

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1869.

No. III.

ART. I.—*The Writings of St. John, with special reference to the Recent Assaults on the Gospel of St. John.* [Translated from the German of Dr. LANGE, with additions by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF.]

THE writings preserved by the Church under the name of John, with all their diversity, corresponding to the diversity of their literary species, have so many and so important peculiar traits, and have these traits, too, so much in common, that, with a better developed taste in regard to biblical style, we shall be no more able to ascribe them to different authors, than to attribute the different masterpieces of one great painter to different masters.

The peculiarities of the matter of these writings are: (1.) The depth and fulness of the christological idea of Christ and his kingdom (*the Word*); (2.) The spiritual concentration of the depth and fulness of the Messianic life in the personality of the Lord, making heaven and earth a symbolism of Christianity, of its struggles and its triumphs (*Love*); (3.) The universalism of Christianity, grounded in God, embracing and shining through the world (*Life*); (4.) The festive spirit of the assurance of victory, wherein Christ in his imperial power

Jesuit in many an article that I have read in the Protestant papers within the last thirty-eight years. Sir, you know what a Jesuit is, and therefore I need not describe him. But, sir, they dread the Presbyterian Church more than all others combined. One of their priests once said to me—"We *hate* the Methodists, but we *fear* you." Fear you! Now, sir, in order that you may give a blow to infidelity and Sabbath desecration, that you may give a check to Romanism, in God's name reunite these hosts, that you may do better in the name of King Jesus. Only let us guard, brethren, against one temptation. Just as sure as you live, if it promotes vanity, and ambition, and self-sufficiency, God will frown upon it. That is now about the greatest danger I apprehend. It is that if we consummate this union, we will feel proud and self-sufficient. Oh, that God would keep us from that spirit; that he would make us humble and help us to realize our absolute dependence upon him; and that he would give us the spirit of prayer after the union, as well as before it; that he would make it a blessing to the church and to the world! May God speed this happy work, and this year not close until this union is declared effected.

ART. VIII.—*The New Basis of Union.*

THE Senior Editor of this Review avails himself of the privilege, common to all his brethren, of stating, in a few words, his view of the present aspect of the re-union question.

1. The terms of union now proposed are greatly preferable to those heretofore submitted to the Presbyteries. So far as the basis of doctrine and polity is concerned, all we require of those belonging to our own church, is the adoption of our acknowledged standards. This is all we have the right to demand of others, whether individuals, Presbyteries, Synods, or larger bodies, proposing to unite with us.

2. The adoption of the standards without note or comment leaves the church perfectly untrammelled. It stands pre-

cisely as it has stood from the beginning. It is as free to exercise discipline for any departure from our system of doctrine and order, as it was from 1729 to the disruption in 1838; and from the disruption to the present time. The whole world, and of course our New School brethren, know what we mean by the words "system of doctrine;" and they know what we mean when we say that we cannot conscientiously consent to any doctrine being taught in the united church, which is inconsistent with that system. We do not, therefore, lower our standard; we do not renounce our principles in consenting to the proposed plan of union being submitted to the Presbyteries.

3. Nothing but the article thus submitted, viz., that the union shall be consummated on the basis of our common standards, is of any binding force, either legally or virtually; either morally or as a point of honor. If Congress pass a law which is of the nature of a contract, it binds its successors; because it is a principle of morals, and of the constitution, that a contract legally formed cannot be invalidated without consent of parties. But the resolutions, the opinions, the recommendations of one Congress, leave those which follow it, as free as if they had never been made.

4. As not only the General Assembly by an overwhelming vote, but a majority of the Presbyteries have expressed an opinion favorable to re-union on the basis of the simple standards, we think that all organized, formal opposition should cease. A majority has the right to govern. The question is submitted to the Presbyteries. Every one will have the opportunity to vote yes or no, as his conscience directs, and to give his reasons for his vote.

5. If two-thirds of the Presbyteries sanction the union on the terms proposed, every one should not only submit, but endeavor to carry it out in good faith; and do his best to render it successful.

6. The distinctive doctrines of Old School theology for which our church has so earnestly contended, are known in history as Pauline or Augustinian, although taught more clearly and solemnly by our Lord himself than by any of his prophets or apostles. Those doctrines lie at the foundation of the whole

system of redemption. They enter into all genuine Christian experience. They are essential to the purity and power of religion. They are believed by all Christians with the heart, even when rejected by the understanding, and denied with the lips. Every true believer is an Augustinian on his knees. When the Holy Spirit convinces a man of sin, he convinces him that he is lost, that he can no more save himself than he can raise the dead; that if delivered from the pollution and condemnation of sin, it must be by the supernatural and almighty power of God, exercised in the sovereignty of his love, and through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ as his substitute and surety, and by his prevalent intercession, without a shadow of merit or worthiness on his part. That such are the experience and inward convictions of every true Christian is proved by Scripture, by history, and by the common consciousness of the church.

7. It is of unspeakable importance that these doctrines should be upheld and inculcated by ministers of the Gospel and by all authorized teachers in the church. It is not enough that they have liberty thus to teach them. The salvation of men and the purity of the Gospel, in a great measure, depend on the official teachers of the church, being required to believe, profess, and inculcate those great truths. It is not enough that they should be included in the recognized standard of doctrine. Those doctrines are contained in the standards of the Church of England. But that church has ever been tolerant. It admits into its ministry the advocates of every form of doctrine from the Tridentine to the Rationalistic. The same is true of the established churches on the continent of Europe. It is true also in a great degree of the Episcopal Church in this country; no one of these churches stands out before the world as a witness for these doctrines. The effective influence of no one of them is given to their support.

8. The Presbyterian Church in this country, from its organization, has been the open and avowed advocate of these distinctive features of Augustinian theology. It has not only proclaimed them in its Confession of Faith, but insisted that they should be received and taught by all the ordained offi-

cers of the church. No church in Christendom is more tolerant and liberal as regards Christian communion. It receives as brethren and admits to its membership every sincere worshipper of our Lord Jesus Christ, however ignorant he may be. At the same time no church has been more strict in requiring its members to adopt and teach the system of doctrine which it professes. This is the historical character of our church, universally known and admitted. Fidelity to this strictness is of incalculably greater importance to the cause of Christ than any increase in numbers, wealth, or power.

9. The New School, also, as a church, has its historical character. It is tolerant or liberal. This is avowed. It is universally admitted. It tolerates forms of doctrine which the Old School have repeatedly and officially declared to be, in its judgment, inconsistent with the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession. This is an unquestioned fact. It is not said that the New School, as a church, sanction the doctrines which the Old School condemn; nor that the mass of their ministers are not orthodox. It is only said, what they avow, that they are tolerant. They license and ordain men whom the Old School could not conscientiously receive into the ministry.

10. What is to be the character of the united church? Is it to be strict, as the Old School has hitherto been, or tolerant, as the New School? The Old School, as a body, say it is to be strict. The New School, as a body, say it is to be tolerant.

Three-fourths of our Presbyteries have twice decided that they cannot consent to the union if they are bound legally or in honor to be as liberal in the interpretation of the standards as their New School brethren have hitherto been. And the latter have as clearly declared that they can consent to the union only on the condition that the united church is to be as tolerant as themselves.

11. Under these circumstances, what ought to be done? Many of our Old School brethren will vote for the union on the ground of the principle stated in the second paragraph of this short article. They say that, as the standards are unaltered; as no condition is attached to them; no rule of inter-

pretation is prescribed; they accept the union as leaving the church just where it was; just as free in enforcing conformity to its doctrines, as it has been from the beginning.

Others will vote for it, because they think the time has come to adopt a more tolerant principle. They admit that the Old School church dies with the union; and that a more tolerant church takes its place. They believe that this course is indicated by the providence of God, and that it is best not only for the outward prosperity of the church, but for the cause of religion and of sound doctrine itself.

Others of us will be constrained to vote against the union, not because blind to its advantages, not because insensible to the spirit of brotherly love and charity, by which the movement seems at present controlled, but because we regard the strictness in interpreting the standards for which the Old School have always contended to be the "ark of the covenant" committed to our trust, which we are bound to preserve, and on the preservation of which our safety and usefulness as a church ultimately depend; and because we consider that principle to be endangered by consenting to the union, when those with whom we unite, and the public generally (so far as we can judge), consider that we surrender our palladium.

It is exceedingly painful to stand aloof from such a movement. We were in the Philadelphia Convention, and felt the full power of the spirit by which that assembly was pervaded. And had we been in either of the Assemblies recently convened in New York, we doubt not our hearts would have melted with the rest. Neither popular opinion, however, nor popular feeling, is the rule either of faith or practice. While constrained thus to dissent from a majority of our brethren, for whom we cherish undiminished respect and confidence, we still hope for the best. We earnestly pray that, should the union be consummated, it may produce not only a great increase of efficiency, but also of the power of religion and zeal for the truth. If the truth be lost, all is lost. Our numbers, wealth, and influence will avail us nothing.