

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 16.—October, 1883.

I.

MILTON AND TENNYSON.

“ Blessings be with them and immortal praise,
Who gave us noble lives and nobler cares,
The Poets, who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays.”—WORDSWORTH.

TWO rivers, rising in the same lofty region and fed by kindred springs, are guided by the mountain-slopes of their environment into channels which, though not far apart, are widely different. The one, deeper and stronger from its birth, after a swift and lovely course through fair uplands of peace, is shattered suddenly by the turmoil of a fierce conflict, lifting but one foam-crested wave of warning, is plunged into the secret and tumultuous warfare of a deep cañon, emerging at length with wondrously augmented current, to flow majestically through a land of awful, thunder-riven cliffs, towering peaks, vast forests, and immeasurable plains,—a mighty land, a mighty stream. The other river, from a source less deep, but no less pure and clear, passing with the same gentle current through the same region of sweet seclusion, meets with no mighty obstacle, is torn by no wild cataract in its descent, but with ever-growing force and deepening, widening stream sweeps through a land less majestic, but more beautiful, not void of grandeur, but free from horror,—a land of shadowy vales and gardens; mysterious cities hung in air, and hills crowned with ruined castles,—a stream brimming and bright and large, whose smooth, strong flow often conceals its unsounded depth, and mirrors, not only the fleeting shores, but also the eternal stars, in its bosom.

Such is the figure in which I see the poetry of Milton and of Tennyson flowing through the literature and life of our English race.

for in words which do not appear in print he cautiously introduced his course by telling his audience that they were prepared with the wants of a class-room in view, and were not, and were not meant to be, popular at all.

F. L. PATTON.

THE ASSOCIATE CREED OF ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. By EDWARDS A. PARK. Boston: Franklin Press; Rand, Avery & Co. 1883. Published at the request of Drs. R. S. Storrs, Mark Hopkins, William M. Taylor, A. C. Thompson, and many other Congregational Ministers.

The recent controversy between the different parties existing among the friends of Andover Seminary, as far as it involves personal relations, or any criticism whatever as to theological belief or official integrity of any individual or of any party, lies beyond the province of this REVIEW. On the other hand, it is evident that the points so prominently raised in that controversy relating to the ethics of creed subscription in general, and to the special elements involved in the terms and the history of the Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary, are questions in which all men of our profession have a vital interest, and which we are all presumably competent to discuss.

This paper of the veteran professor, Edwards A. Park, is in the highest degree of public interest and value, and should have a wide circulation and intelligent study. Its interest is, in the *first place*, historical. His discussion necessarily involves a resumé of the remarkable history of the genesis of Andover Seminary and its Creed. Professor Park relates that the great motive which led to the foundation of this first of the permanent American Theological Seminaries, was the general alarm occasioned by the inroads of Unitarianism when, on May 14, 1805, Rev. Henry Ware, D.D., was inaugurated Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College. The new Seminary was grafted upon Phillips Academy, in the town of Andover, and intrusted to the government of the already existing Board of Trustees of that Academy. Of these Trustees a majority were, by their constitution, required to be laymen, while only one was required to be an educated man, or an orthodox believer, or even a professing Christian, or either a Congregationalist or Presbyterian in ecclesiastical connection. More than one of these Trustees had been an avowed Unitarian, and one continued to be so, long after this Board had accepted the trust of the Theological Seminary.

Eliphalet Pearson, LL.D., with the aid of Dr. Jedidiah Morse, draughted the Constitution and Statutes of the new Seminary. These men and their coadjutors were old Calvinists, and were severally followers of Watts, Doddridge, or of President Dwight. The Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism is especially made the standard of their doctrinal covenant in their original Statutes and Declaration of faith, and the Constitution of the Seminary states that the funds of the original Founders were given "*on the following express condition,*" that the "institution be *forever* conducted and governed by them (the trustees and their successors) in conformity to the following general principles and regulations."

In the meantime a circle of Hopkinsian Calvinists, Drs. Samuel Spring, Nathaniel Emmons, Leonard Woods, etc., had accumulated funds in 1806 to establish a Seminary at Franklin, or afterward at Newbury, Mass., to be consecrated to the war against Unitarianism, and specifically to the defence of what they called "*Consistent Calvinism.*" After a lengthened period of consultation and much concession on both sides, these two parties co-operated in the establishment of the historical Seminary at Andover. The original Calvinists of Andover desired to found their Seminary on a Theological basis equivalent to that assumed as the condition of ministerial communion in the Presbyterian Church, viz., the Westminster Confession and Catechism as containing *the system of*

doctrine taught in the Sacred Scriptures, or, as they phrased it, "for substance of doctrine." Under the circumstances of the case, their new Hopkinsian Associate Founders were unwilling to accept this basis. They were unwilling to subscribe the Westminster Standards as expressing their belief, both for substance and form, because that was not in truth the fact. They were also unwilling to leave the matter open by binding the Trustees and the Professors of their Seminary to the acceptance of their standards only for substance of doctrine; leaving that "substance" undefined. They therefore insisted upon the preparation of a definite Creed in which the "substance" of the Catechism, as *understood and admitted by them*, is explicitly stated and forever bound upon the officers of the Seminary. This is the ASSOCIATE CREED of Andover Theological Seminary which every Professor is required to read and subscribe before the Board of Trustees as the condition of his installation, and once every five years thereafter as long as he holds the office. This Creed does not contain all that the Hopkinsians believed, nor does it contain anything which they did not believe, and it expresses, on both sides, the very utmost that either party of the founders of the Seminary were willing to concede, and what they united in determining to demand as a condition forever of office-bearing in their institution. The Original Constitution of the Andover Calvinists, written by Dr. Pearson, with the aid of Dr. Morse, also remains in perpetual force, except in those instances in which the Additional or Associate Statutes have modified it.

Also because of the above-stated extraordinary Constitution of the Board of Trustees of Phillips Academy, who had now become the Trustees of the Theological Seminary, the Associate brethren in 1808 insisted that a Board of Visitors should be created, to preside over, and to a degree control, the actions of the Board of Trustees. This Board consists of three persons, two of whom must be Congregational ministers. They, like the Professors, must, upon induction and every five years thereafter, subscribe the Associate Creed, and declare it to express their own personal belief. "They are in our (original founders) place and stead, the *guardians, overseers, and protectors* of this our foundation in the manner as is expressed in the following provisions," in order "that the trust aforesaid may be always executed agreeably to the true intent of this our foundation; and that we may effectually guard the same in all future time against all perversion, or the smallest avoidance of our true design as herein expressed."

This Board of Visitors is held responsible for "determining, interpreting, and explaining the Statutes (including the Creed) of this foundation with respect both of professors and students, and in general to see that our true intentions, as expressed in these Statutes, be faithfully executed." They have also the power of vetoing the act of the Trustees appointing a professor, and of removing any professor for heterodoxy. "The Board of Visitors, in all their proceedings, are to be subject to our Statutes herein expressed, and to conform their measures thereto; and if they shall at any time act contrary to these, or exceed the limits of their jurisdiction and constitutional power, the party aggrieved may have recourse, by appeal, to the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court of this Commonwealth for the time being for remedy, who are hereby appointed and authorized to judge in such case, and, agreeably to the determination of a major part of them, to declare null and void any decree or sentence of the said Visitors, which, upon mature consideration, they may deem contrary to said Statutes, or beyond the just limit of their power, herein prescribed; and by the said Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court for the time being, shall the said Board of Visitors at all times be subject to be restrained and corrected in the undue exercise of their office."

In the *second place*, this paper of the great Andover dialectician is a specimen

of thorough, masterly, and triumphant argument. Dr. Park's assertion is, that with respect to four great doctrines emphatically affirmed in the Andover Creed, viz., the entire trustworthiness of the religious and moral teachings of the Bible; that all the moral actions of men previous to conversion are sinful; the objective reference of the atonement, or its effect upon God as a pre-condition of pardon; that probation is confined to the present life; that these, one or all, are perverted or denied by certain parties who, as Trustees or Professors, are now administering the Andover trust. Of this assertion he offers no direct proof in this paper, and of course we have no adequate information, and therefore no definite opinion, and no proper occasion to proclaim it, even if we entertained it. But the real motive of this able paper, and its great contention, which we believe the author establishes with absolutely unanswerable conclusiveness, is (1) that the intention of the founders of Andover Seminary was to bind its Trustees and Visitors forever to the selection of such professors as would believe and teach, and to bind the professors so selected to believe and teach, the very doctrines in substance and form as they (the founders) believed them, and intended to express them in their Creed; and further, that these Founders made this conformity in doctrinal faith and teaching the condition of the gift and of the continued enjoyment of their money. And (2) Dr. Park's contention is that this certain intention of the original Founders of Andover Seminary morally and legally binds the Visitors and Professors in succession through all time.

The first of these propositions Professor Park proves in every possible way from the known opinions and intentions of these Founders; from the history of their consultations and compromises; from the design and constitution of Phillips Academy, and the known opinions of its Founder; from the occasion, genesis, substance, and form of the Associate Creed itself. He shows that the very structure of the Creed requires each professor to declare its several propositions in succession as each a part of his personal faith—the phrase “I believe” being necessarily grammatically understood before each of the successive propositions. It is by them styled a “common and permanent Creed.” They say, “it is strictly and solemnly enjoined, and left in sacred charge, that every article of the above said Creed shall forever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, or any addition or diminution.” The Trustees did “cheerfully accept the same” (the endowment funds) “for the purposes and upon the terms and conditions expressed in the said instrument; and that we covenant and engage faithfully to execute the sacred trust reposed, agreeably to said Statutes” (which include the Creed, etc.) Besides saying, “I believe,” with reference to every proposition of the Creed in succession, every professor must promise to hold and teach the Christian faith “as expressed in the Creed by me now repeated.” The Statutes require that “every professor shall be a Congregational or Presbyterian minister; an orthodox and consistent Calvinist,” and that he shall “publicly make and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in Divine Revelation, and in the fundamental distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel *as expressed in the following Creed.*” The Visitors and the Professors are required to repeat their personal declaration of faith and subscription to the Creed every five years, with the same solemnity that is required at their installation. The Visitors, in their successions, to act “in the place and stead of” the original founders, thus perpetuating the personal providence of those founders over their institution, not with discretion, but specifically to “guard the same in all future time against all perversion, or *the smallest avoidance of our true design as herein expressed.*”

Professor Park argues the same from the early history of the Seminary, from the opinions of the first Professors, and from the discussions attending their

installations. He also states, discusses, and answers all the objections made to the fact or to the reasonableness of the proposition he has undertaken to prove. Upon the whole, he has made it as certain as possible that if any men in founding an institution, and in conditioning the enjoyment of their benefactions, are capable of expressing definite and immutable intention, then the Founders of Andover Seminary did intend, and did in clear language give force to their intention, that in all the matters covered by the propositions of the Associate Creed, all the Visitors, and all the Professors of their Seminary, fiduciaries and beneficiaries of their gifts, should believe and teach, and required the others to believe and teach in their successions, as the Founders in their day believed and defined in the words of their Creed. If this be not true, language is incompetent to express thought, and human covenants are impracticable.

The *second* point included in the Professor's contention is, that the certainly ascertained intention of the Founders morally and legally binds the Trustees, Visitors, and Professors forever. It is not a question of reasonableness, or desirableness, but simply of contract, the sacredness of which the Constitution of the United States recognizes as fundamental and essential to the welfare of human society. The Founders gave their money on the express condition that the Creed in their sense of it should be maintained without any change forever.

The Fiduciaries and the Beneficiaries must accept the trust on the same conditions. Justice William Strong, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in his Lectures before Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on "The Relations of the Civil Law to Church Polity, Discipline and Property," says that when the Will, or Deed of Gift, or Terms of Subscription of the original donors of the property, define and prescribe a specific doctrine, or particular ecclesiastical connection, the civil courts will protect and enforce the trust.

It is credibly reported that one of the most honored of the Professors now in the Andover Faculty said, at the meetings associated with the last Seminary anniversary, "that he had that day, as he had on a number of previous occasions, subscribed the Associate Creed deliberately and prayerfully as a religious act. But that he would allow no man to dictate to him his interpretation of that Creed." Literally this last sentence is a matter of course. No *man* should *dictate* to another in such a case. But if the implication is that the interpretation which a Professor or Visitor signing puts upon the Creed is the private business of the signer alone, it is a radical error. To every contract there must be two parties. The moral and legal principle upon which all test oaths or pledges is interpreted, is that of the *animus imponentis*. In the case of the subscription to the Westminster formularies of a candidate for the Presbyterian ministry as the condition of his ordination, the *animus imponentis* is the general mind of the Presbyterian Church expressed in its history, and in its contemporaneous higher courts. In the case of the Andover Professors, that *animus* is the intention of the Founders, expressed in their Statutes interpreted, as they have provided, first by the Visitors, and ultimately by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

As to the question of law, that Court will undoubtedly enforce the intention of the Founders in their own sense of their words. But as to the matter of fact, unless a Professor either refuses to sign, or point blank in words denies the propositions of the Creed, it is not probable that the Court will pretend to decide. No civil court, much less the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, will undertake the interpretation of the propositions of that Creed severally, nor the decision of metaphysical or of the theological consistencies or diversities.

The part of Professor Park's paper in which he appears to us unsuccessful, is that in which he undertakes to prove unfounded the charge that he has himself ever fallen below the strict and literal measure of fidelity to the Creed which he

now requires of others. He does very successfully show that the Andover Creed is Hopkinsian to a degree, and that it so far departs from Old Calvinism and the Westminster Catechism. He successfully shows that in respect to several of the peculiar and controverted points of his theological teaching he was clearly within the limits of the Creed. But at times his keenness is put to a severe test. The Professor has taught that God did not covenant with Adam as the representative of his descendants, and that consequently Adam's sin is not imputed to his descendants; and yet the Professor has every five years of his official life declared "I believe—that Adam, the federal head and representative of the human race, was placed in a state of probation." Thus it appears that God did not enter into a covenant of works with Adam in English, but he did in Latin, and that although Adam represented us, we were not represented in him. It is to be feared that this want of entire clearness in the explanation of a part of the history of the Seminary, will prevent this righteous and powerful argument from having all the influence otherwise due to it over its present and its future.

Nevertheless, the paper is a grand one. The reading of it is an education. It ought to be universally circulated and read. A. A. HODGE.

THE following deserve brief notice:

Present Day Tracts, on Subjects of Christian Evidence, Doctrine and Morals. By various writers. Vol. I., containing first six numbers, which may also be had separately. (The Religious Tract Society, London.) These tracts are for popular use rather than for scholars, nevertheless they are strictly scholarly and able, and upon subjects of the highest and freshest interest. The Tracts have all been published in the first instance separately. In that form they number at present 15. Six of these are collected in the present neat volume. They are on the following subjects: "Christianity and Miracles at the Present Day," "Christ the Central Evidence of Christianity," and "The Success of Christianity and Modern Explanations of it," by the Rev. Principal Cairns, D.D.; "The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead," and "The Existence and Character of God," by the Rev. Prebendary Row, M.A.; and "Christianity and the Life that Now Is," by the Rev. W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D.—*Studies of Creation and Life.* By Rev. F. Godet, D.D., Professor in the College, Neuchatel, Switzerland. American edition. (Boston: Congregational Society. 1882.) Professor Godet's "Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith" have already been noticed in this REVIEW, vol. iii., p. 427. The present selection from his Essays is the first that has been published in America, and is presented as an experiment. If well received by the public, the rest are promised by the same publishing society. The subjects are of the highest importance and their treatment learned, original, and essentially evangelical and spiritual. We trust the public will demand the entire series.—*Antitheism: Remarks on its Modern Spirit.* By Richard Hill Sandys, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law, author of "In the Beginning," etc., "They wist not what it was." Exodus xvi. 15. 12mo, pp. 224. (London: Pickering & Co. 1883.) This book is from an able and truly Christian layman, and is full of valuable thoughts. But the order is obscure, since there are no divisions indicative of the progress of thought, or of the transitions from one topic to another, in the entire book.—*Does Science Aid Faith in regard to Creation?* By Rt. Rev. Henry Cotterill, D.D., F.R.S.E.; *Are Miracles Credible?* By Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A.; *Life: Is It Worth Living?* By J. Marshall Lang, D.D. These are all treatises on the most important subjects of present interest, and in defence of the truth, by able and well-known writers. They are published by Hodder &