

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1874.

ART. I.—APOLLOS: OR THE WAY OF GOD.

BY PRESIDENT J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D. D. LL. D.

WE introduce our notice of Bishop Coxe's respectable work, lately put forth under the above title,* with the following characteristically Episcopalian passage in regard to it from the **CHURCHMAN**:—

“It sometimes, in the course of Divine Providence, turns out that works done out of mere self-will, serve as an occasion, in the exigency of affairs, of accomplishing much good. It also turns out that a work wrought by a devoted servant of God for the good of the Church, does, in the Divine ordering of things, meet a crisis in affairs with a surpassing adaptation for which its projector had not dared to hope. It may be well enough to note two such undesigned adaptations at the present time.

“The Evangelical Alliance met, did what was given it to do, and dispersed. A great number of godly and well-learned men, deeply impressed with the evils of the present schismatic state of Christendom, assembled in the fear of God, to devise a remedy. It would be unwise as a mere matter of prudence, if from no higher motive, to say witty or unkind things about these men. There is not so much goodness in the world as to warrant us in passing severe judgment upon a great and well-meant effort. The testimony of so large a number of men, however mistaken, who by their character would be an ornament to any age of

* **APOLLOS: OR THE WAY OF GOD.** A Plea for the Religion of Scripture. By A. Cleveland Coxe, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1873.

the Church, to the felt want of Christian union, is worth a great deal to mankind. No good Churchman could, for a moment, adopt the ideas of these men; but all can share their aspirations. Noble aspirations lift up people. A failure to realize them conveys no moral contamination, but marks an error of judgment. Such an error of judgment, we think events have already shown, was manifested by the prevailing opinion in the Alliance, that corporate union was neither possible nor desirable, but that a union in spirit and in aim was all that in any case ought to be attempted, and that this already existed to a satisfactory degree. This we believe to be not only an error, but a very mischievous, and, for the hope of the world, *deadly* error,—an error in reality not less deadly in its ultimate effects than the existence of the papacy itself. The Church has survived twelve hundred years of the papacy, but it could not survive twelve hundred years of the universal adoption of this error. We do not believe that this opinion fully gratifies the noble longings for Christian union which the members of the Alliance do themselves the honor of showing to the world that they entertain.

“It was necessary that something should occur to demonstrate to the world the baselessness of this idea of Christian union, and so to demonstrate it as to point with significant meaning to the true basis of Christian union, and this, too, so effectively, as to awaken general discussion of this basis. This want has been supplied; supplied in a dreadful way—in a way that can cause only sadness to any good Churchman. It **must** needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh. The apostacy of Dr. Cummins, like the falling of a star, has filled good men with amazement. It came so soon after the adjournment of the Alliance, and so confessedly as a result of it, as to beget the apprehension that judgment had begun upon this woful travesty of Christianity that could call schism by the name of union. The way is now open for a discussion of the real question that ought to have engaged the Alliance.

“The first want was supplied by a mere act of self-will. Nothing could have occurred so effectively to stir up discussion concerning the very ground of the Church’s Apostolic order. It has been the occasion of doing that which all Churchmen desired to be done,—that is to demonstrate the falsity of the ideas of Christian union entertained by the Alliance, and to open up discussion of that which the Christian world has, in all ages, held to be the one and sole external bond of organic union. Discussion having been turned to this subject, there is a felt want for a treatise on Christian union, written in these times, and for these times, by a Churchman of acknowledged genius, and of representative character. Such a treatise has been prepared. The Bishop of Western New York, in his parochial visitations, was painfully impressed with the desolating effects of sectarian divisions in his own diocese. He found hundreds of

little villages and country neighborhoods where numerous sects were represented, but none of them strong enough to sustain constant service; where the little strength that existed, would if combined, have been equal to the comfortable maintenance of religion. Grieved to the heart he felt moved to the preparation of a treatise upon the subject, conceived in a new spirit, and such as might under the blessing of God, arrest the attention of those who by their very divisions had cut themselves off from the ministrations of the Gospel. This book was originally published serially in *THE CHURCHMAN*. It awakened a good deal of interest at the time. Readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* for the last few years need not to be told that '*Apollos: or the Way of God*' is the treatise to which we refer. But they may, perhaps, need to be told that in its present form it has been largely rewritten and retouched throughout. It is the best book that the Bishop has yet written. It is wondrously effective. It is conceived and executed in an exaltation of spirit, that irradiates and glorifies the whole subject. Mistaken views never prompted so pure an enthusiasm. The exalted strain of its eloquence must captivate all readers."

There is an air of lordliness in all this which, if we understand at all the heart and mind of the Bishop of Western New York, he would hardly be willing to assume as his own. It is not in harmony at least with the professed animus of his book. The book breathes humility, Christian love and peace; the article from the *Churchman* is full of intolerant bitterness and bad humor.

We say nothing now of the temper shown toward Bishop Cummins. We notice only in brief the uncharitable judgment fulminated against the Evangelical Alliance; a judgment all the more offensive in purpose, as it is but in keeping with much spleen going before on the same subject, which might seem to have simply come to the height of its exacerbation here from the vinegar poured upon it by the "apostacy" of the quondam Bishop of Kentucky. "This came so soon after the adjournment of the Alliance," we are meekly informed, "and so confessedly as a result of it, as to beget the apprehension that judgment had begun upon this woful travesty of Christianity that could call schism by the name of union." The whole quarrel of the *Churchman* with the late Evangelical Alliance Conference proceeds on the assumption, that it came together to

declare in some way a final union of the several Protestant denominations, and yet did not at once go into the question of a general common organization by trying to settle the only true basis first of all on which the union should take place. Need we say that no such object was proposed in the calling of the Convention, and that nobody in the Convention was so insane as to speak or even dream of it as the end of its being brought together? One object of the meeting was indeed to *exhibit*, as it was said, the substantive oneness of the Evangelical Christian world, *notwithstanding* its present unhappy division into sects; and some possibly may have had the thought that this was all that the idea of Church unity required. But most assuredly no such thought as this was in the mind of the members of the Convention generally. They desired far more than this, and looked upon their fraternization as far as it went, as serving only to open the way toward such ulterior end, without being able to see or to say at all how that end should be brought to pass.

And are we to be told now that this was all wrong? Can there be in truth *no* concord of faith or life among Christians, outside of a common church organization, worth talking about, worth coming to the consciousness of, worth exhibiting and showing forth to the world, or worth making use of in the way of earnest thoughtful discussion for coming to a full solution, if possible, of the difficulties that still keep the Churches apart? So thought not the clear-minded and warm-hearted Dean of Canterbury, when he came over the Atlantic to proclaim the theme, *Unity consistent with Diversity*; not meaning thereby certainly to justify the divisions of Protestant Christendom as being absolutely right and good, but owning in them nevertheless the presence of a common actual life and power of Christianity, which all who love the kingdom of our Lord should be willing to join in helping onward to its own completion in the full ideal of the Church, wherever that may lie and however it is to be finally reached. Just here would seem to have been the true significance of the Alliance, that it was such a gathering of good men from all parts of the Protestant world, *not* to discuss a plan of union, and still less to stul-

tify themselves by declaring no farther union necessary or desirable—but to confess before the world and to one another the sad wrong of their divisions, and to do what in them might lie, through such testimony and confession and mutual brotherly provocation in love, to stir up in themselves and in others the full measure of zeal that is required to do away with the sectarian evil through earnest consultation and study of the things that make for unity and peace. The Convention may have been—no doubt was indeed—largely one-sided and defective in its constitution; and a fair proportion of crude and shallow talk may have found place in its proceedings, as how in such a body could it well have been otherwise; but for all that, the work with which it was employed was a great and noble one, and such as deserved to command, as it did while it was going forward, the respect and reverence of men generally.

But all this with the *Churchman* goes for nothing. The Convention had in it “a great number of godly and well learned men, deeply impressed with the evils of the present schismatic state of Christendom.” Their testimony too to the felt want of Christian union “is worth a great deal to mankind.” Their aspirations are entitled to regard; all *good* Episcopalians can share them, though not capable for a moment of having anything to do with any such movement as this, for getting toward the end thus breathed after in their souls. For in spite of all allowances in favor of the members of the Alliance, they labored under a grand hallucination, and their work has turned out a self-convicted failure. They met to organize unity (so the *Churchman* will have it persistently), and they did no such thing; did not even talk of it seriously, as a thing practicable there and then; and so they brought forth only wind. Worse still, there was an error in their machination, from the beginning, plain to all sound churchmanship, which in fact, though they knew it not, was “a very mischievous, and for the hope of the world *deadly* error—an error in reality not less deadly in its ultimate effects than the existence of the papacy itself.” It was in truth, for the *Churchman's* vision, of one sort seemingly with the profane attempt to build the tower of Babel; insomuch

that as that was visited with the divine judgment of the confusion of tongues, so the late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance is considered to have been convicted of like profanity by the close sequence of a like startling judgment—not lighting directly indeed on the Alliance itself, but so related to it nevertheless on the outside as to be very much the same thing. It was necessary that something should occur to show the baselessness of the whole idea of Christian union with which these builders of Babel were impiously amusing themselves; and it came “in a dreadful way,” namely, “the apostacy of Dr. Cummins,” which “like a falling star” (the apocalyptic *Wormwood* perhaps) “has filled good men with amazement.” This dire omen speaks for itself. “It came so soon after the adjournment of the Alliance, and so confessedly as a result of it, as to beget the apprehension that JUDGMENT had begun upon this woful travesty of Christianity that could call schism by the name of union.”

And what now is the ground of all this heavy indictment against the Evangelical Alliance? In what sense was it schismatic, in pretending to deplore schism, and in trying ostensibly to bring it to an end? The *Churchman* is at no loss for an answer. The first step toward Christian union for all Protestant denominations outside of the Episcopal Church, is that they should go into the question of a *jure divino* ministry, and settle this at once in favor of Episcopalianism, as it happens to exist under non-Catholic character here in America; which of itself must imply their immediate unqualified submission to the authority of the *Church* in that would be Catholic form. That is the one only method of unity in the case. The Episcopal Church is the one true Church all ready to start with in welding Lutherans, Presbyterians, Reformed, Methodists, Congregationalists, and others into one; and all that these bodies have to do is simply to throw themselves as repentant truants into her bosom. Then all will be well. They are now dissenters, schismatics, heretics and apostates. Then they will be in the ark. Then there will be one shepherd and one fold. Here the Evangelical Alliance should have set out in its work of Church union; and because it did not do this, its work was conceived

in sin and born in iniquity. So at least runs the oracular sentence heard from the tripod of the *Churchman*.

The serene self-complacency of all this is something to be astonished at, for any one who has looked seriously into the precarious character of the foundation, historical and theological, on which these lofty pretensions in the case of our American Episcopacy are found to rest; but we have no mind here to go into any controversy on the subject. We have no wish at all to quarrel with the Episcopalian Church. We regard it with high esteem. We honor its bishops. We respect its order. We love its liturgy. We sympathize largely as is well known with its sacramental and churchly spirit; having suffered more indeed for our testimony to what are rightly known as Church principles, than most so called high churchmen in the Episcopal Church itself. We desire the prosperity of the Episcopal Church, and pray God to bless it in its appointed work and mission. But with all this, we feel bound to say that the dream of the *Churchman*, and of the school for which it is the spokesman, in regard to this mission, is utopian in the extreme. The question of Church unity as the world now stands involves immeasurably more than the government of the Church by bishops. It is theological first, and then ecclesiastical; not ecclesiastical first, and then theological. And the sooner Episcopalians come to see this, and so join themselves with the earnest friends of Christianity in other Christian bodies (without forsaking their own communion) in trying to make our common theology fairly answerable to the demands of the present age (which it now is *not*), the better it will be for our sorrowful divisions and distractions all round.

With these prolegomena, bearing directly on the general subject in hand, we pass on now to a direct consideration of the book which forms the title of our present article; reciprocating at the outset, from the bottom of our heart, the expression of the author's "particular regard" in the copy with which we have been kindly favored from his hand. We honor him for his father's sake as well as for his own, recognizing in him indeed much of his father's Presbyterian and even Quaker peculiarity,

through the superimposition, as the venerable father himself might say, of the son's later Episcopal life. The book itself is worthy of high commendation both for its matter and its spirit. It is a polemical *eirenikon*, we may say, designed to operate, like the smiting of the righteous, as an excellent oil on the head of evangelical Puritanism, not breaking it, but reconciling it softly and sweetly to the idea of episcopacy. The argument is ingenious; the method clear; the style sprightly; the intention, as all candid readers must feel, transparently honest and most earnestly sincere. In these respects, the volume is a model of Christian controversy on the principle, *Come, let us reason together!* It aims to speak what it holds to be the truth in love. We have full faith in its sincerity, as well as deep sympathy also with what may be termed the burden of its subject; and we shall try at least to meet its challenge in a temper friendly, frank, and honest as its own.

The evil state in which we are through our existing sect system is described by Bishop Coxe in scorching terms, which however are only a fair picture of the truth. "There is as really need for a great awakening," with our Christianity, he tells us, "as there was in the days of Wickliffe. The scandals of our times are different from those of the Middle Ages; but I am forced to believe that they are not less hateful to Christ. A fragmentary Christianity; 'a house divided against itself;' time, wealth, energy, zeal, immense resources and facilities wasted by Christians, in contending one with another; innumerable moral evils bred of this state of things—evils which, because of these things, cannot be rebuked, much less corrected; this is a reality which everywhere confronts us. And, correspondingly, what is the case? Missions paralyzed; infidelity rampant; and after three centuries of boasted 'reformation,' the greater part of Europe and America still enslaved to the superstitions of the feudal era, and all its demonstrated imposture!" Again: "The dissensions of the reformers stopped the progress of reform in the sixteenth century; and here, in America, they are reproduced in such countless forms of mingled truth and error, that unbelief becomes the rational resource

of millions, who argue that if truth exists, they have neither the time nor the facilities to discover it amid so many discordant sounds. Christians see and feel all this; but they take no steps to correct the gigantic evil, and are contented to see each his own sect flourish. Nobody mourns, like a Daniel or a Nehemiah, over the broken walls of the temple; over the dust and ashes of the glorious city of God."

Strongly and graphically spoken; but true, every word of it. We agree with it, of course, for it is only what *we* in our Reformed, non-Episcopal way, have been writing and preaching for many years past—a testimony starting with our two tracts, *The Anxious Bench* and *Antichrist, or, The Spirit of Sect and Schism*, and reaching down continuously to the present time.

In these circumstances, Dr. Coxe feels himself called to a sort of prophetic office in the service of his generation. His spirit, like that of Paul, is stirred in him at seeing the whole Christian world given over to ecclesiastical madness. The fire kindles, and he speaks: "Somebody," he says, "must break the stolid apathy of the times on this behalf. God grant that mightier voices may follow. I speak boldly, however, because I speak for God; and I speak nothing but what I shall draw from His Holy Word. May He save me from any mistake, and from all confidence, save that which His Holy Word inspires."

To shield himself from the charge of presumption, he takes refuge in the case of Aquila and Priscilla, mentioned in the 18th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, who, in the exercise of the common priesthood of believers as it stood at that time, undertook to instruct the great and mighty preacher Apollos, expounding unto him the way of God more perfectly than he had known it before. Apollos stands for learned, pious, gloriously gifted teachers of Christianity, outside of the Episcopal Church. The bishop, for the nonce, lays aside his episcopal dignity, and speaks as a common man. These outsiders or dissenters (men like Dr. Adams, Dr. Hodge, or Henry Ward Beecher) may know much of "the way of the Lord," may be

mighty in the Scriptures, evangelical, eloquent, and all that; but still there is wanting with them a farther something, of which they are not aware, to make them complete in their ministry; and the office of furnishing this additional something is all that the humble-minded bishop assumes under the guise of "such a one as Ananias, the tentmaker."

It so happens at the same time, that this story of Apollos admits of an easy accommodation to the service of the main question with which the argument of Dr. Coxe's book is concerned; and it is wonderful, accordingly, how glibly for his lively fancy it is made to play from all sides into the merits of that question. What Apollos needed when he came to Ephesus, we are told, was a proper knowledge of the Church constitution already established by the Apostles; he was evangelical, but not churchly; an exact case, therefore, of what the same opposition means now with our modern sectarian Christianity; and so all that Aquila and Priscilla did was to expound to him more perfectly the way of the Lord, the true outward law of God's kingdom in regard to this matter.

But we must beg leave respectfully to demur to the exegesis, which puts into the text here such a meaning as this. Our imagination is too dull to catch even a glimpse of anything of the sort. What Apollos, the Jew—coming from Alexandria, well taught in the Old Testament Scriptures, but knowing as yet only the baptism of John—needed still to make him a competent Christian teacher, was something more, certainly, than indoctrination simply in the outward order of the Church. It was a deeper insight than he had yet gained into the interior power and glory of Christianity itself, as determined by the full meaning of Christ's person and work. According to Alford: "He knew and taught accurately the *facts* respecting Jesus, but of the *consequences* of that which he taught, of all which may be summed up in the doctrine of Christian baptism, he had no idea."

Fanciful as it may be, however, to find in the case of Apollos a real historical example of what Dr. Coxe is bent on exposing as respectable evangelical Christianity of the modern type,

disjoined from the way of the Lord more perfectly expounded in the sense of apostolic order, there is of course room still for this distinction in itself considered ; so that his general argument with regard to it, otherwise taken, may still hold good, or at least deserving of respectful attention. The loss of Apollos need not damage it essentially, however it may interfere here and there with its vivacity of representation, and its pleasing, rhetorical embellishment.

We cannot pretend at all to follow the argument in this general character into its particulars ; we feel constrained to say, however, that viewed as a plea in favor of Episcopacy over against the reigning popular Puritanism of our land, outside of that form of church government, it is to our mind by no means satisfactory. In other words, it is not of a character to shut up outsiders of the thoughtful, conscientious sort, to the conclusion that all the miseries of the present broken and disordered state of the Church are referable wholly to *their* denominational distinctions, and that the one single panacea for the evil is to own Episcopacy for the first and great commandment of the Christian law, as if there could be no deeper or more vital question possibly than that involved in the problem of bringing our common Christianity back into right order and form. There are many outside of the Episcopal communion, we are well persuaded, who see and deplore the present evil condition of things quite as clearly as Bishop Coxe does, and sigh also just as sincerely as he does for the deliverance of the Church from the Babylonish captivity of the sect system, who yet cannot be brought to fall in with his short and easy method of ending the trouble. Not from any prejudice against Episcopacy as such ; they would be glad to take refuge in it, if it could show itself truly equal to the task of the times ; but just because they feel the method to be too short and easy for this. It does not reach to the true bottom of our difficulties. It is too external and mechanical, and so at the same time too superficial also, in its way of seeking to heal the hurt of the daughter of God's people. The cure it offers is too slight for the disease. The malady which

is now upon the Christian world needs deeper probing, and calls for more fundamental help.

Dr. Coxe is generous enough in his concessions to evangelical Puritanism. Sectarian Christianity, as he calls it, has in it much that is good. In its better forms, indeed, he is with it largely in his heart and mind. Its "exemplary piety and noble achievements" command his honest admiration. There is no *theological* discrepancy between him apparently and the religious theory of the self-distinguishing brotherhood of the so-called evangelical churches. They are substantially right as far as they go in doctrine and practice. But the difficulty with them is, we are told, that they do not go far enough. Like the evangelical Apollos (rather a sorry case of *Christian* experience, it must be confessed), they stop short in a mere half of Bible truth; while another half of it, just as plainly taught in the sacred volume, they fail to see altogether. It is there all the time, but their eyes are turned away from it, and it is for them as if it did not exist. This unregarded and overlooked side of Bible truth has to do with religion in its general character, as something different from individual or personal piety; to which it stands related, however, as its necessary complement. Individual piety is sufficiently provided for by the evangelical system; but to continue itself properly in the world, it must be organized into fixed general form. Without this, it is liable to grow erratic, and run itself to waste. Hence the constitution of the Christian Church, in which a scheme of law and order has been established by Christ Himself, and His Apostles, to conserve the Christian tradition, and to hand it forward from one age to another in a sure way. Let now this Apostolic order (as we see it exemplified in Episcopacy), be conjoined with the other half of the gospel as we find it with righteous Presbyterians and Puritans, and all will be well. We shall have then a whole Christianity, and sectarianism and schism will cease to torment the Church. So runs the dream of our book, *Apollos: or, The Way of God.*

"The half Christianity of our day," the author tells us, "never gets any farther than this; its bare idea is, if one can

get to heaven with such an imperfect gospel as he may possess, what need of more perfect knowledge?" "This they willingly are ignorant of: that there is another half of Christianity which has respect to other souls than one's own, and to unborn generations. The gospel has not done its work in getting *you* and *me* to heaven: there are yet millions to be saved besides us; ages to come must be provided for."—"There is something in a *whole* Christ which this generation sees not." The twofold or double character of the whole Christ is illustrated, throughout nature, in everything "whose seed is in itself." It has in it an individual end and a general end. So, for example, with a bushel of wheat. It is both "bread for the eater" (individual use), and "seed for the sower" (general use). The full idea of the gospel is the same. It must be at once both bread *and* seed, seminal as well as personally experimental. Here it was that Apollos learned the way of God more perfectly. He had an imperfect gospel before that might have sufficed to save his own soul and the souls of those that heard him; "but the divine plan for the preservation and propagation of the entire gospel, and for the ultimate evangelization of the whole world, must have been defeated, had not St. Paul and his disciples insisted on teaching him and others the way of the Lord more perfectly."

We have taken some pains to bring into view distinctly Bishop Coxe's notion of the two sides, which are required to make Christianity whole and complete; and we need not say that we agree fully with his general conception of such a necessary duality in the constitution of the gospel. But our immediate object here is to notice what seems to us to be his defective way of putting the case, in illustration of our remark already made with regard to the too mechanical and external character of his scheme in general, for the proper cure of our church difficulties. The two sides of Christianity with him stand out of each other, each separately complete for its own end, and they are only brought together by divine ordination to make sure of both purposes at the same time. There is no real intussusception of the two forms of life into each other; and

so far as this is the case, the true idea of organization is not reached in their union. Their relation is that of one thing made to fit in with another in an outward way. It is made intimate and necessary through God's wise plan. Individual Christianity is one thing; corporate Christianity is altogether another thing, thrown around the first for its protection and defence, and its proper propagation in the world.

Need we say that this wrongs the true conception of religion in the most serious manner? It flies in the face at once of the analogy brought to illustrate it from the natural world. There, wherever we have life, in animal or plant, its twofold sides, the individual and the general are joined together indissolubly, inwardly and essentially, as one life. Can less be required for the unity of life in its higher and infinitely more glorious Christian form?

Episcopalianism is fond of harping on its Apostolical Order. "There is a Way of God," we are told, "as well as a Word of God." Christianity is a rule to be obeyed as well as a doctrine to be believed. But the idea of this order, method, rule, in the book before us, never gets beyond the form of an abstract, outward scheme. We must have organization, the book says, to save us from the chaotic Christianity of sects which destroys itself. "We want a clear and candid exhibition of organic Christianity," we are told, "as opposed to the multiplication of sects." But, alas, what we get in the case after all is not an organism, but simply a mechanism. The two conceptions are totally different. A mechanism is a mere external system, a putting together of things to serve a design which is not in the things themselves. An organism implies life, and is the union of its parts as organs in the constitution of this life. There is law, necessity, order, in both cases: but in one case, the order is rigidly fixed and dead, like that of the grave; in the other, it is indefinitely flexible and free. So through the whole natural world. Animals and plants obey their fixed typical forms, which nevertheless spring forth with endless diversity from their individual lives. Even the hard shell of the lobster is the outgrowth of the animal's flesh. It comes not by accretion

from without, but by concretion from within. And just so it is also in the moral world. Virtue, righteousness, truth, good, hold for men only in the character of universal identical law; while yet they can be this only as they are born at the same time out of the inmost peculiarity of each separate human life. Good is not measurable arithmetically; truth is not to be taken into the soul automatically; virtue is not reducible to standing rules and maxims; and righteousness working in the harness of a mere outward casuistry is no righteousness at all. It would seem to be a fair presumption now, that the same order should be found to reign in the economy of Christianity, the spiritual life of the Church; that this too, out to its ultimates in ecclesiastical polity, should be a whole or entire constitution, organically, and not just systematically, joined together in all its parts. But the church polity recommended to us by Dr. Coxe, as a remedy for our chaos of sects, holds no such inward relation to the animating soul of Christianity. It is a divine contrivance rather, which is made to inclose this in an outward way; heaven's gracious machinery, we may say, superadded to the Christian life otherwise considered, to make it work right, and to protect it from heresy and schism. Is not this to degrade in fact what the argument seeks to exalt?

But this is not all. We cannot help feeling that the Word of God, in the hands of Dr. Coxe, is wronged very much in the same way with the Way of God. It is regarded as a text book simply of divine origin, from which men are to draw the truths of religion in an external rational way, each for himself as he best can, under the supposed guidance of God's Spirit. In other words, we see no difference between Dr. Coxe here and the sects he is trying to put down. We know to what such private judgment in their case comes. They can make the Scriptures mean anything they please; for the letter of the Word in them is capable of being sundered entirely from the spirit of the Word, and then it takes into it of course any sense which the spirit of the human expositor—be he Methodist, Calvinist, Unitarian, Political radical, or what not else—chooses to put into it. This Dr. Coxe sees and condemns; but

then makes his appeal to the law and to the testimony in what seems to us to be precisely the same mechanical and arbitrary style.

Who now, however, is to assure us again that the learned Bishop may not himself go wrong in thus handling the Bible for our instruction? For he claims no infallibility for his prelatial dignity, either as belonging to him in his own office, or as flowing into him mysteriously from the general hierarchy, in which he holds so honorable a place. He is himself aware of such vulnerableness in his Bible argument, and tries to cover it as he best can; but the help, to our mind, is vain. "Why am I so sure," he asks, "that what I see in Holy Scripture is really there?" To which he answers. "I subject myself to a test which can easily be applied. I have appealed to the Bible, to nothing but the Bible. I have searched the Scriptures,* and find 'that these things are so.' But a Jesuit, for example sees, it differently. I turn to the Jesuit, then, and I say to him, Show that I am mistaken by an appeal to historic facts."—"Confidently do I throw out this challenge to the Jesuit. Scripture is all I need; but he proclaims that I misinterpret the Scriptures. Very well. I am willing to go with you to the interpretation of the first ages; I will meet you there, and will abide by the result." That is, the *nothing but the Bible* must be supplemented now by another rule, namely, the authority of antiquity or early church tradition. Here again, of course, we are out upon a sea of conflicting opinions as before. But what we have to do with just here is the hard externality once more, that oppresses us through this whole Episcopal scheme. Its use of tradition is like its use of Scripture, and like its idea of Apostolical order, an attempt to build up Christianity from mere outside elements, when it is only the presence and power of the divine life which is immanent organically in Christianity itself, which can make these elements ever to be of any account.

* As the Pharisees did too in the time of Christ, thinking to have in them eternal life (John v. 39), and yet found nothing there but their own private blindness, because they had not God's word abiding in them.

It follows necessarily, from what has been said, that we are not satisfied with the view which the scheme before us takes of Christian obedience and faith. They both suffer, we think, from the general mechanical and unfree character of the scheme. The test of obedience is made to be too much simple unquestioning submission to "ordinances," because they *are* ordinances; whereas it should be borne in mind that it is the "obedience of faith" which the Gospel requires, and the essential character of this is to be always, not darkness, but "light in the Lord." And so then, on the other hand, we are made to feel that faith itself is reduced too much here to the character of a reception of different religious truths propounded of God in an external way; in the sense commonly put upon that famous word "the faith once delivered to the saints," not only by Episcopalians, but also by Romanists, Lutherans, Baptists, Scotch Seceders, and Evangelicals generally, each body construing it in conformity with its own creed. We must get beyond every such notion of a dead mechanical *traditum*, if we are ever to do justice to the true idea of faith as the central organ of the Christian life.

We wish it to be distinctly understood that in thus criticising the Episcopalian basis of church unification presented by Bishop Coxe, we are not opposing his positions in a controversial way. Our object, on the contrary, is amicable discussion only in the prevailing spirit of his own book. We too, as already said, mourn with him over the sect system, and desire most sincerely to see it brought to an end. We agree with him also in his general view of what he regards as the egregious one-sidedness of our reigning Puritanic, non-episcopal Christianity. It sees one side of the Gospel, but overlooks entirely for the most part another side of it no less essential to its perfection. We would not call this other side exactly the seminal interest, that which regards the propagation of Christianity, God's way or *plan* for keeping the Gospel—viewed as being in itself otherwise all that it needs to be—from dying out, or losing itself, as we say, in the sand. We have been accustomed to speak of it rather as the objective side of the Gospel, that

which has to do with the historical verities of the Christian salvation going before subjective or personally experimental religion, and making room for this through faith, in the only form in which it can ever be a truly divine power, coming into men from beyond themselves, and so raising them out of themselves in the way that the idea of religion requires. Such objective Christianity is of course general or universal in its nature in difference from all simply private experience, and it draws along with it of itself—by a rationale which we need not now stop to explain—what is to be understood by a sense for the sacramental, the liturgical, the churchly, in Christian life and worship. We have it in the Apostles' Creed. We have it in the idea of the Christian Year; where all turns first, from Advent to Trinity, on the objective outwardly historical view of the world's redemption, running its course through the mystery of the Incarnation out to the full glorification of the Son in the Father; and where only then room is made for the subjective experience of this grace to run *its* course also (starting as regeneration, where the other ends, in the Holy Trinity), through the second half of the year, out to its full and proper conclusion. All this *we* hold to be the needed complement of evangelical sectarianism, its great missing *desideratum*, quite as earnestly as Dr. Coxe, and in a view, we think, that goes more into the life of the subject than his view of "seed for the sower" as well as "bread for the eater."

And therefore it is, that we have no quarrel at all, as just said, with the points he insists upon as necessary for the effectuation of true church union, in themselves considered. Most certainly, this can never be reached in a purely ideal form. It must involve objective actualities, outward historical system. In particular, there must be for it divinely appointed order, method and rule: a "way of God" as well as an outwardly spoken word of God; and there must be for it along with this also, a continuity of tradition connecting it historically with the beginning of the Church in Christ and His Apostles. We are not disputing these points as urged in this book, *Apollo, or the Way of God*, when we object to the manner in which they

are here presented. Our criticism is only to show that as thus presented they are not sufficient for their own purpose. They do not set the "way of God" before us, in a form commensurate with the exigencies of the case which it is required to meet; in a form suited to convince the deeper religious thought of the age, that English and American Episcopacy is all the Protestant Christian world now needs to bring itself right. We wish most heartily it were otherwise. But the book is not equal here to its own task. Its notion of apostolical doctrine and order, its ecclesiastical methodism we may call it, is too mechanical, too extrinsic to the only effectual principle of unity in the interior life of Christianity itself, to allow the thought. It dualistically divides in truth, and holds at arms-length apart, the very interest—life and form—which it proposes to join into one. Aiming to be systematic, it makes no account of being organic; and thus destroys on the one hand, what it industriously labors to build up on the other.

This is what we mean by our altogether friendly criticism. The question is not just how far certain elements of external authority shall enter into the constitution of the Christian Church; but this rather: In what way shall they enter it? Shall they be for it pure externalism simply—apostolical machinery, faith once delivered, cut-and-dry tradition—made to environ its internalism in mechanical fashion; or shall the last appear as the living soul of the first? There is no necessary antagonism between these seemingly opposite terms. All life, on the contrary, supposes and demands their union: objective law, namely, from beyond itself, and its own actualization of the law, nevertheless, from within itself. Of this no proper account seems to us to be made by our modern Anglo-American Episcopacy; and therefore it is, that we are sorrowfully sure that it is not of itself, as it now stands, a last answer to the great and solemn question: How shall the health of the daughter of God's people at this time be recovered? The question, we are very certain, is too deep for that. We must go farther for its sufficient answer.

Dr. Coxe, of course, includes the government of the Church

by bishops, in his scheme of things necessary to make out his idea of the Apostolical way of God. He tells us indeed at the outset, in language we like, that he desires a truce of controversy on the subject. "I am tired," he says, "of the stale word-fights of centuries; I have no taste for controversies, involving old grudges and issues of the dead past. I know nothing more distasteful than the endless changes rung upon the words 'bishops, priests and deacons,' and the discussions thereon, which have filled so many books. Not even the droning, dreary debate about the measure of water involved in the word *baptize*, is more unutterably sickening to my soul." To this *our* soul also groans from its inmost a hearty *amen*. We detest the whole thing—not because we hate either bishops, priests or deacons, but because we love the truth of the Gospel and the peace of Jerusalem more. "The broad subject which I would bring before my brethren," says our author, "is that of the family of Christ in its organic forms and features; and I would view it, freed entirely from all colorings of historic and controversial theology, in the simple light which is shed upon it by Holy Scripture."

With all this, however, the argument of the book, as just said, contrives to take in bishops as one of the unquestionable "first principles of the oracles of God," without which there can be no right Christianity; and it does this only the more easily, by thus tabooing beforehand the "word-fights of centuries" on the subject. Anglo-American Episcopacy, of the high church type, is accustomed to assume in this way a good deal that it cannot prove. For example: That the episcopate is the direct continuation of the apostolate; that there was anything like a regular episcopal ordering of the Church before the destruction of Jerusalem; that Timothy, Titus, Silvanus, Marcus, Clemens, Epaphras, Epaphroditus, and other such apostolical delegates and fellow-workers, were regular diocesan bishops belonging to this order; that the stars and angels of the seven churches in the symbolism of the Apocalypse mean just so many unsymbolical bishops of Asia Minor of the same empirical sort. Postulates like these transcend the measure

of our credulity. Rothe's *Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*—the best historical argument, by the way, in favor of Episcopacy, we have ever read—makes it clear, we think, that whatever of elementary preparation there may have been for it in the previous state of Christianity, the episcopal system, as such—in the form in which we find it universally established in the second century—came in only after the destruction of Jerusalem; being a wise provision at the time, brought in by the counsel and advice of such of the Apostles as were still living—particularly St. John—and having for its object the unity of the Church in the new critical stadium on which it was then entering.*

This, however, merely by the way. Our object here is not to go into the controversy about the origin of bishops, but simply to show that here again, as in its other elements already noticed, the Episcopal cure for schism presented in Dr. Coxe's book is too much for the surface of things, and too little for the inward heart of things, to meet effectually the wants of the case as it now stands. The crisis through which the world is at present passing—in morality, learning, politics and religion—calls for far more than any such simply external application, whether human or divine. The mechanism of the papacy in such view is not what the sick world needs to make it well; but neither is it, any more than this, the high-church mechanism of episcopacy by divine right—a mechanism, which can come to its full sense and right end at last, unquestionably, only in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre. What we mean is, that if either popery or episcopacy be essential to the being of the Christian Church, it must be under the view of their

* Of apostolical origin in such humanly historical way, the episcopate was of course an outbirth also of the life of the Church; and in this view there is force in the remark of Dr. Rothe, that we may see a divine providence in the circumstance of the obscurity—the absence of outward observation—which marks the coming in of the institution. "The Christian world," he says, "was to be guarded thereby from the temptation of regarding the episcopate as an *ex jure divino* institute, and of looking upon a temporary measure of purely human wisdom as a divine ordinance, having in itself fixed and necessary permanent force, so as to lay upon itself in this way a self-imposed yoke for all time."

being in some way, along with their outward ordination, a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church. Any other view is becoming more and more intolerable for the self-consciousness of the age in which we live. The world has got beyond *that* notion of the "obedience of faith," and can never more get back to it in its historical life, whether in Vatican or Laudean form.

As mere externalism, or supposed divine machinery, the high church Episcopalian pretension here seems to us—we are bound to say—even less rational than the Roman pretension. For what is the meaning of the regimen of bishops in either theory? Is it not that of a bond, apostolically contrived, to hold the Church together in all its parts? This of course implies unity in the episcopate itself, for how can a dismembered episcopate make the body of the Church one, any more than a dismembered presbyterate or a system of independent church synods?

Who then is to bind together the visible bond of unity represented by the bishops? The Vatican Church answers the question consistently, by providing for the visible bond a very visible and material sort of knot in the bishop of bishops who sits enthroned as the successor of St. Peter at Rome. And all ecclesiastical honesty requires us to admit, that this agrees with the idea that underlies the Episcopal institute, from the time it first comes before us in the second century under this view of a necessary bond of Christianity. We feel it in Ignatius; it comes to full blossom in Cyprian; it is Romanism out and out in Augustine. Nothing can well be more rigorously logical and consequential than the way in which it thus runs its course from the second century to the fifth. The principle of the argument is clear. A bishop can be worth nothing for unity, except as a member of the whole body of bishops; for even an Apostle could be of no apostolical authority in truth, except as he stood in conscious union with the college of the Apostles collectively taken. Hence the episcopate must be visibly one, and only in that character of organized solidarity can any part of it deserve the least respect as a defence against schism;

for outside of such solidarity, is it not seen at once to be itself the very quintessence of schism ?

We have shown twenty years ago—in our articles on Cyprian, published in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1852*—how far that great church father in particular, reflecting the sense of his age, carried this idea of corporate solidarity as essential to any divine significance in the office of a bishop. The idea of a bishop outside of a true catholic or whole episcopate—a bishop, prating of his apostolic succession as a mere fractional prerogative, cut off from the succession in its entirety—was worse in his view than a puerility—it was the very sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. There were bishops enough of such outside apostolical succession in the early Christian times—schismatical and heretical bishops, Novatian, Arian, Donatist—representing together more than half the nominal Christian world; but that only served to show, for men like Cyprian and Augustine, of how little account the office was for its own end, in any such abstract shape. There was no magic in the thing; even as a divine institute it was worth nothing, save as an organic power joined organically with the one whole life of the Church itself.

No bishop, according to Cyprian, can be said to be the organ and representative of Christ, in virtue of what he is simply in his single and separate capacity. To be such an organ he must be comprehended, believingly and consciously, in the *whole* organism of which Christ is the Head. His office can never be of force, except in union and harmony with the entire office of which it is only a part. That is the plain meaning of the famous dictum: "*Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur;*" which meets us again in the formula: "*Episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordia numerositate diffusus.*"

And so we repeat here very deliberately what we said a score

* Articles which offended many at the time by their fidelity to simple historical truth, although nobody, so far as we know, has ever pretended to meet them with even the ghost of an answer. But the world has moved considerably since then, and there is nothing so ugly about them now.

of years ago. The Cyprianic doctrine of the Church is not modern Protestantism. It is not this, of course, in Lutheran or Presbyterian form. But neither is it this in the Protestant Episcopal form, however fashionable it may be with a certain class of Episcopalians to claim a historical resting-place for the foot-sole of their faith away back on this mythological basis. Anglican Episcopalianism is not the Episcopalianism of the third and fourth centuries; and the difference is more than accidental or circumstantial. "Its theory of the Church is not that of Cyprian. Whether right or wrong, this last makes no room for the legitimate entrance of any such fact as the Reformation, owns no possibility whatever of a valid hierarchy aside from the unity of the apostolical succession as a solid whole, and asserts with unflinching precision the presence of supernatural powers objectively at hand in the Church and to be found nowhere else."

To the question thus, *Who is to bind into one the visible bond of Church unity represented by the bishops*, the Roman Catholic answer is plain, as is also the answer of the third century. The answer is wrong, as we have taken pains to show in our article of last April, on *The Old Catholic Movement*; only, however, because the premises on which it is based are to be considered wrong. But what are we to say now of our modern high church Episcopalian answer, which starts from the same premises—all coming together in the idea of a *jure divino* visible hierarchy made necessary by Christ for the very being of His body the Church—and then for the needful unity of this hierarchy itself remands us to the purely invisible presence of Christ promised to be with the Church to the end of time? No one is more ready than our excellent and much honored Christian brother, Bishop Coxe, to exclaim against the idea of a visible centre of unity in the Vatican view. It is in his eyes a monstrous and blasphemous assumption; while yet he loses no opportunity at the same time of hammering the sects, as he calls them, for not accepting the like visible means of unity set before them in the divine institution of Episcopacy. We cannot help feeling that there is serious contradiction in this. The

Episcopalian theory, so put forward, is either too little or too much; too little, if earnest is to be made with the Cyprianic doctrine in which it professes to start; and altogether too much, if it is to be passed off upon us, in its character of a mere fraction of that doctrine, as if the fraction were the whole.

There is something in fact, well nigh ludicrous in the modern Protestant High Church Episcopalian notion of the charm there is supposed to be in the apostolical succession of bishops, to preserve sound doctrine and right order in the Church, when one brings to bear upon it the calcium light of the ancient doctrine of Cyprian and Augustine, in the view particularly of what they insist upon, as the necessary unity and solidarity of the episcopal office regarded as a whole. In our modern system, if we understand it, this idea of solidarity has slipped very much out of mind. Anglicanism has been, since the Reformation, what Cyprian graphically pictures as "a sunbeam cut off from the sun, a bough torn from a tree, a stream sundered from its fountain;" but this has not been felt by the system itself as a fatal break in its apostolical succession; the only question of account in the case being simply to establish the validity of the original English ordinations, thus fractionally considered, in their own separate form. Any rivulet of Episcopal derivation from the general succession is supposed to have been enough for that. And so it is wonderful now, how far in the judgment of many the merest minimum of such aphoristic apostolicity can go to make all things right, if only there be in it a grain of true episcopal blood. That puts all the Oriental sects in catholic position. That saves Swedish Lutheranism, while the Lutheranism of Germany is considered to be no Church at all. A single stray bishop, lighted upon in Berlin, happily gave the Moravians a right start, without which they would have been no better than Continental Protestantism generally.* The so-called Jansenist secession in Holland has been held in connection with the Apos-

* In organizing his new Church at Herrnhut, Count Zinzendorf got himself introduced into the ministry, in 1734, by Lutheran ordination. His missionary plans, however, required that other brethren with small education, should also be ordained as ministers. This was not to be expected from any Lutheran consistory;

tles similarly by a very small thread indeed down to our time, until finally through the death of Archbishop Loos of Utrecht, this also was reduced to a single precarious filament in the person of Herman Heykamp, Bishop of Deventer. That filament, however, has proved quite sufficient, as we know, to convey the magic force in full of a true apostolical succession, in spite of Rome, onward to the newly elected bishop of the Old Catholics, Joseph Hubert Reinkens—saving thus that otherwise sectarian movement from the sin and misery of egregious schism.

We quote these instances merely to set in its true light that high church Episcopalian view—not shared in by either Moravians or Old Catholics—which hangs the entire weight of a true apostolical succession in the life of Christianity, on the single peg of a supposed separate apostolical succession in the episcopate—the office of diocesan bishops; and then, nevertheless, allows that the episcopate itself may be broken into a thousand fragments, and each fragment be able still to carry away with it the full and entire life of the succession just as if no such schism had taken place! Cyprian would have scouted such a thought with derision, and it stultifies, we are very sure, the whole conception of what the office was intended to be as a bond of unity in the beginning.

And so we come back to our main thesis; namely, that the cure for the divisions of Christendom, as the world now stands, is not to be found in the outward order simply which is offered to us by the Anglo-American Episcopal Church. The crowning element of the Church, its episcopate itself, think what we may

and he was not willing, like Wesley, to take the matter into his own hands. Here was a difficulty. But it so happened that there was in Berlin an aged bishop, of previous Moravian emigration—Jablonsky by name—officiating at the time as court preacher in the service of the Lutheran Church; and now by a happy thought, it was resolved to call in his aid for the emergency. Zinzendorf commended David Nitschman to him as worthy of being consecrated to the episcopal office; Jablonsky cheerfully consented to convey to him the apostolic succession still quietly immanent in his own person; and so David Nitschman became the first Bishop of the New Moravian Church. Some time after, Zinzendorf himself was consecrated to the same office by the same obliging hands. The Church thus had its own modest prelecy now, and could make ministers and missionaries to suit itself.

of it otherwise, is no better for such purpose than its other elements, viewed in this abstract outside way. The problem calls for a deeper solution.

Bishop Coxe seems himself mournfully aware that his Church—"all glorious within" as he considers it to be for those who are in it—is not after all what he would fain have it to be as the "way of the Lord" for restoring the captivity of His people. "It has been common among us Anglicans of the Anglo-American communion," he says with a tone of pathetic sadness toward the close of his book, "to flatter ourselves that our Apostolical claims are destined to prevail, and to win over the reflecting and the educated among all Christians of other names. Far be it from us to deny or affirm any such thing, in view of the 'signs of the times.' The real issues become complicated and mysterious every day. The German immigration, the Chinese irruption, the African problem, the menaces of Jesuitism—all these and other features of the age, to say nothing of materialism, sensualism, and communism, teach us to be very humble, and to wait on the Lord in patience of hope, and in the fulness of faith. I frankly confess, and I avow it with a due sense of my accountability to my dear brethren in the episcopate, but with a deeper sense of my accountability to the Master, that I dare not boast of any such expectations as in past years many among us have ventured to adopt. I love our Church with a deeper love than ever; I believe in her more than ever; but I feel that God has chastised our proud spirit, and rebuked our too confident words."

This is a good confession, and it lies in the same direction exactly with the general object of our present article; which as we have said, is not to antagonize Episcopaliam as such, but merely to show that it is not in and of itself the power that is needed at this time to actualize in full the true idea of the Holy Catholic Church, the coming down of the New Hierosolyma from heaven.

It does not relieve the case at all, that we are not able to refer to any other existing order of church life as having in it more of promise or power for that glorious end. On the con-

trary, this only makes it so much the more a sacred duty for all who love the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ to look the whole truth solemnly in the face. Certainly, what we miss in Episcopacy here, we miss at the same time also in other denominations. Why should we try to deceive ourselves? The Shiloh to whom shall be the gathering of the nations in the Church of the Future is not in Romanism; but just as little in Presbyterianism, or Lutheranism, or Methodism, or Puritanism of whatever shape or form. His coming is not heralded even remotely as yet in any of the Oriental Churches; nor may we dare to acknowledge it in the Old Catholic Movement. These systems severally, along with Episcopalianism, are at best but partial Christianity, and not whole Christianity; and, alas, they are not organic parts, but divided, broken, reciprocally schismatic parts, each virtually pretending to be the whole, and in its particularity excluding the others. But what then? Does it follow that these systems should be for this reason all at once abandoned as a first step toward general unity, in the way the "Churchman" virtually assumes in taxing the Evangelical Alliance with abetting the sin of schism? Only in one view could this be rationally demanded—that which in fact underlies the *Churchman's* severe crimination of non-Episcopalian Christianity throughout; in the view, namely, that Anglo-American Episcopalianism, as a mere outward *via media* between Romanism on the one side and Sectarianism on the other, offers in itself what all the world should see to be God's ordination, carrying with it immediately whatever is needed to make the Church one and complete. But this, we have seen, is an untenable assumption. The question of Church union, to whose claims the Evangelical Alliance is trying to awaken the attention of the Christian world, is not to be met and answered in any such summary, superficial way as that. The Alliance has not yet found the right answer to it; has not indeed pretended to have done so; but neither has it been found, we feel very sure, by Episcopalianism. This may have, and we trust has, an important part to contribute toward the reintegration of the confessional divisions of Christendom; but other confes-

sions have *their* gifts to bring also, according to such a man as Döllinger, no less essential to the idea of a full and whole Christianity. The Episcopal Church—in spite of her self-distinguishing title of “*The Church*”—is in truth at last a section only, or sect, of the Church Catholic, and not by any means the wholeness of its proper life. All the Evangelical Protestant Churches are in this respect, we repeat, in like condemnation, as not having in them the true full law and power of Christian unity; and the sooner this is seen and felt by all, the better. Then we shall not have Episcopalians—because they have bishops—refusing to talk with other denominations on the subject of Church unification because these have no bishops, and saying to them in substance: ‘This question of unity is for you, and not for us; *you* are in schism; *we* are the Church; repent—believe—enter the mechanism of our communion, and all will be at once made right.’ Instead of this, the question will be seen to involve immeasurably more than any such pitiful issue as that; and the mind and heart of the whole Christian world may be expected then to flow together more and more, from all sides, under the influence of God’s Spirit, seeking the true answer to it in a deeper, more inward, and far more comprehensive form.

How that blessed end—the growing desire now of all nations, the true second coming, perhaps, of our Lord Jesus Christ—shall be ultimately accomplished, we, of course, know not and pretend not to say. We may safely mention some ways, however, in which it certainly will *not* come.

As we have already intimated, it will most assuredly not come on the platform of any existing church organization as it now stands. Among them all, no single one can be named that is broad enough, or deep enough in its foundations, to serve this purpose. What Protestant body—however it may have pleased itself with such a wild fancy in the beginning—now seriously dreams of being the very “pattern in the mount,” to which all Christendom must conform itself in order to become one? And yet, how hard it is for any of these bodies to see and own steadily the practical force of the thought

that they are, at most, parts only of the full Christian idea, and that "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." It were an immense stride gained in the right direction, only to have this single truism clearly before the vision of the Church on all sides. It would be, of itself, the power of catholic unity already at work.

The union we speak of, will not come on the basis of any one confessional scheme of doctrine now known in the world. No such scheme, Romanist or Protestant, may, without vast presumption, pretend to be the full sense of Christianity. The full sense of Christianity indeed, the faith once delivered to the saints, is not capable of being imprisoned in any logical sarcophagus of this sort; just because it *is* living, and not dead; and it is no derogation from the proper worth of any one of our theological confessions, therefore, to say that it is not all that is required to set forth that faith in true universal form. Neither the Lutheran nor the Reformed symbolical books are fitted to become the end of all strife and division in this way. The ultimate unity of the Church will not be built on the Augsburg Confession, nor on the decrees of the Synod of Dort, nor on the Westminster Catechism, nor on the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. Who, from his inmost heart, can seriously believe any such thing?

Neither will this unity be brought about, however, by diplomatic inter-denominational negotiation of any sort, having for its object the bringing of the separate Churches into one, in a merely outward way. The Evangelical Alliance, if we looked upon it simply in that view, might well be set down for a failure; especially in the extremely partial and one-sided character under which it appeared at its late New York Convention; but that, we have already seen, is not the right view to be taken, either of its work or of its reigning mind. No mere confederacy of denominations in the way of concordant discord, and no counsels or plans looking simply to the reduction of differences to a common platform of doctrine and order, can ever bring to pass the end here proposed; just as little as the decrees of kings or popes. "Not by might, nor by power, but

by My Spirit, saith the Lord," applies to all such *ab extra* compulsion in either form.

It is a vain imagination again, to expect the coming of the Lord to build up Jerusalem from the repristination, simply, of any past period of Church history. As if the new here was to be nothing more than the old! As if the living were to be sought only among the dead! What is needed is something vastly greater than any mechanical return to the theology and life of the sixteenth century, whether in Lutheran or Reformed type, whether in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland or England. Something far beyond any falling back to the piety of the Middle Ages. Something unspeakably better than a general retrogression to the Nicene period, or to any portion of the Patristic time going before. It is a delusive vision—this dream of bringing all things right by an unhistorical pilgrimage of our whole modern Christendom to the tombs of the fathers, martyrs and confessors, who fell asleep in the Lord fifteen hundred years ago; this fond conceit of putting an end to all heresy and schism by setting ourselves, as Dr. Coxe phrases it, "to work back to the precise position in which the Churches would have continued, had the Papacy never disturbed the primitive constitutions." God be praised, that the early Christian world was doomed to no such stagnation as that! And God forbid, that the Christian world now should try to work itself back to it by any such crab-like process! We cannot do it, if we would; we should not wish to do it if we could. God has "provided some better thing for us," we feel very sure, than this. If ever there was a time in the history of the world, when the deliverance and redemption of men, whether in the political or religious light, demanded progression, and not retrogression, that is the character of the present time. Our age is in a crisis like that of the Red Sea; and the voice of Jehovah-Jesus may be heard plainly sounding through it as of old to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they GO FORWARD!" We must face the realities of our own age, as they are in their own nature. We must grapple with the world-problem of the nineteenth century, in the bosom of

the nineteenth century, and not by skulking into the dim religious light of the fifth century. Christianity must conquer the modern world in the midst of its own conditions, if it is to make good its claim to true catholicity—if it is to be a *Church* in the end, and not simply a school or sect.

The error thus rejected, is only one pole of the unhistorical spirit in religion; there is, of course, another pole of the same spirit—the seeming opposite of this, though only its obverse complement in fact—to which it is, if possible, even more vain to look for any effectual escape from the acknowledged misery of our present ecclesiastical divisions. We have it in the growing disposition which is shown with some, on all sides, to come to a full rupture with the historical past of Christianity; to get clear of its dogmas, mysteries and supernatural peculiarities, out and out, at one stroke; and thus to win at once free room, as they imagine, for a new birth of the gospel, that will leave behind forever the endless *isms*, as they say, which it is found impossible to reconcile or harmonize in any less sweeping way. This is Humanitarian Christianity; exalting itself against all that is called God, in the very temple of God; and pretending to save Christ, through the destruction of Christ.

The negatives which we have now briefly noticed, make of themselves, of course, no positive, in answer to the question before us: “When or how shall the Son of Man come, and what shall be the sign of His coming?” But they go far, we think, to bring into view what *must be* the general character of the positive, through which only the idea of this glorious advent can be realized in the end. Christianity, to be truly historical, must revert again—not just to the period of the Reformation, nor to the Nicene period, as if the stream in either case could give us the wholeness of the fountain—but back to the very fountain-head itself, so as to descend from this afresh, through all the following ecclesiastical ages, down to our modern time, freighted with a depth and wealth of meaning, such as is not to be met with either in any one age, or even in all ages together, going before.

All the signs of the present—far beyond the signs of any past time since the first coming of Christ; apocalyptic signs, we may call them, felt now by all the deep thinkers of the world; signs in the moral and political heavens, no less than in the world of Christianity itself; signs, which it is felt no extravagance now to symbolize as the “shaking of the powers of the heavens,” or as a universal giving way and breaking up of what has seemed to be, heretofore, the established order of nature; all these signs, we say, go to show that Christianity is in fact, in such a vast fundamental crisis as we have mentioned, and that it needs, therefore, nothing less than such a whole renovation as we now speak of—starting from the Lord, and taking hold upon the deep places of the earth spiritually considered—to carry it triumphantly onward in its mission.

We cannot go farther here into the question of this new dispensation of the Church; a question that is much in our heart and mind; but take leave of it at present by simply referring to our paper, *Christianity and Humanity*, read before the late Convention of the Evangelical Alliance, and published in the last number of this Review. Which itself, however, is only a synopsis, as all can see, needing a commentary for every separate thesis.

Bishop Coxe complains with good reason, as we have seen, of the one-sidedness of Evangelical Puritanism in holding itself all the time to one class of texts in the Bible, while it overlooks and ignores entirely another class of texts, just as plainly there, which go to favor Episcopalianism. It is the object of his work, we are told, to bring this neglected side of Scripture to its proper rights; which is done, however, as we have seen, in a strangely external way. “I come with half truths,” he says, “which are not thought of by many of my pious countrymen, and I propose to join them to the half truths which are almost universally accepted by them, and which are mistaken for integers.” “The two halves united, present a perfection and beauty which proves that they were not meant to be put asunder.” The charge thus preferred against Evangelical Puritanism is just; it is at best but a partial Gospel; but is

Dr. Coxe quite sure that all it needs to make it the Gospel in full is that it should be pieced out by what he proposes to add to it as another partial Gospel? What if these two "halves," as he calls them, in order to become inwardly one, demand a still more interior view of the Gospel as the proper ground of their wholeness? Then we should have yet another class of "neglected Scriptures," in the case of which both Puritanism and Episcopalianism would stand alike convicted of being in the same wrong. And just this now, it seems to us, is the actual truth of the matter, and nothing less than this. Plainly there is a whole vast order of thought and statement in the Scriptures, which as yet has found no sufficient attention from either Roman Catholic or Protestant exegesis; while at the same time the more it is considered, the more it must be felt to deserve and demand such attention. For it has to do with the inmost and deepest life of Christianity; and falls in wonderfully also with what we have just seen to be the great need of the Christian world at the present time, in the vast and mighty crisis through which it is now passing. We look upon it accordingly as one of the most significant among the "signs of the time," that there is coming to be an awakened interest in these mysterious oracles heretofore so much overlooked, and that the question *What think ye of Christ?* around which they all revolve, is beginning to be lifted up in such sort as to draw all men toward it, so that even the infidelity of the age is forced to do homage to it, more and more, no less than its faith.

The oracles we speak of are very numerous; far more so than those ecclesiastical Scriptures, "which the Continental reformers neglected," according to Dr. Coxe, and which it is the object of his book now to rescue from the hands of the Romanists, who have made it their business, he says, to "appropriate and abuse them with a malevolent triumph." For "him that hath an ear to hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," the oracles we speak of form indeed an under-tone running through the whole Bible, so that the voice of the Lord in them is felt as "the sound of many waters." We can but notice them here in the broadest and most general way.

They include all that range of Scripture, in which the idea of *revelation*, or the simple making known of God to men—through His Word at large, and then specifically through His Son Jesus Christ—is represented as being identical with the idea of redemption and salvation. The Old Testament is full of this thought, and so also is the New Testament; all culminating in that word of our Saviour's last pontifical prayer: "This is life eternal, that they might KNOW THEE THE ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This it is that we are to understand by what has been called the "*offenbarungs-bewusstsein*" of the first centuries, in distinction from the mere "*erlösungs-bewusstsein*" of the 16th century. The two conceptions are not contradictory; each is in the other; but there is a necessary order in their reciprocal relation, and that order requires that the fact of revelation—not as a theorem, of course, but as a living power—should go before the fact of redemption, for the consciousness of faith—should underlie it—should be for it in truth nothing less than the very womb from which it is born. "God hath shined in our hearts," says St. Paul, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;" and that inshining of God, we now affirm, is itself salvation.

Along with this goes necessarily the idea, that what the Scriptures mean by salvation is nothing less than true and real conjunction with the divine life itself; in the image and likeness of which man was originally made, just that he might be capable of union with God through his intelligence and will—the proper substance of his being—in such actually living and not merely notional way. And who needs to be told, what a world of "neglected Scripture," in both Testaments, is occupied with this high and holy mystery, in which the natural and carnal mind is so prone to see only its own carnality, stigmatizing it perhaps as transcendentalism or pantheism? Take only one text here: "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is IN HIS SON." It is but a specimen of a vast armory of other texts, reiterating in every variety of way the same stupendous thought.

Then follows another class of these oracles of the living God, wherein the Scriptures themselves, and all the facts of redemption, are set forth as having their origin and full deep force only in the actual spiritual world that lies beyond the present world, and in which the whole sense of the present world is all the time comprehended as a fleeting shadow. The economy of salvation being the intensely realistic *life* we have just seen it to be, it *must* have its actuating soul everywhere in the life of eternity, and not in the life of time. So much is signified by the symbolism of the ark of the covenant, overshadowed by the cherubim, behind the veil, in the old Jewish Sanctuary. Divine powers, the very "powers of the world to come," are made to challenge our faith in every part of the Bible. Its words are "spirit and life." The *aura* of an actually present divinity stirs within it, and breathes forth upon us from its pages, if only we come to it in the spirit of little children. Simply to read the 119th Psalm, with right spiritual receptivity, is to come under the force of this strangely mysterious afflatus almost in every verse.

And so finally we have a fourth class of the much neglected Christological (more than Puritanically experimental, and more also than merely churchly) declarations of Scripture, in whose behalf we have here undertaken to speak; namely, that wide chapter, in which faith—the faith that justifies men and saves men—is made to be first of all direct correspondence with the divine life, whether in the Bible or in Christ—both being in this view the presence of the same Word, whose life is the light of men—making room thus, through its own constitution, for the entrance of that life substantively into the believer's spirit. We need not repeat here what we have said on this point in our article on *Christianity and Humanity*, but offer it as a mere corollary following necessarily from the points going before.

We owe it to the Bishop of Western New York, whom we honor in the Lord, to say in conclusion, that his position with regard to the Christian world outside of his own communion, if we understand it rightly, is by no means so ex-

clusive and intolerant as the argument of his book might appear at times to imply. "What I propose," he says, "involves no supercilious claim that my own Church needs no reformation; nor does it involve the folly of saying to others: 'Accept unity by accepting her communion in place of yours.' By no means." To a devout brother of the Lutheran or Presbyterian communion, pleading a sense of duty for staying where he has been providentially placed, his charitable answer is: "I can only say with the prophet, 'Go in peace.' The conditions of modern Catholicity do not permit me to speak as I must have done in the days of Cyprian. This is felt so deeply that the tone of a Cyprian, in these days, excites disgust. It is illogical and impertinent. The only answer is, 'Physician, heal thyself.' Till we illustrate our own principles more practically, it becomes us to be very modest." And so in the end, we feel as if the bishop's stand-point were wholly our own, and are ready to join with sympathetic heart-beat to every word he utters, when we hear him winding up as follows: "What then? The first thing is a general concession that the existing state of things is temporary, and only tolerable till a return to unity can be wrought out by the power of the Spirit, and under the guidance of His providence. Let every Christian look upon the disorganized state of Christendom with sorrow of heart, and yearn and pray and labor for restoration. Then, when the servants of God take pleasure in the stones of the old temple, and 'favor the dust thereof,' then God Himself shall arise and have mercy upon Zion; the time to favor her, yea, the set time will have come; so the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth His glory.' Would to God every Christian who reads these words would agree with me to pray daily in the use of this Psalm, adding, 'Thy kingdom come!' This is the end for which I write; it is much better than prose-lytism."

To which what can we do better than to add, as we do from our inmost heart, the Apocalyptic response: "Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus; come quickly."