphysical *contradiction*—to imagine anything which can be strictly called a *beginning*, or first formation, or endowment of matter with new attributes, or in whatever form of expression we may choose to convey such an idea, —is altogether beyond the domain of science, as it is an idea beyond the province of human intelligence." *Ib.* p. 251. "Both the idea of self-existence and that of creation out of nothing are equally and hopelessly beyond the possible grasp of the human faculties. How, then, can we pretend to reason, or infer anything respecting them?" *Ib.* p. 255.

How is it possible more fully and explicitly to deny the possibility of any Supreme Creator, Upholder and Disposer of all things? It is to no purpose that he afterwards tells us on page 257,

"The idea of creation is wholly one of *revelation*, accepted by *faith*; and if guided by Christianity, the assertion of it will rest in the *general* expression, and will never degenerate into an admixture with the obsolete cosmogonies of olden dispensations."

No doubt creation must be here used as a very "general expression"—so general, indeed, that the true and proper idea of creation evaporates into thin air. Revelation and faith can compass mysteries; but contradictions are beyond their reach.

Such, we have seen, the very idea of creation is pronounced to be. Moreover, the fundamental principle of this author and his confederates, everywhere affirmed, is, that science controls our interpretation of revelation, but can never be overruled by it. Besides, if in the above passages the author means any real creation out of nothing, he subverts his whole doctrine with regard to the impossibility of Divine interpositions interrupting the order of nature. If creation out of nothing is possible, much more are miracles, which simply control, modify, or destroy what is so created. This would annihilate the pet theory of this writer and his Broad Church friends, viz. the impossibility of miracles, and of attesting any Divine revelation by such evidence. He tells us elsewhere (p. 249) that these views of naturalism are not "meant as a negation of higher truths; but only that they are of another order." But observe, whatever "higher truths" may be ascertained from other sources, they must be such as do not contradict the principles claimed to be ascertained from physical philosophy, which have been already brought to view. This is implied, or expressly asserted, in all the reasonings of this school, and preëminently in their exegesis of Scripture. Says Powell, of revelation, (*ib.* p. 278,) "*it can involve nothing which can come into contact or collision with the truths of physical science, or inductive uniformity; though wholly extraneous to the world of positive knowledge, it can imply nothing at variance with any part of it, and this can involve us in no difficulties on physical grounds.*" The italics are the author's. If we turn, however, from the volume on the "Order of Nature," to the tract on the "Evidences of Christianity," which forms one of the "Essays and Reviews," we shall find all this indubitably affirmed, along with assertions of the development theory and spontaneous generation, which he puts forth in both treatises in furtherance of the same cause. In this article he says, "the first dissociation of the physical from the spiritual was rendered necessary by the palpable contradictions disclosed by astronomical discovery with the letter of Scripture. Another still wider and more material step has been effected by the discoveries of geology. More recently, the antiquity of the human race and the development

of species, and the rejection of the idea of 'creation,' have caused new advances in the same direction." P. 145. Again:

"It has been the unanswered and unanswerable argument of another reasoner, that new species *must* have originated *either* out of their inorganic elements, or out of previously organized forms; *either* development or spontaneous generation *must be* true; while a work has now appeared, by a naturalist of the most acknowledged authority, which now substantiates on undeniable grounds the very principle so long denounced by the first naturalists—*the origination of new species by natural causes*; a work which must soon bring about an entire revolution of opinion in favour of the grand principle of the self-evolving powers of nature." Pp. 156, 157. Mr. Jowett not obscurely intimates the same thing, in passages which we may yet have occasion to cite. Pp. 384, 463. Thus, while the idea of creation is rejected, we have substituted in its place development, spontaneous generation, the origination of new species by natural causes, the "self-evolving powers of nature"!

It can hardly be necessary to exhibit with further explicitness and detail of proof the doctrine of this party in regard to the Trinity. As we have already seen, the Triad of Dr. Williams is, "being, becoming, animating," or "substance, thinking and conscious life." These writers do not give us any very definite formula on the subject. Their theistic hypothesis renders it superfluous. They, however, display their animus in occasional flings, such as the following from Prof. Jowett:

"How can the Nicene or Athanasian creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture?" P. 389. "The decision of the Council of Nicæa has been described by an eminent English prelate as 'the greatest misfortune that ever befell the Christian world.' That is, perhaps, true; yet a different decision would have been a greater misfortune." P. 465. The personality of the Holy Spirit is brought into question (pp. 394—6) where, referring to John xiv. 26, xvi. 15, Mr. Jowett says, "What is spoken in a figure is construed with the severity of a logical statement, while passages of an opposite tenor are overlooked or set aside."

The Christology of this school is in keeping with its radical character. Dr. Williams tells us the "ideal of the Divine

Thought was fulfilled in the Son of Man." P. 79. What this means may be learned from the Hegelian views already cited from him. He tells us, "The kingdom of God is no more Romish sacerdotalism than Jewish royalty; but the realization of the Divine Will in our thoughts and lives. This expression of spirit in deed and form, is generically akin to creation, and illustrates the incarnation; for, though the true substance of the Deity took body in the Son of Man, they who know the Divine Substance to be Spirit will conceive of such an embodiment of the Eternal Mind very differently from those who abstract all Divine attributes,—such as consciousness, forethought and love, and then imagine a material *residuum*, on which they confer the holiest name. The Divine attributes are consubstantial with the Divine Essence. He who abides in love abides in God, and God in him. Thus the Incarnation becomes with our author (Bunsen) as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul. The son of David by birth is the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness. What is flesh is born of the flesh; what is Spirit is born of the Spirit." Pp. 91, 92.

Notwithstanding the somewhat transcendental mysticism and obscurity of this language, we think it very evident that he has misstated and caricatured the true doctrine of the Incarnation, in order to set it aside, as amounting to a mere "material residuum without Divine attributes;" while he sets up in its place an Incarnation consisting in the realization of the Divine Will in our hearts and lives. In other words, God is incarnate in all who have his Spirit, or who abide in him by abiding in love. The Son of David was preëminently or representatively "the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness." But whoever is born of the Spirit is spirit—that is, divinity in the same essential sense. For holiness and love are Divine attributes; and these are declared "consubstantial with the Divine essence." Whoever has them, has then the Divine essence—God incarnated in him. It is only this Hegelian key that gives us any clue to the exegesis of the foregoing passage. The same writer scouts the meritorious and vicarious character of Christ's death and sufferings in the following terms: "Salvation from evil through sharing the Saviour's Spirit was shifted into a notion of purchase from God through the price of his bodily pangs. The

deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual." P. 97. Again, "why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer?" P. 90. If all efficacy is thus denied to Christ's death, and the very idea of sacrifice discarded, his life is pronounced by Jowett "the centre of Christian teaching," (p. 475,) while Dr. Temple says, "This (Christ's) life we emphatically call the Gospel." P. 29. Prof. Powell thus naïvely disposes of our Saviour's resurrection: "Not in its physical letter, but its doctrinal spirit; not as a physiological phenomenon, but as the corner-stone of Christian faith and hope, the type of spiritual life here, and the assurance of eternal life hereafter." *Order of Nature*, pp. 458, 459. It is well to magnify the spiritual significance of Christ's resurrection. But this cannot be done, unless in inverse proportion, by underrating the "physical phenomenon" which was so far implicated, and, in a high sense, identical with it, that it is signalized as of the highest moment in the representations of Scripture, the symbols of the church, and the experience of the believer.

We shall give attention to what further of these essays relative to soterology requires attention, after noticing their anthropology. Meanwhile we will bring to view their principles relative to the authority and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. These must have been in some measure foreshadowed to our readers in what has already been set before them. It has been already shown that they deny the reality, and even possibility, of miracles, and their utility as attestations of Divine revelation. Of course, the miracles of Scripture, together with the constant appeals made to them by Christ and the sacred writers, as attestations of their message, must be explained away. They were either myths, or hallucinations, or exaggerations, or otherwise erroneous representations; and, so far as true, are explicable by some law of nature, either known already, or yet to be discovered. But any hypothesis which explains away the reality or the utility of the miracles of Scripture, equally discredits those portions of the Bible which assert them—this at least, if nothing more. We have no time, nor is it necessary

here to evince the extent and emphasis of the scriptural teachings on this subject.*

We proceed, then, to show their doctrine concerning the inspiration and authority of the sacred oracles. Says Dr. Williams :

“If such a Spirit did not dwell in the church, the Bible would not be inspired ; for the Bible is, before all things, the written voice of the congregation. Bold as such a theory of inspiration may sound, it was the earliest creed of the church, and it is the only one to which the facts of Scripture answer. The sacred writers were men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which dwelt in them. Hence, when we find our Prayer-book constructed on the idea of the church being an inspired society, instead of objecting that every one of us is fallible, we should define inspiration consistently with the facts of Scripture and of human nature. These would neither exclude the idea of fallibility among Israelites of old, nor teach us to quench the Spirit in true hearts for ever. But if any one prefers thinking the sacred writers passionless machines, and calling Luther and Milton ‘uninspired,’ let him coöperate in researches by which his theory, if true, will be triumphantly confirmed.” Pp. 87, 88.

According to this, the inspiration which guided the writers of Scripture, was the same in kind, and in the absence of infallibility and Divine authority, with that illumination which actuates all Christians of every age. In a like tone, Prof. Jowett tells us, “there is a view of inspiration which regards the apostles and evangelists as equally inspired in their writings and in their lives, and in both receiving the guidance of the Spirit of truth in a manner not different in kind, but only in degree, from ordinary Christians. . . . Nor for any of the higher supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the evangelists or apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of preaching or teaching, which they daily exercised ; nor do they

* Those who are desirous to inquire more fully into this matter, will find a clear and succinct collation of the teachings of Scripture in reference to the convictive force of miracles, in the first article of our July number for 1860.

anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity." Pp. 379, 380.

Such principles are put forth in all forms of implication, assertion, and elaborate argument, throughout the several articles of this volume. The article on the Mosaic "Cosmogony," by Mr. Goodwin, is, of course, devoted to proving that the account of creation, in Genesis, is false, and that all attempts to reconcile it with the discoveries of geological science are inconsistent with each other, with the sacred record, and with scientific fact: hence that it subverts the inspiration and Divine authority of the Bible. The main drift of the article on the "Education of the World," by Dr. Temple, Dr. Arnold's successor at Rugby, is to show that humanity, collective and individual, has three successive stages in its education: 1. by formal precept; 2. by example; 3. by the development and exercise of self-reliant reason. Analogous to this, he tells us, has been the Divine method of educating the race: 1. in the minute precepts of the Jewish ritual; 2. in the example of Jesus Christ; 3. in the subsequent development and reign of reason as the source of doctrine and guide of life. To say nothing on the question whether precept or example first make their power felt in the training of individuals; of the assertions that the "Pharisaic teaching contained elements of a more spiritual religion than the original Mosaic system," (p. 11); that "the Hebrews may be said to have disciplined the human conscience; Rome, the human will; Greece, the reason and taste; Asia, the spiritual imagination," (p. 22);—or of other analogous statements, which rank heathen or natural agencies as coördinate and concurrent with Christianity in the advancement of our race—it is enough that this article, ingenious, scholarly, and beautiful as it is, has for its main object the exaltation of reason to an authority paramount to that of revelation. As our quotations have already shown, the articles of Drs. Williams, Powell, and Jowett, are, *ex professo*, devoted to this object. The same view is patent enough in the remaining two, as will sufficiently appear in the citations which have been, or will be made. Thus, Mr. Pattison says,

"The word of God is contained in Scripture, whence it does not follow that it is co-extensive with it. . . Under the terms

of the sixth Article, one may accept literally or allegorically, or as parable or poetry or legend, the story of a serpent-tempter, of an ass speaking with a man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, of a reversal of its motion, of waters standing in a solid heap, of witches and a variety of apparitions. So, under the terms of the sixth Article, every one is free in judgment as to the primeval institution of the Sabbath, the universality of the Deluge, the confusion of tongues, the corporeal taking up of Elijah into heaven, the nature of angels, the reality of demoniacal possession, the personality of Satan, and the miraculous particulars of many events. So the dates and authorship of the several books are not determined by any authority, nor their relative value and importance."

"Many evils have flowed to the people of England, otherwise free enough, from an extreme and too exclusive Scripturalism. . . . A Protestant tradition seems to have prevailed, unsanctioned by any of our formularies, that the words of Scripture are imbued by a supernatural property. . . . But those who are able to do so ought to lead the less educated to distinguish between the dark patches of human passion and error, which form a partial crust upon it, and the bright centre of spiritual truth within." Pp. 198, 199.

While this needs no comment, Professor Jowett uses the following language: "We can no longer speak of three independent witnesses of the gospel narrative. Hence there follow some other consequences. (1.) There is no longer the same necessity as heretofore to reconcile inconsistent narratives; the harmony of the Gospels only means the parallelism of similar words," &c. P. 408. "It will be hard to demonstrate from the Scriptures any complex system of doctrine and practice." P. 404. To the same effect, says Dr. Wilson, p. 181, "Our Lord's discourses have almost all of them a direct moral bearing. This character of his words is certainly more obvious in the three first gospels than in the fourth; and the remarkable unison of these gospels when they recite the Lord's words, notwithstanding their discrepancies in some matters of fact, compels us to think that they embody more exact traditions of what he actually said than the fourth does."

"Calvinists and Arminians—those who maintain and those

who deny the final restoration of man—may equally find texts which seem to favour their respective tenets." P. 471.

Says Dr. Williams: "Thus considerations, religious and moral, no less than scientific and critical, have, where discussion was free, widened the idea of revelations for the old world, and deepened it for ourselves; not removing the footsteps of the Eternal from Palestine, but tracing them on other shores, and not making the saints of old, orphans, but ourselves partakers of their sonship. Conscience would not lose by exchanging that repressive idea of revelation, which is put over against it as an adversary, for one to which the echo of its best instincts should be a witness. The moral constituents of our nature, so often contrasted with revelation, should rather be considered parts of its instrumentality." P. 58. The same author, in all consistency, refuses to "confine revelation to the first half-century of the Christian era," and affirms, "at least, affinities of our faith existing in men's mind anterior to Christianity." P. 92. Of course, revelation and Christianity are only the voice or echo of natural conscience. Professor Powell utters the same principle more articulately. "The philosophy of the age does not discredit the inspirations of prophets and apostles, though it may sometimes believe it in poets, legislators, philosophers and others gifted with high genius." Pp. 157, 158. If this is not rank infidelity, where can it be found? He tells us of the "perversions which make the cursing Psalms evangelically inspired." P. 71. "As imperfect men have been used as the agents for teaching mankind, is it not to be expected that their teachings should be partial, and to some extent erroneous?" *Goodwin*, p. 275. Says Professor Jowett: "No one can form any notion, from what we see around us, of the power which Christianity might have, if it were at one with the conscience of man, and not at variance with his intellectual convictions." P. 414.

"Why he (Bunsen) should add to his moral and metaphysical basis of prophecy a notion of foresight by vision of particulars, or a kind of *clairvoyance*, though he admits it to be a natural gift, consistent with fallibility, is not so easy to explain. One would wish he might have intended only the power of seeing the ideal in the actual, or of tracing the Divine government

in the movements of men. He seems to mean more than presentiment or sagacity; and this element in his system requires proof." P. 79. This, with other like passages, of course makes an end of all real prophecy. Of course the same destructive process is employed to overthrow the Messianic prophecies. Accordingly, Dr. Williams tells us of arguments for applying Isa. lii. and liii. to Jeremiah. "A little reflection will show how the historical representation in Isa. liii. is of some suffering prophet or remnant, yet the truth and patience, the grief and triumph, have their highest fulfilment in Him who said, 'Father, not my will, but thine.' But we must not distort the prophets to prove the Divine Word incarnate, and then, from the incarnation, reason back to the sense of prophecy." Pp. 82, 83.

"Loudly as justice and humanity exclaim against such traditional distortion of prophecy as makes their own sacred writings a ground of cruel prejudice against the Hebrew people, and the fidelity of this remarkable race to the oracles of their fathers a handle for social obloquy, the cause of Christianity would be the greatest gainer, if we laid aside weapons the use of which brings shame. Israel would be acknowledged as in some sense still a Messiah." Pp. 82, 83.

It is difficult to imagine a more thoroughly destructive rationalism, than is evinced in the foregoing passages which might be multiplied to any extent from these writers. If the system is to be accepted, the Bible is no more the word of God than the Koran or the "Critique of Pure Reason." Its authority as an objective standard of faith, and the infallible word of God, is absolutely annulled.

The anthropology of this school has already gleamed out through its theology, Christology, and doctrine of inspiration. We have already seen that, as to the origin of our race, they regard the account in Genesis as a myth, "half ideal, half traditional notices of the beginnings of our race," (p. 64); they teach the origination of the race by development, not by creation; that its antiquity vastly exceeds the Scriptural representation; that it "may one day be known, that mankind spread, not from one, but from many centres, over the globe," and hence descended from several distinct pairs. This, of course,

subverts the scriptural doctrine of the Fall, Original Sin, and Redemption. The idea of a "curse inherited by infants" is scouted. That view of the fall of Adam, which makes it represent "ideally the circumscription of our spirits in limits of flesh and time, and practically the selfish nature with which we fall from the likeness of God, which should be fulfilled in man," is referred to with seeming approbation. P. 98. In regard to the state of the heathen, their future destiny is to be inferred, we are taught, rather "from reflections suggested by our own moral instincts than from the express declarations of Scripture writers, who had no such knowledge as is given to ourselves of the amplitude of the world which is the scene of the Divine manifestations." It is abundantly insisted by these writers, that, whatever the Scriptures may say, the Christless heathen shall be saved. Pp. 173—177.

The soterology of this school has already been so distinctly and fully stated or implied, under other topics, that it scarcely requires to be further signalized. There can be no doctrine of salvation if there be no fall, apostasy or ruin to be saved from. We have already seen that propitiation and justification are scouted. It is the office of the Gospel, they tell us, to "do more perfectly that which the heathen religions were doing imperfectly." P. 189. It is constantly asserted, as has appeared in some of our citations already made, that morality is the great moment of our Saviour's teachings and requirements, and that it is so set forth by him as wholly to overshadow doctrine and faith. It can hardly be necessary to multiply quotations like the following. "Our Lord's discourses have almost all of them a direct moral bearing. . . . These words of our Lord, taken in conjunction with the Epistle of St. James, and with the first, or genuine Epistle of St. Peter, leave no reasonable doubt of the general character of his teachings having been what, for want of a better word, we must perhaps call 'moral.'" P. 181. "Moreover, to our great comfort, there have been preserved to us words of our Lord Jesus himself, declaring that the conditions of men in another world will be determined by their moral characters in this, and not by their hereditary or traditional creeds—i. e., in accordance with the whole system, by any creed or faith in Christianity." Pp. 176, 177. "The Cal-

vinist, in fact, ignores almost the whole of the sacred volume, for the sake of a few verses." P. 403. "If our philosopher had persuaded us of the moral nature of justification, he would not shrink from adding that regeneration is a correspondent giving of insight, or an awakening of forces in the soul. By resurrection he would mean a spiritual quickening. Salvation would be our deliverance, not from the life-giving God, but from evil and darkness, which are his finite opposites (*ὁ ἀντικείμενος*.) Propitiation would be the recovery of that peace which cannot be, while sin divides us from the Searcher of hearts. The eternal is what belongs to God, as spirit; therefore the negation of things finite and unspiritual, whether world, or letter, or rite of blood." P. 91. It is easy to see that this language resolves regeneration, justification, and the resurrection into a mere moral quickening. Not merely so: it seems to identify the finite with evil and darkness, as opposites of God; to imply that there is no wrath and curse of God from which we need salvation; but that salvation consists in deliverance from God's "finite opposites," i. e., we judge, in re-absorption into the Divine substance. The finite is apparently represented as "unspiritual," and the opposite of the eternal. Eternal salvation of men then, is—what? What else can it be than the resumption of man into that absolute and eternal One of whom he is, on this theory, an emanation? And what is this but pantheistic philosophy, theology and soterology? The writer last quoted proceeds to say, "The hateful fires of the vale of Hinnom (Gehenna) are hardly in the strict letter imitated by him who has pronounced them cursed, but may serve as images of distracted remorse." This intimates what is elsewhere more explicitly given out—that future punishment is either a chimera or purgatorial, terminating in universal restoration. Says Dr. Wilson, "The wise heathens could anticipate a reunion with the great and good of all ages. . . . The Roman church has imagined a *limbus infantium*. We must rather entertain a hope that there shall be found, after the great adjudication, receptacles suitable for those who shall be infants, not as to years of terrestrial life, but as to spiritual development; nurseries, as it were, and seed-grounds, where the undeveloped may grow up under new conditions, the stunted may become strong,

and the perverted be restored. And when the Christian church, in all its branches, shall have fulfilled its sublunary office, and its Founder shall have surrendered his kingdom to the Great Father, all; both small and great, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent, to repose, or to be quickened into a higher life, in the ages to come, according to his will." Pp. 231, 232.

We close this branch of our subject with a single quotation from Prof. Jowett, in which he sets forth his view of what missionaries ought to teach the heathen. In the following terms he indicates his opposition to giving them the Bible, while he would offer them in its place what he calls the "essence of religion;" i. e., of course, the wretched system of negations and inanities which we have educed from the works under review, and which differ in no appreciable degree from sheer infidelity: "It is not the Book of Scripture which we should seek to give them, to be revered like the Vedás or the Koran, and consecrated in its words and letters; but the truth of the Book—the mind of Christ and his apostles, in which all lesser details and differences should be lost and absorbed. We want to awaken in them the sense that God is their Father, and they his children; that is of more importance than any theory about the inspiration of the Scripture. But, to teach in this spirit, the missionary should himself be able to separate the accidents from the essence of religion; he should be conscious that the power of the gospel resides, not in the particulars of theology, but in the Christian life." P. 473.

It is safe to say, that as such a religion is not worth propagating among the heathen, so it never did and never can awaken zeal enough among its adherents, to induce any large and enduring self-sacrifice for the sake of thus propagating it. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." "The essence of religion" we are commissioned to teach, "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Our commission is to "preach the word." "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*: and lo, I

am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

It only remains that we briefly exhibit the ecclesiology of this school, which is not obscurely implied in its assumed title of Broad Church. And, 1. as a logical sequence from what has already been shown, they reject from the foundation of the church, every doctrinal basis, all fundamental articles of Christian truth. "A national church must be concerned with the ethical development of its members; and the wrong of supposing it otherwise, is participated in by those of the clericalty who consider the church of Christ to be founded, as a society, on the possession of an abstractedly true and supernaturally communicated speculation concerning God, rather than upon the manifestation of a Divine life in man." P. 219. Hence, 2. formularies ought to "embody only an ethical result." P. 223. 3. Subscription to articles of faith pertains to "a subject which a promise is incapable of reaching." P. 212. Hence churches are multitudinist and national. "The acknowledgment of churches as political and national institutions is the basis of a sound government of them." P. 477. The nationality of churches is lawful and scriptural, because, first, the qualifications for membership are ethical; and secondly, "if any called a brother were a notoriously immoral person, . . . the rest were enjoined, no, not to eat with him; but he was not to be refused the name of a brother or Christian, (1 Cor. v. 11.)" P. 185. 4. Hence, while the church ought to be national, it need not be Christian. "A national church need not, historically speaking, be Christian; nor, if it be Christian, need it be tied down to particular forms which have been prevalent at certain times in Christendom. That which is essential to a national church, is that it should undertake to assist the spiritual progress of the nation and of the individuals of which it is composed, in their several states and stages." Pp. 194, 195. Hence, 5. the broadest latitudinarianism is to be allowed. "The freedom of opinion which belongs to the English citizen should be conceded to the English churchman; and the freedom which is already practically enjoyed by members of the congregation, cannot without injustice be denied to its ministers." P. 202.

But enough. We have aimed to show what this scheme is, rather than to offer a formal refutation of it, which is unnecessary for our readers, and would unduly prolong this article. We think, if we have not proved the Broad Church principles tantamount to the grossest liberalism, and to substantial infidelity, then no proof can establish any matter of fact. This scheme seems to us a reproduction of the polite Deism of the last century, sublimated by an infusion of the later pantheistic, transcendental theology of the continent, and decked or disguised by some scriptural references and technical Christian terms and phrases. Religion, Christianity, must perish, so far as such principles prevail. All Christendom will look with intense anxiety to the reception which this system meets in the English church and nation. Should it meet the welcome given to the Tractarian principles, the effects will be deplorable. The fruits which will grow from such a root must be the apples of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrha. They will blast the land with the "abomination of desolation." We earnestly hope for a vigorous and decisive reaction against these principles; that the English church will resound with protests against these invaders of her precincts; and that the Spirit of the Lord will raise up a standard against them which will prevent such sentiments from going beyond the closets of speculatists to penetrate and poison the heart of the people. The Tractarian system awakened a distorted and morbid faith; it induced a revived but perverted religious zeal. This undermines all Christianity; all true faith; and gives us nothing in its place. It destroys, but does not build up—it leaves us only dead negations and hopeless vacuity. We will close with a quotation or two from admirers of these writers and their principles, which go to confirm the truth of our interpretations, and of our estimate of the extreme liberalism and destructiveness of their opinions. The following language of the *Christian Examiner*, (Unitarian,) in regard to these writers is incontestable: "In general they advance views like those which have for half a century been maintained in our own journal, while on some important points they far exceed in 'destructiveness' any opinions that are identified with Unitarianism."

Says the *Monthly Religious Magazine*, as quoted by the

publishers on the fly-leaf, a journal of apparently similar spirit, after a warm laudation of these writers: "Their doctrine is, that the race is a collective man, to outgrow, in time, the regulative discipline of childhood, and be moved by the Spirit within, and not subject to authority without; that the Bible is not a book of plenary inspiration, or Christianity a universal religion, specially authenticated in Palestine; but that God inspires men ever and everywhere; that there is only one kind of inspiration, and all good men have it, as well as prophets and apostles; and that the doctrines of the church, such as the Trinity and the Fall of man, are to be held in the light of a 'philosophical rendering.'"

ART. IV.—*The Fulfilment of Prophecy.*

THE predictions uttered by the prophets were real disclosures of future events, and must therefore of necessity always be accomplished. Luke xxiv. 44. The denial of this rests upon a radical misconception of the nature of prophecy. If it were of merely human origin, no fulfilment in any proper sense could be expected. Even if there should be a fortuitous correspondence with the future, this would not be the necessary completing of the word which was spoken. Prophecy, however, came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Pet. i. 21. It proceeded from Him to whom the future, equally with the past and the present, is naked and opened, and whose word cannot return unto him void. Isa. lv. 11. This removes it entirely out of the region of vague anticipations, the forebodings of hope or fear, shrewd conjectures, calculations from existing causes, fictions by which actual history was clothed in a prophetic dress, or frauds giving that out as prediction which was written after the event. It is evident, too, that there is no antecedent necessity limiting the range of a prophet's vision. It need not be confined to what has been called his own politi-