

197 2111 2002

THE

✓  
PRINCETON  
REVIEW.

---

By *Whom*, all things; for *Whom*, all things.

---

*FIFTY-FIFTH YEAR.*

---

JULY—DECEMBER.

---

NEW YORK

1879.

## JULY.

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| LABOR AND WAGES IN ENGLAND . . . . .                         | I    |
| PROF. THOROLD ROGERS, LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD            |      |
| THE AIM AND INFLUENCE OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM . . . . . | 27   |
| REV. DR. E. A. WASHBURN, NEW YORK                            |      |
| NEMESIS IN THE COURT-ROOM . . . . .                          | 47   |
| FRANCIS WHARTON, LL.D., CAMBRIDGE                            |      |
| REASON, CONSCIENCE, AND AUTHORITY . . . . .                  | 67   |
| PREBENDARY IRONS, D.D., F.R.H.S., ST. PAUL'S, LONDON         |      |
| THE ORGAN OF MIND . . . . .                                  | 98   |
| PROF. DAVID FERRIER, KINGS COLLEGE, LONDON                   |      |
| MUSIC AND WORSHIP . . . . .                                  | 126  |
| PRESIDENT POTTER, UNION COLLEGE                              |      |
| CHRIST AND THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY . . . . .             | 144  |
| REV. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D., SCOTLAND                         |      |
| LOCAL GOVERNMENT: AT HOME AND ABROAD . . . . .               | 172  |
| ROBERT P. PORTER, ESQ., CHICAGO                              |      |
| PHILOSOPHY AND APOLOGETICS . . . . .                         | 196  |
| PROF. CHARLES W. SHIELDS, PRINCETON COLLEGE                  |      |

---

## SEPTEMBER.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE UNITED STATES . . . . . | 209 |
| PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  |     |
| THE PHILOSOPHIC MOVEMENT IN ITALY . . . . .             | 253 |
| PROF. LUIGI FERRI, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF ROME            |     |
| PAINTING IN ITS HISTORIC RELATIONS . . . . .            | 277 |
| PROF. HENRY COPPÉE, LL.D., LEHIGH UNIVERSITY            |     |

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| RELIGION AND MORALITY . . . . .                         | 302  |
| REV. HENRY N. DAY, D.D., NEW HAVEN                      |      |
| THE PROBLEM OF THE HUMAN WILL . . . . .                 | 328  |
| PROF. HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH  |      |
| THE LAWS OF WAR IN THEIR BEARING ON PEACE . . . . .     | 352  |
| SHELDON AMOS, LL.D., LONDON                             |      |
| SECULARIZED EDUCATION . . . . .                         | 377  |
| PREST. ROBERT L. DABNEY, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY THEOL. SEMINARY |      |
| VIRGIL AS A PRECURSOR OF CHRISTIANITY . . . . .         | 401  |
| PRINCIPAL SHAIRP, D.C.L., UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS     |      |

---

## NOVEMBER.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S EXPOSITION OF HUME'S PHILOSOPHY . . . . . | 421 |
| PRESIDENT PORTER, D.D., LL.D., YALE COLLEGE                  |     |
| UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS IN ENGLAND . . . . .                    | 451 |
| GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L., TORONTO                               |     |
| PROFESSOR TYNDALL UPON THE ORIGIN OF THE COSMOS . . . . .    | 471 |
| MARK HOPKINS, EX-PRESIDENT OF WILLIAMS COLLEGE               |     |
| COMPARATIVE VIEW OF AMERICAN PROGRESS . . . . .              | 493 |
| ROBERT P. PORTER, ESQ., CHICAGO                              |     |
| THE A PRIORI NOVUM ORGANUM OF CHRISTIANITY . . . . .         | 517 |
| LYMAN H. ATWATER, D.D., LL.D., PRINCETON COLLEGE             |     |
| BIMETALLISM . . . . .  | 546 |
| PROF. WILLIAM G. SUMNER, YALE COLLEGE                        |     |
| POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND REVELATION . . . . .   | 579 |
| PRINCIPAL J. W. DAWSON, D.C.L., F.R.S., MONTREAL             |     |
| HERBERT SPENCER'S "DATA OF ETHICS" . . . . .                 | 607 |
| PRESIDENT McCOSH, D.D., LL.D., PRINCETON COLLEGE             |     |

## THE A PRIORI NOVUM ORGANUM OF CHRISTIANITY.

MACHIAVELLI is credited with saying that "there are three classes of men: one who see things in their own light, another who see them when they are shown, and a third who cannot see them even then."<sup>1</sup> We have been thankful, as respects the mysteries of supernatural redemption, for a place in the second class, enabling us to see them when shown us by the authority of God in his Word. We confess that the effort to obey the earnest, not to say imperious, summons of those who would fain enter the first class, by assuming to see things more perfectly in their own *a priori* light, begets a feeling of perilous and growing nearness to the third.

We have no controversy with the advocates of *a priori* knowledge as such, even in the Kantian sense. We are no mere empiricists. We only object to the extravagant lengths to which some carry it, either in itself, or its uses and applications. We hold it to be unquestionable that pure mathematics and logic, *i.e.*, purely formal sciences, are capable of being established *a priori* in the strictest sense, or without proof from experience. Indeed, all universal and necessary propositions must rest upon such evidence, intuitive or deductive. They cannot be proved by experience or by any induction from particular facts, which are themselves contingent. Good and sufficient proof of many laws of nature may be obtained inductively from experience, or *a posteriori*. But *ex vi termini* necessary truths, which cannot but be, never can be proved from contingent facts which in their own nature might or might not be. No ex-

<sup>1</sup> PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1849, p. 262.

perience of ours can grasp all possible instances of two straight lines, or of fraud and blasphemy, or all space and time. Yet we know with absolute certainty that no two straight lines can enclose a space; that fraud and blasphemy are immoral; that space and time are and must be illimitable. This *a priori* knowledge, however, beyond such formal sciences, is limited to a few first principles and elementary axioms. When we come to sciences which involve facts and truths of actual being, it cannot safely proceed a step without the support of *a posteriori* investigation and proof. Trigonometry will establish the height of a steeple, the length of a base-line and the magnitude of the angles formed by this with two other lines being first given. But how can these be ascertained unless by *a posteriori* investigation and measurement?

The history of human thought abounds in abortive, though often brilliant, efforts to construct ontologies, cosmologies, theologies, psychologies, systems of physics, ethics, politics, jurisprudence, by exclusive *a priori* methods. These can only result in signal failure in all the departments of applied science, and sciences of actual being. If any human mind could thus attempt to overfly human nature without a disastrous downfall, surely the mighty philosophic genius of Emanuel Kant, the foremost modern inaugurator of *a priorism* in philosophy, was equal to the task. But even he was a conspicuous example of his own illustration of philosophic speculation soaring to heights above its reach, when he likened it to the case of the bird flying upward into an atmosphere too rare to support its pinions. Baffled in the attempt, it is compelled to sink to its appropriate level. His speculative reason, after soaring to altitudes where it could neither "fly nor go," dropped down into a thicket of contradictions and antinomies, thus wrecking itself in the wreck of all objective knowledge. With "a noble inconsistency" he asserted the validity of the affirmations of the moral reason or conscience, although claiming for it an absolute infallibility inconsistent with the disorder of our moral nature, and the paramount infallibility of revelation. Fichte spun out the thread thus started from Kant's distaff into a subjective, egoistic pantheism, ending one of his lectures, according to Madame de Staël, with this piece of supersublimated transcendentalism: "In the next

lecture we will proceed to create God"! From this subjective egoism, Schelling ascended to the absolute ego grasped by an intellectual intuition so transcendent as to transcend consciousness; whence Hegel, lowering it into the domain of conscious thinking, brought this transcendent philosophizing *à priori* to its grand climacteric in the formulas, "Thought and Being are Identical;" "Pure Being = Nothing;" or in the paraphrase of the famous "Rejected Addresses,"

"And Naught  
Is Everything, and Everything is Naught."

Another striking instance of the *à priori* method misapplied and overdone, in our judgment, is its use by the Rev. W. J. Irons, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, London, in his article in the PRINCETON REVIEW for July, 1879. The topic treated is of the first importance: "Reason, Conscience, and Authority in Reference to Rationalism and Ultramontaniam." His grand solvent of all questions in reference to every branch of this subject is the *à priori*. Indeed he appears to invest it with the prerogatives of a *Novum Organum* of matchless power and oracular authority for determining all Christian controversies. So far as we can gather from this and other writings of Dr. Irons, the outcome of it all, as will soon appear, is a strange complex of Kantian *à priori* Rationalism, Hierarchical Sacramentarianism, Anglo-Catholicism, pre-Reformation Christianity resting on tradition, historic creeds, and the Scriptures—all being kept in due subordination to the *à priori*.

On page 87 of the article referred to he complains that "men of education, but uneducated in philosophical thought, and with no knowledge of revelation as the enlargement of our perception of the *à priori*, not unwillingly accept the most illiterate revivalism as Christianity." On page 92 he speaks of "that enlarged knowledge of the *à priori* which the gospel gives." On page 73 he charges Catholics and Rationalists with "alike abandoning the *à priori*" and holding that if Christianity is to be "admitted at all, it must be so, right or wrong (as we have said), on the authority of the Pope or the authority of the Bible." Queer rationalists these, by the way! And who are justly or

even plausibly chargeable with holding that any system is to be espoused on any pretext, be it right or wrong? Again, page 78, he charges that "the previous question as to the possibility, *à priori*, of serving or pleasing the Supreme and All-perfect against our reason has been as little considered among the assertors of private judgment as among its deniers." As if, indeed, it could be against our reason to serve and please such a Being!

Again, page 81: "Our phenomena, experiences, or conditions may often be to us of the nature of authorities, but still such authorities as imply the *à priori*." On page 83 he complains of the "absence in Cornewall Lewis of the poetry of *à priori* thought, to a degree quite surprising." We think, in the potency ascribed to it by the Prebendary, it must be rather a faculty for poetical creations than for exact truth. In this we are confirmed both by the stupendous results achieved through it by Dr. Irons in this article, and the functions ascribed to it by him in antecedent publications of which this is a small but somewhat explosive echo. While we hold fast by the *à priori* in its legitimate sphere, we protest against the abuse of it when "shot madly from its sphere" in gross misapplication. The justness of the applications made of it may be fairly tested by their results *à posteriori*. We shall not argue the propriety of judging of the tree by its fruits, even if this should incur a fulmination of Dr. Irons against us for bowing to the authority of the Scriptures.

We are now prepared to notice a number of the astounding decrees of this new imperial authority, which comes with somewhat of the pomp and circumstance of a *Novum Organum* in ethics and religion. Of these the first is that submission to the authority of the Pope, and to that of the Bible, are the same in principle.

He says, pages 69-70:

"With a majority of Christendom, at this time, it is the Bishop of Rome, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, who is the "authority" to which reason and conscience is said ultimately to defer. With others it is the authority of Scripture, which, they think, is absolutely to be bowed to, even when it seems opposed to what men feel to be right in principle and true in fact. This idea of "authority" is essentially the same with both sides, and is based on

the supposition that divine truth must come to us in a form of external infallible certainty, even in detail."

Again, page 78:

"The appeals often made to the Divine Scriptures as the practical authority to which reason must surrender, after a certain amount of examination and criticism, are *eo modo* as difficult to reconcile to the rights of conscience as any put forth by Rome."

Does Dr. Irons believe that the "Divine Scriptures" are really divine, that they are the Word of God? If so, are they or are they not true with an "infallible certainty" guaranteed by the omniscient holiness of their author, whether "external" or not? And if so, are acceptance of their teachings and obedience to their precepts to be stigmatized as essentially the same with obedience to a fallible mortal? Does God speak in his Word, and are faith in and submission to his utterances on the same footing as unquestioning submission to the Roman Pontiff? Let him stake his soul on this principle who will. For ourselves, we have and desire no alternative but to obey "the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 3:15.) That final ordeal which "shall try every man's work, of what sort it is," will show who has builded on the rock, and who on the sand.

One clause of the foregoing quotation puts in its strongest form what Dr. Irons, by innumerable forms of assertion and implication, is constantly imputing to evangelical Protestants, who receive the Scriptures not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the Word of God, which worketh effectually in them that believe (1 Thess. 2:13.) It is that they recognize the obligation to bow to the Scriptures when they seem "opposed to what men feel to be right in principle and true in fact." This, like so many of the author's representations of this type, is true or false according to the interpretation it is made to bear, and is so put by him as to convey a false charge or innuendo. No person, on the authority of Scripture, accepts that as true which he feels, *i.e.* knows, to be wrong "in principle" or false "in fact." To do so would be to accept contradictions and upturn the very foundations of all truth in sight and intelligence. No person would believe that two and two make five, or that a square is a circle, or

that the acceptance of bribes to pervert justice is right upon any supposed authority, unless some wild *ultra-fidian* whose motto is *credo quia impossibile*. No sane or intelligent believer would hold that such a meaning could arise from a right interpretation of the Scriptures.

Here is a legitimate case for an *a priori iudicium contradictionis*. But this is not what Dr. Irons chiefly aims at. He refers to statements of fact, doctrine, or precept, for practical guidance, in the Scriptures, and believed and acted on by evangelical Christians upon the authority of the Bible, which involve what human reason, especially when under a hostile bias, cannot readily solve, or see in their harmony with other indisputable moral truths. To some minds these difficulties seem greater, to others less. For most Christians they have been gradually cleared up with the advance of spiritual and intellectual life till attenuated to a vanishing point, or quietly remanded to that region of mystery in which naturalists and supernaturalists must (Dr. Irons to the contrary notwithstanding, page 88) ultimately leave all the problems of nature and grace. *Omnia ex-eunt in mysterium*. We shall find, as we proceed, what special system of doctrines accepted by the great mass of earnest Protestant believers, on the authority of the Bible, Dr. Irons means to brand as antagonistic to his *a priori* standards, and therefore, even if taught in the Scriptures, in his view no more worthy of acceptance than the superstitions of Rome. We shall see, especially, that vicarious atonement, justification by faith, and the system of doctrine and life interlocked with them are particularly referred to.

Meanwhile, let us see how Dr. Irons' *a priori organum* or criteria of righteousness display their efficacy in misrepresentation of his adversaries, and of the issues between him and them. He says of these standards of authority that their advocates "have not succeeded in persuading men that any such standards take the place of reason or conscience among responsible beings" (p. 70). This implies that those who enthrone the authority of the Bible have attempted so to persuade men. Abnormal cases aside, no such attempt has been made, and the imputation of it to evangelical Protestants as a body is a sheer libel. When they betake, or urge others to betake, themselves to the Word of God

for the enlightenment and guidance of their reason and conscience, is this displacing or superseding, or is it elevating and invigorating these faculties? Nay, is it not by the very light of reason and conscience that the Christian is led to the oracles of God for that further and infallible guidance which it thus becomes manifest they alone can give? It is argued to wearisome repetition, as if those accepting the authority of the Bible questioned it, that "whatever comes before us as an obligation should commend itself to our intelligence" (p. 67). Who questions it? But does it follow because a given truth is clearly revealed by God, and for this reason the acceptance of it "commends itself to our intelligence," that we are always able so to grasp it as to bring all its sides at once within our comprehension, or that we are not to believe it till we can fully master it?—that, *e.g.*, the Incarnation is not to be believed till we can understand how a Divine Person could become flesh, and be at once very God and very man? He charges that such submission to external authority, like the Bible, would mean "the suppression of thinking, the persecution of investigation, and the silence of some of the best emotions of the heart of man." "A large proportion of nominal Christians would gladly keep things quiet, and secure peace at the price of truth." This is a grave charge, and if brought, under the somewhat indeterminate term "nominal Christians," against those who incur his objurgations for submitting to the authority of the Scriptures, is simple calumny. Where in all history have free and fruitful thinking and investigation flourished, if not in the atmosphere of biblical religion—a religion born of submission to the authority of the Word of God?

"The thorough desire to be right, the steady aim to be right, must accompany every step of our real progress" (pp. 72, 73). Surely. But what is the aim of the incessant iteration of truisms like this, unless on the assumption and implication that those who accept Christianity on "the authority of the Bible" (see p. 73) proceed in disregard of this principle? "The Catechism of Trent and the Westminster Confession admit the same principle of a formal authority commanding a dead acquiescence in certain points as 'revealed,' whether we can think them true or not" (p. 78). We shall not speak for the Catechism of Trent. With regard to the Westminster Confession, we content ourselves

with an indignant denial. Indeed, we think that candid judges will consider Dr. Irons about the last man to say this, if they will compare some Westminster definitions with his *a priori* ones on the same subjects. The Westminster Shorter Catechism says: "Prayer is an offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Says Dr. Irons: "The Christian philosophy first regards prayer as the effort of the conscious being to hold its true relation with the Absolute. If thought is the effort of the 'Ego' to compare himself with reason, prayer is the effort to compare with the Eternal Good the individual attainment of it. The heart and mind of a man in true prayer are thrown on the *a priori* by a mighty inward *vis*, transcending the individual power, which ever projects itself on reason."<sup>1</sup> It may be due to our weakness, but we confess that, while we give a living acceptance to the Westminster formula on this subject, the best we could give to Dr. Irons' is a "dead acquiescence," if even that were possible. Nor can even the cultivated, to say nothing of the uneducated, masses, whose religious views are so degraded in Dr. Irons' estimation, get as much help from his *a priori* description of faith and religion as from these same maligned formularies. He describes "divine faith as a new sense of *a priori*,"<sup>2</sup> and pronounces religion "a solemn sense of the *a priori*."<sup>3</sup> We will not weaken such deliverances by any comment.

Nor will we consume further space with the quotation of passages asserting or implying that they who are concerned to conform their thinking and beliefs to the teaching of God in his Word, are therefore guilty of indifference to the rightness of their thinking and beliefs. Such charges and insinuations obtrude themselves all through not only this article, but other publications of the author having the remotest relations to the subject that have fallen under our notice. But we pass from these to show that Dr. Irons himself is compelled, after all, to concede the necessity of this deference to external supernatural authority, which he so fiercely denounces but cannot escape—nay, which

<sup>1</sup>"The Church of All Ages," by W. J. Irons, D.D. (London, J. Thayer), pp. 351, 352.

<sup>2</sup>Id., p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>Id., Preface, p. xiii.

form such a network in our moral condition and environment that the more he who holds to any God-given religion tries to escape them, the tighter he often draws them about him. He admits in his article that the "prohibitions of conscience" are sometimes "spurious" (p. 87). "No man, after all, is eager to claim intellectual freedom so far as to dispense with *all* authority" (p. 79). He declares that even on such vital questions as marriage, its lawful degrees of consanguinity, polygamy, parental and marital authority—"all these are questions on which natural morality can give but the vaguest possible decision." And though "all these, and countless other and more complicated questions, are involved in the very beginnings of society, and cannot be settled without the religious aspirations and sentiments being regarded and satisfied; and these all belong to the *a priori*;" yet "natural conscience without religion . . . in its least artificial state decides too indistinctly on such questions for its voice to be of use."<sup>1</sup> Nay, he adopts as unquestionable the following deliverance of Cardinal Newman (P. R. Art., p. 85):

"The sense of right and wrong, which is the first element in religion, is so delicate, so fitful, so easily puzzled, obscured, perverted, so subtle in its argumentative methods, so impressible by education, so biassed by pride and passion, so unsteady in its flights, that in the struggle for existence, amid various exercises and triumphs of the human intellect, this sense is at once the highest of all teachers, yet the least luminous. . . . Natural religion, certain as are its grounds and its doctrines as addressed to thoughtful, serious minds, needs, in order that it may speak to mankind with effect and subdue the world, to be sustained and completed by revelation."

He adds the comment, as if some parties questioned or ignored it [who are they?]"—"But then it obliges us to own that we are held responsible for right doing by some direct though dim discernment that we possess, and not in consequence of elaborate definitions." But not only does this "dim discernment" of ethical truth require to be "sustained and completed by revelation." Natural religion, or the light of nature, however completed and clarified, could never give us the first glimpse of the Trinity, Incarnation, Divine Redemption in all its parts,

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," pp. 363, 364.

however it may prove our perishing need of them. The knowledge of all this must come to us by supernatural revelation from God, and be received upon his authority, if at all. It can only be known *a posteriori* from the testimony of God, and all pretence of knowing it *a priori*, by mere force of native *a priori* conceptions, is but a *priorism* run mad. What pretext then remains, after such concessions, for incessant charges against those who obey the revelations and mandates of the All-wise and All-holy God in his Word, of being disloyal to truth and righteousness, to conscience, and to God?

Whatever the motive for all this, it serves to prepare the way for discharging at that evangelical Christianity, which makes implicit conformity to the Word of God the law of its inner and outer life, the libellous caricatures of Clifford and Huxley, prominent among the agnostic materialists of our day. We come then to these portraiture of Protestant evangelical Christianity by which this hierophant of *a priori* righteousness illustrates its alleged superiority. Let us first make sure what it is at which this vituperation is aimed. He frequently applies the term Calvinism to it, a term with which he is very apt to label whatever lies between the ritualism and sacramentarianism of Rome and Anglo-Catholicism on the one hand, and rationalistic scepticism on the other: especially the religion of the great multitude who make the Bible their supreme rule of life, and adopt the maxim that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." These include the great mass of earnest Christians in the middle and humble, with a large proportion of the higher and cultured classes. Thus we find him speaking of "the natural Calvinism of the uneducated."<sup>1</sup> "The popular Calvinism, and the Roman Catholic controversialists of the day, alike slur over the initial truth" alluded to. "To be one of 'the elect,' or to be 'in the true church,' seems, however, the first hope of modern Christians, Protestant or Catholic."<sup>2</sup> "The former seems the modern Calvinian and the modern Roman method. The latter (*i.e.*, as the whole volume shows him to mean, what he regards as the High-Anglican way) is natural, and leads to the supernatural in a right way. It is ethical, primitive,

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 378.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, pp. 177, 178.

and catholic."<sup>1</sup> Such is the author's *usus loquendi*. By Calvinism he means the form which Christianity naturally takes with the "uneducated," in which it actually prevails with the great mass of Protestants. "Calvinism" is the author's contrast with Romanism and High-Anglicanism. This style of speaking is carried out in the article under review, in which by such phrases as "the popular Calvinism," "the popular Calvinism of the uneducated," used synonymously with such phrases as "the uneducated substitute for Christianity which is so fatally spread among the populace," and "the popular substitute for our religion," represented also as that of "evangelicals." The vast sweep of his denunciations is still further decisively evinced when he speaks of "Chalmers' semi-Calvinian representation of Conscience sitting as a queen among our faculties" ("Church of All Ages," p. 208). This is, for substance, Bishop Butler's doctrine. If this is to be condemned as Calvinistic, very little of much importance in ethics and religion will be left outside of Calvinism, which, whatever its merits or demerits, need not fear such attacks. (For the writer's further views of the "Supremacy of Conscience and of Revelation," he must refer those interested to his article on that subject in this REVIEW for May, 1879, p. 671.) Such denunciations strike at the great body of evangelical Christians in the Church of England who embrace its Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, to which the Anglo-Catholic divines, like our author, seldom do honor: the Presbyterians, the Independents and Congregationalists, the Baptists and the Methodists, who are among the evangelicals, and certainly receive the teaching of the Bible upon the authority of God. It will be seen, too, that the caricatures endorsed by Dr. Irons are, for substance, equally applicable to the faith of all these bodies. That the views of evangelical Christians, within and without the Church of England, are identified in the author's estimation and reprobation appears still further from his language in the "Church of All Ages" (p. 47). "A form of nonconformity sprung up within the Church herself, and became known as 'evangelical,' . . . but the church as a body was unable to take up this movement, which chiefly contributed at the time to quicken the sects."

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 183.

Indeed, Prof. Clifford is quoted as describing "the popular and received theology of Christian communities, as he understands it," in the following abominable caricature, about as near the truth as some disjointed and broken bones of a skeleton, tumbled together in a heap, would be like the complete body in full flesh and blood sustained by and adorning the same skeleton. Quite possibly fragments could be picked out of crude or passionate utterances of controvertists, and polemics, and even higher sources, including the Bible itself, and so jumbled together as to simulate the ghastly portraiture which we regret to be obliged to spread out again on the pages of this REVIEW :

"The condition of men departed this life depends ultimately on the will of a being who, a long while ago, cursed all mankind because one woman disobeyed him. The curse was no mere symbol of displeasure, but a fixed resolve to keep his victims alive forever, writhing in horrible torments in a place which his divine foreknowledge had prepared beforehand. In consideration, however, of the death of his son, effected by unknowing agents, he consented to feed with the sweets of his favor such poor wretches as should betray their brethren and speak sufficiently soft words to the destroyer of their kindred. For the rest, the old curse survives in its power, condemning them for the manifestation of his glory. To the dead, then, if this be the future life, there is left only the choice between shame and suffering. How well and nobly soever a man shall have worked for his fellows, he must end by being the eternal sycophant of a celestial despot, or the eternal victim of a celestial executioner."

Says Dr. Irons: "This, though expressed with a savage venom for which there is no excuse, is the popular Calvinism." He thus endorses its truth, and, in our view, therein shows a "savage venom" far less excusable in the self-proclaimed *a priori* oracle than in the earth-bound materialist. It is the less excusable that it is deliberate and from no sudden impulse. We find the same thing uttered in substance years ago, when he spoke of "some theories of justification unknown to the Christian creeds, and yet unhappily identified with Christianity itself by such writers as Professor Clifford and the author of 'Christianity a Civilized Heathenism.'"<sup>1</sup> This is an incidental sign that the caricature is applied to all those bodies of Christians which have for their basis the doctrine of justification by faith,

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 389.

the key-note of the Protestant Reformation. Those who wish to see how far elaborate special pleading can be carried to argue "forensic justification" out of the writings of St. Paul, may consult Dr. Irons' "Bampton Lectures," note F, p. 515. On page 272 of the same volume they will find the whole doctrine "of the substitution of the personal goodness of the Saviour for that of the sinner;" of "his atoning death as a mere equivalent of vicarious suffering appropriated by us; that multiform mechanism of sudden pardon *ab extra* presented in so many ways among various Christians" denounced as "crudities so incompatible with the Gospel that it is amazing that any intelligent conscience has ever accepted them." This, however inaccurately expressed, is aimed at the common faith of evangelical Protestants, by whatever name called.

But says Dr. Irons, "The core of this fanaticism lies, however, in its mechanical predestination, which is equivalent to universal materialism, and is easily admitted by the imperfectly ethical multitude, educated or not" (p. 88). The upholders of mechanical predestination and universal materialism, whoever they may be, may defend them as they see fit. We know of none among evangelical Christians, whatever exceptional and sporadic cases may be hunted up. Certainly the Westminster Confession maintains predestination, "so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established" (chap. iii. 1). And we commend to the attention of Dr. Irons, Bishop Ellicott, and Dr. Washburn, who have of late greeted the readers of this REVIEW with their views of Calvinism and predestination, the Seventeenth Article of their own church, which declares "that the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons." Dr. Irons, however, much as he detests predestination, does not seem able to get rid of it, as he confronts St. Paul's utterances about it. He says: "It is He who, as St. Paul's teaching is, 'plans' his world, or, as the word is sometimes said, predestinates. . . . Every intelligent being 'plans' beforehand, that is, 'predestinates.' . . . All predestination, too, implies a consideration of its object; election is moral, but predestination is the

inward act, the special thinking of the mind alone. If we speak of God's predestinating, we can only mean that God, the Supreme Mind, always proceeds according to that which he thinks best, in his government of his universe."<sup>1</sup> On this subject Dr. Irons and the creed of his church sufficiently answer Dr. Irons, not less than the following lines quoted by him :

" To him no high, no low, no great, no small ;  
He fills, he bounds, sustains, and *orders* all." <sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the author finds his Calvinian spectre in the slur contained in Professor Clifford's savage reference to the fall of the race in the Fall of its progenitors. There is no necessity of defending or extenuating the biblical and Christian doctrine on this subject, as held substantially by Calvinist, Arminian, Romanist, or Anglo-Catholic. If it could be wrenched out of the Bible or eliminated from Christianity, this would not destroy the facts still remaining in Nature and Providence, which, so far from being aggravated, are rather relieved by the scriptural account of their origin. Inveigh, if you please, against God for the permission of sin and the unsolved origin and wide domination of evil. The moan of the suffering babe, and the awful prevalence of sin, death, and woe in this world, under the dominion of a righteous and merciful God, still present an enigma which it will require a greater than Professor Clifford or Dr. Irons to solve. But why should Dr. Irons endorse scoffing caricatures on this dread theme? Surely, if they are just against Calvinists and evangelicals, they are no less so against himself. For he declares, "*If* there be a God, *since* there is a God, the human race is implicated in some terrible aboriginal calamity. It is out of joint with the purposes of its Creator. This is a fact, a fact as true as the fact of its existence ; and thus the doctrine of what is theologically called original sin becomes to me almost as certain as that the world exists, and as the existence of God."<sup>3</sup> Again, he seems to adopt something like the realistic theory both of the Fall and Redemption. "It is an essential part of all the problems connected both with our

<sup>1</sup> "Christianity as Taught by St. Paul," by William J. Irons, D.D., p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 157. (Italics are ours.) <sup>3</sup> Id., p. 186.

fall and our rising, that it is with associated man that we have to deal. Self-contained as we are [in so awful a solitude for each of us], yet are we, in our destiny throughout, parts of the great human whole. Our 'nature,' our 'humanity' are no nominal conceptions. None can win our assent to the theory that Human Nature is merely a 'collective term.' . . . All inherit physically a certainty of death, which affects the whole career of life. And there is a moral and social inheritance also. . . . The race of moral beings has a unity of its own, notwithstanding the individual unity of each of its members; and some injury has surely befallen the race, whatever be the share of personal responsibility in every one. . . . So that what has in later time come to be called 'original sin' is but a fact, most reasonably stated in the words, 'By one man sin entered' [for a beginning it must have had], 'and so it passed on to all men,' each adding his own sinfulness."<sup>1</sup> "There was to be as real a union for us with the second Adam as we had by nature with the first Adam."<sup>2</sup>

We leave this caricature of that Protestant Christianity which alone prevails or has life and power with the great body of Protestant religious people, to notice his parade of Prof. Huxley's blind fulmination (it lacks even the semblance of similitude requisite to constitute it a caricature), which wants any sign of being hurled more at Calvinism than Arminianism, or at anything less than all evangelical theology and religion. Says this scoffer in the abused name of science: "Who shall exaggerate the deadly influence on personal morality of those theologies which have represented the Deity as vainglorious, irritable, and revengeful, as a sort of pedantic drill-sergeant of mankind, to whom no valor, no long-trying loyalty, could atone for the displacement of a button of the uniform, or the misunderstanding of a paragraph of the regulations and instructions" (p. 88).

These denunciations by a materialist, as vague as bitter, against, for all that appears to the contrary, Christianity in general, the Prebendary quotes as "another example of the revolt of conscience against the prevalent Calvinism of the uneduca-

<sup>1</sup> "Christianity as Taught by St. Paul," by Wm. J. Irons, pp. 120-1-2.

<sup>2</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 241.

ted." But he soon shows himself shy and wary, lest the charge he has thus exploded against the religion of so many Christian people should rebound upon himself. He suspects "regulations and instructions" may be meant for the Scriptures, and "uniform" for the Creed. When the Creed is impugned in the least iota, Dr. Irons reminds Professor Huxley that "things that look sometimes very small—*e.g.*, Davy's safety-lamp in a mine—may be important," so important that "no 'valor or loyalty' could atone for" the least breach of regulations about it. He shows doubts of having "caught the whole meaning of the passage." He not obscurely intimates that it is defiled with "scoffing," and that its author resorts to "hinting and mocking." Yet he agrees with Professors Huxley and Clifford that "such 'theologies' as they condemn in these places are abominable." Still he seems not to be quite sure that some part of his own may not be included. In fact, Prof. Clifford was specially intolerant of sacerdotalism.

And now what is the grand finale in which this parade and endorsement of these venomous thrusts at all living Protestant Christianity, beyond one narrow section of his own Church which homologates with him, terminates? What is its outcome? Answer, see page 90. "The position with which we began (section 4) is now made plain, that the popular substitute for our religion is what cultivated conscience rejects." We shrink from using the terms which alone can express our sense of the enormity of this conclusion from premises at once so slender and so false. The premises are the ravings of two distinguished materialists, largely classed as agnostics and nihilists, against the principles of the immense majority of earnest and zealous Protestant Christians—caricatures so gross that even Dr. Irons cannot refrain, while endorsing them, from rebuking the "savage venom," the "scoffing" and "mocking" which defile them.<sup>1</sup> And these are the typical dicta of "cultivated conscience:" proofs that "cultivated conscience" rejects the "religion" of the great body of Christian people, which he branded as not being the Christian religion, by declaring it a "substitute"

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Huxley's attitude is well understood. In regard to Prof. Clifford, W. H. Mallock says (*Contemporary Review*, vol. xxix. p. 172): "No one can

therefor. We recommend to Dr. Irons the application of his own well-expressed principle to his own procedure. "Neither have they [objections] any validity if they are directed against a caricature of our religion, and not our religion itself" (p. 87). We greatly prefer the rectitude fostered by the religion denounced as a "substitute" for Christianity, as tested by its fruits, to which we shall presently ask attention. Still further, notwithstanding these denunciations of it as "uneducated," he declares it to be "easily admitted by the imperfectly ethical multitude, educated or not" (p. 88). After all, then, it seems to be accepted easily by the educated as well uneducated multitude; only, to accept it is evidence of being "imperfectly ethical," not in respect to purity of life or fruitfulness of good works, but some kind of *a priori* standard; which is a poor substitute for them. This *a priori* religionism dominating over the authority of the Bible seems, according to this reasoning, to be the differentia of a "cultivated conscience." It must be narrowed down to this, in order to afford even a pretext for the allegation that the religion he stigmatizes is repulsive to the cultivated conscience and intelligence of our time. There is as large intelligence and as generous culture among its adherents as among its rejecters. *A priori* religionists have no monopoly here.

But suppose it were otherwise. While Christianity furnishes the stimulus and the atmosphere in which intellect, culture, science, and knowledge thrive, so that Christendom is the theatre of their greatest advancement and of the highest civilization of modern times, it is no less true that its chief triumphs have not been in the first instance among the philosophers and *savans*, *a priori* or *a posteriori*, but among the humble and average classes

be more vehement, more positive, more explicit than Prof. Clifford in his denial of any belief in God or in immortality. These beliefs, according to him, are absurd, are groundless, are demonstrably false. He attacks them in every conceivable way, with reason and with rhetoric. And yet, when he touches on the moral side of life, he adopts all the warmth and all the indignation of a religious zealot fighting for the glory of God. In the name of a high morality he calls all faith in the supernatural 'blasphemy' and 'unspeakable profanity.' Like the apostles of Christ, he invokes 'the sleepless vengeance of fire' upon those who do not share his unbelief, but who still 'soil their hearts,' as he puts it, with arguing for their gods, their hells, their heavens—'sickly dreams,' so he calls these, 'of hysterical women and of half-starved men.'

of mankind, of whose elevation it has been the great lever. While welcoming all converts, and rejoicing in the submission of the wise and noble to its standards, it depends on no man's vote, but on the authority of God its Author. If any people, however cultivated, reject or scoff at it, so much the worse for them. They are so far wrongly cultivated, or abusers of their culture. Let them correct their vagaries and come into accord with eternal truth. God's Word standeth sure, and no earthly or unearthly principalities or powers shall prevail against it. With no contempt of learning on his part, it was the common people who heard Christ gladly. With the exception of the "philosophic apostle," who did so much to develop in the Bible the substance and form of Christian doctrine, unlearned men were chosen to the apostolate by him to superintend the planting and founding of the primitive church. The New Testament abounds in manifold representations of the scorn which the Gospel encountered at the hands of the lofty and philosophic, and of its triumphs among the people. It was to the "Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." Then, as now, the greatest intellectual pretension and pride often went athwart the track of heavenly wisdom. "Professing to be wise, *φάσκειντες εἶναι σοφοί*, they became fools." To this grade does all "cultivated conscience" which chafes against the Gospel come.

We now pass to notice the views on these subjects contained in an article in this REVIEW from one tinctured with decided antipathy to Calvinism and evangelicalism, but of a vastly higher tone than that thus far under consideration. We refer to the paper of Dr. Ellicott, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol,<sup>1</sup> on "The Anglo-Catholic Movement, Past and Future." He says the "shadows of Calvinism were resting on well-nigh one half of the Church of England," *i.e.*, the half made up of the evangelical party, prior to the publication of the Oxford Tracts and the consequent Anglo-Catholic movement growing out of

<sup>1</sup> PRINCETON REVIEW, September, 1878, beginning p. 612.

it. The religious books put in the hands of youth were, says his Lordship, "tinged with a sub-Calvinistic teaching which chilled and antagonized. There was no sunshine. . . . Nay, no genial teaching of that ever-fresh and ever-quickening gospel story. . . . Religion was sombre and unattractive." Yet, on the same page, the venerable prelate assures us that "of the two great schools of thought, only the evangelical had any degree of vitality," and speaks of its "love for souls," its "enthusiasm and glowing devotion which had breathed again the breath of life into the Church of England in the closing decades of the preceding century." True, he says that all this was dying out in what he calls "those dull and dreary days" (p. 616). But the best evidence we can find satisfies us that this, if not wholly a mistake, is greatly overcolored through the learned bishop's prepossessions.<sup>1</sup> Still he is candid enough to say, while invoking the union of the evangelical party with the Anglo-Catholic in the English Church, to arrest the Romanizing movement so portentous in his eyes, "We do not forget the other great party to which the Church of the Reformation already owes so deep a debt of lasting gratitude. If the great evangelical party had not quickened the Church, there could have been no Oxford movement five-and-forty years ago. Nay, those who most influenced the movement were themselves originally of evangelical prin-

<sup>1</sup> Austerity is no way essential to Calvinism or Arminianism. It is simply characteristic of earnest Christianity, when confronted with abounding iniquity, frivolity, and vice, against which it raises an emphatic testimony by proportionately rigid self-denial. So a kind of Puritanism has been apt to attend every great religious reformation from prevalent worldliness, self-indulgence, and licentiousness. Against precisely this state of things the evangelicals raised the standard, and sounded aloud the trumpet-call to repentance. While severely simple and pure in life, they had more than earthly joys. But no Christians, as a class, are more glad and cheerful than Calvinists. Contrariwise, the austerity of the Arminian Wesley was in some respects extreme. We remember that in our youthful days it was an Arminian congregation that adopted the Quaker costume in contrast to the more fashionable attire of Calvinistic congregations on the same town-square. Says Canon Wilberforce: "Cowardice in the service of Jesus is the most insidious of all evils, because it so soon takes to itself some fair name and aspect, calling itself freedom from prejudice, emancipation from prudery, reaction from Puritanism; because when it inspires the fashionable world, it gains fresh might and power every day, until it eats at last the whole heart and life out of religion, leaving only its husk and its mask."

principles, and owed perhaps all their future influence to that depth of personal religion, and that adoring love of a personal Redeemer, which they had attained to when under the teaching of a very different school of Christian thought. The great evangelical party can never be overlooked in any estimate of the vicissitudes of the church of the future" (p. 638). "The High Church party, on the other hand, has begun to appreciate and to apply that warm, personal, and individualizing ministry of Christ crucified to each sin-laden soul, which has so long and so blessedly characterized the teaching of the best days of the evangelical movement" (p. 640). "The evangelical party, by the blessing of the Holy Ghost, had almost exclusively in the past fifty years sustained the holy and blessed work of the revivification of the Church of England. They had brought back life; they had made salvation to be felt as something real and individual; they had rendered the Redeemer's own vital words as to personal conversion a deep subjective conviction and reality; they had been as the life-bearing wind that had swept over the dry bones of the valley—all this they had been, and may they be forever blessed and honored for this work" (p. 618). The bishop's "shadows of Calvinism," which darken the beginning of his vivid picture of the evangelical movement, vanish under the glow of Christian life and fruitfulness, in which his candor leads him to set forth its actual workings. We shall notice Dr. Ellicott's High Church sacramentarianism in connection with Dr. Irons' views of that subject. Meanwhile, we propose to corroborate our estimate of that type of religion, by decisive testimony of witnesses who are not its adherents, against which the Prebendary has hurled the poisoned shafts of Clifford and Huxley.

In an article on the evangelical movement in the *British Quarterly Review* for July, 1879, Mr. Gladstone, after finding its originators in Wesley, Whitefield, Hervey, Berridge, Romaine, and Toplady, who, unlike Wesley, had decided leanings towards Calvinism, says, not untruly: "The points in which the evangelical school permanently differed from the older and traditional Anglicanism were those of the Church, the Sacraments, and the forensic idea of justification. They are not, in my view, its strong points. . . . That the preaching of the Gospel a

hundred years ago had disappeared, not by denial, but by lapse, from the majority of Anglican pulpits, is, I fear, in large measure, an historic truth. To bring it back again was the aim and work of the evangelical reformers in the sphere of the teaching function. Whether they preached Christ in the best manner may be another question; but of this there is now and can be little question that they preached Christ; they preached Christ largely and fervently where, as a rule, he was but little and but coldly preached before. And who is there that will not say from his heart, 'I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice'?"<sup>1</sup> Again, although Mr. Gladstone is trying to prove Mr. Lecky's estimate of their influence exaggerated, he concedes that in activity and moral influence they counted for a good deal more than their numbers. "The vessels of zeal and fervor, taken man for man, far outweighed the heroes of the ball-room and the hunting-field, or the inert, half-animated minds, and perfunctory performers of a minimum of stipulated duty, who supplied so considerable a number of the clerical host."<sup>2</sup> Again, "it was common, in my early days, for morality to be taught without direct derivation from, or reference to, the Person of Christ."<sup>3</sup> He declares that "the pith and life of the evangelical teaching, as it consists in the reintroduction of Christ our Lord to be the woof and warp of preaching, was the great gift of the movement to the teaching Church, and has now penetrated and possessed it on a scale so general that it may be considered as pervading the whole mass."<sup>4</sup> Whatever its faults, he declares evangelicalism to have been "born to do a noble work, and that the men, to whose hands the work was committed, were men worthy of this high election. Further, in respect to its vivifying and restoring influences, that work is one as permanent as the Gospel; for it is no more or less than an effective inception, if not a full development, of the restoring agency by which the Gospel restores our weak and defaced humanity to more than its ancient beauty. . . . It may also be that a more or less pronounced evangelical school is still required for the general religious welfare of the Anglican Church, in order to maintain, if only by an emulation as between

<sup>1</sup> *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1879, Am. ed., p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, p. 9.

the men of Apollos and of Paul, the vigor and activity in the Anglican body of those 'doctrines of grace' without which the salt of Christianity soon loses all its savor."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Lecky, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* (August, 1879), defends still stronger statements, which he had made in his *History*, of the power of the evangelical movement, against certain criticisms of Mr. Gladstone in the article from which we have already quoted. He is well known to be far enough from any evangelical bias or sympathy. The reader will please note that by evangelicalism he understands that sort of religion, in and out of the Anglican Church, which is earnest in bringing men to faith and newness of life, through the blood of Christ, and regeneration by his Spirit, whether Calvinists, Arminians, or neither. He speaks of it as the "religious revival which began with the writings of Law, found its first exponents in the Wesleys and Whitefields, and which Grimshaw, Berridge, Newton, Romaine, Joy, Venn, and the other leaders of the evangelical party carried over the length and breadth of England. These men and their colleagues gradually changed the whole spirit of the English Church. They infused into it a new fire and passion of devotion, kindled a spirit of fervent philanthropy, raised the standard of clerical duty, and completely altered the tone and tendency of the preaching of its ministers. Before the close of the century the evangelical movement had become dominant in England, and it continued the almost undisputed centre of religious life till the rise of the Tractarian movement in 1830."<sup>2</sup> While Mr. Lecky concedes, in response to the criticisms of Mr. Gladstone, that the word dominant is not happily chosen, and adds that "the ascendancy of evangelicalism in the Nonconformist bodies Mr. Gladstone has not disputed, . . . I must still maintain that at the close of the eighteenth century the evangelical movement had not only fully developed its principles and its powers, but had become, both in Nonconformity and in the Church, the chief centre of religious activity in England. . . . By the end of the eighteenth century the evangelical party had attracted to itself nearly all the fervor, the activity, the spirit of relig-

<sup>1</sup> *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1879, Am. ed., p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1879, p. 280.

ious propagandism and of religious enthusiasm that was circulating in the community" (pp. 280, 281).

He proceeds to prove this by a variety of incontestable facts, such as the prodigious growth of a religious literature from the pens of evangelical authors, which superseded the works previously in vogue, and became the "chief religious reading of the middle and lower, if not of the higher, classes in England." The figures and facts on this subject, produced by him, are simply prodigious.

He justly observes that "few things reflect more clearly the deeper devotional feelings of an age than its hymns, and in hymns the last part of the eighteenth century in England was peculiarly rich. The names of Toplady, Cowper, Madan, Newton, and Charles Wesley will at once occur to the reader. All these were ardent evangelicals; all of them were members of the Anglican Church" (p. 282).

This view of the hymns in favor with bodies of Christians is equally just and profound. It has a much wider reach than he has given it in regard to some charges against the popular religion, whether formulated in Arminian or Calvinistic theological dogmas, with which we have had to deal in this article. The favorite hymns of a communion, and not the strained inferences and imputations of angry polemics, most truly express the manner in which their respective creeds are practically accepted and made operative in the inner life of their adherents. Tried by this test, how are the dismal "shadows," which the supporters of different types of evangelical theology sometimes see in their own distortions of opposing systems, swept away by those hymns of faith, hope, love, resignation, adoration, exultation, which voice the inmost thought and feeling of all true Christians of whatever name? And what a comment is this on all exclusiveness *a priori* and *a posteriori*, when we find the hymns composed by those against whom they vent their bitterest prejudices eagerly appropriated, to express the glad outpourings of their own souls to God, and their most vivid and delighted conceptions of divine truth! Herein we find the strongest proof of the real unity of all the people of God, the whole communion of saints, no matter into how many folds divided, or by what bars of exclusion hindered from visible fellowship with

each other. In this matter no church can say to any other, "I have no need of thee." No satisfactory hymnal can be made up for any one Christian denomination that excludes the choice hymns produced in other communions. We have seen a Roman Catholic book of devotion enriched by Protestant hymns. The collections of the most sacramentarian and ritualistic religionists are always enriched with hymns by evangelicals and dissenters, and *vice versa*. We attended three successive funeral services in Protestant Episcopal churches in which the hymn of Toplady, a great Calvinistic polemic, "Rock of Ages, cleft for me," was most appropriately sung. What collection can do without that sweet song of Muhlenburg, "I would not live away, I ask not to stay," or that of Dwight, "I love thy kingdom, Lord," or the hymns of Doddridge, Watts, and others of all ages and communions, of Churchmen High and Low, and of evangelical dissenters? We quite agree with Mr. Gladstone when he says: "This very remarkable 'communion of hymns,' so to call it, which now prevails throughout the land, is in truth one among the consolatory signs of the great amount of religious unity still subsisting, though amidst many and even important differences, in this nation" (p. 13). It is along the line of experimental and devotional feelings and utterances, and not of dogmatic controversy (although we are the last to undervalue dogma in its proper place and function), that, in the words of one of the inimitable hymns just referred to, "The saints of all ages in harmony meet."

Mr. Lecky proceeds to prove his position, by citing the great Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Reformation of Morals and Manners originated and supported by the evangelical party. The need of the restoration of the religion embodied in the Articles and with slight exceptions, the Liturgy and Homilies of the Church of England, effected through the evangelical movement, is evident enough from the prevalence of frigid scepticism indicated by Bishop Butler, in his advertisement prefixed to his Analogy, and, making every allowance for possible misunderstanding and exaggeration, from the following statement of Mr. Lecky (p. 284):

"Blackstone relates that early in the reign of George the Third he went from church to church to hear every clergyman of note in London,

and did not hear a single discourse which had more Christianity in it than the writings of Cicero, and that it would be impossible for him to discover from what he heard whether the preacher was a follower of Confucius, of Mahomet, or Christ."

All this is confirmed by equivalent testimonies from Addison, Montesquieu, Sir James Stephen, and Canon Ryle, which want of space compels us to omit. (See "The Later Evangelical Fathers," by M. Seelye, p. 12.)

Further vindication of what has been stigmatized by one—we must hope exceptional—dignitary of the English Church as a "popular substitute for our religion" is superfluous. We must now pass from what he denounces to what he espouses as an "enlargement of the *a priori*."

In the article under review he uses the following language :

"The great advancing power of Christianity lay at first in baptism, which demanded moral preparation, and in the sacrament of Christ's body and blood binding men together for 'eternal life.' The intellectual distinction, or 'belief,' of the Christian community came from these two rites; which again issued in the 'Creeds,' and the same faith was educated by the Peschito Scriptures in the East, and by the Itala in the West; supplemented by the care of Origen and Jerome. Having these—the divine sacraments, creeds, and scriptures—a threefold supernatural growth, the Church, of course, asserted herself outwardly the 'pillar and ground of the truth.' But there was also the work of the interior life, which went on in individual moral agents, and constituted everywhere the indestructible essence of Christianity in man. Ages moved on, but with no definition of the canon, or of its inspiration, or of the atonement of Christ, or of the work of God's grace in man's moral nature, or of other and more numerous points, the correct confession of which men often consider 'necessary to salvation' " (pp. 93, 94).

Elsewhere he tells us that "to the authority of the historical creeds, sacraments, hierarchy, and scriptures, a true return must first be moral."<sup>1</sup> "We received it from our fathers, when they accepted that pre-Reformation Christianity to which I would now ask attention. Our reformers did not affect to proclaim a new Gospel. They took, as I may say, even the organized framework of existing Christianity—Bible, hierarchy, sacra-

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 201.

ments, creeds." <sup>1</sup> "No theory, however, can evade the conclusion that we have in the creeds, the sacraments, and the hierarchy of Christendom the actual historical 'outcome' of the 'Word made flesh and dwelling among us.'" <sup>2</sup> "AND NOW, and in my last hour, I would cast my lot with the saints of the 'church of all ages'—their creeds, their sacraments, their worship, their hierarchy, their 'GOD with us.'" <sup>3</sup> In the title-page of "The Church of All Ages," he describes its contents as "Four Addresses on the Christian Revelation." His dedication of it reads: "To his Grace the Most Reverend Archibald Campbell, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England, this volume is dedicated with his permission—not as implying his Grace's approval in all things, but his recognizing the always acknowledged place in the Church of England of those who loyally adhere to the historic Creeds and Hierarchy of Christianity." The Primate of all England will take good care, we are sure, not to give his imprimatur to the Prebendary's *a priori organum*. But from the foregoing passages, as well as many others, in which he strives to minimize the legitimate scope of the Reformation, and the extent of the change from the "pre-Reformation" basis wrought by it in the English Church, we infer that he maintains the highest views of the efficacy of the sacraments, with the limitation of that efficacy to the hierarchy descended by unbroken, actual succession from the apostles—a hierarchy which constitutes the only lawful ministry ever dreamed of by the Oxford Tractarians, or the Anglo-Catholic party in the English Church which has grown out of it; has furnished such large recruits to the Romish Church; and which, according to Bishop Ellicott's article, unless present tendencies are arrested, will continue to furnish them in alarming abundance. In truth, the impression given us by such of the Prebendary's writings as we have seen, is that he has a hundred points of sympathy with the historic Romish Hierarchy and Church to one with Protestant bodies outside of the Anglo-Catholic party, of the Church of England, and that his strongest repulsion from Rome springs from its recent dogma of Papal Infallibility, which leaves no place for *a priori* Chris-

<sup>1</sup> "Church of All Ages," p. 248.

<sup>2</sup> Id., p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> Id., p. 315.

tianity. Submission to this seems to him a crime no whit less or greater than submission to the Scriptures as infallible. Scriptures, creeds, sacraments, hierarchy, are apparently placed in the same category as constituting revelations from God, of like authority—at least when duly interpreted, and sanctioned by the requisite *a priori* tribunals. We, too, cast in our “lot with the saints of the ‘church of all ages,’ their creeds,” not as of co-ordinate authority with the Scripture, but because, according to the Eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles, “they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture;” with “the sacraments,” also, because (according to Articles XXVII. and XXVIII.) they are full of spiritual benefit to those who receive them “rightly, worthily, and with faith;” their worship, too, when “in spirit and in truth.” But we do not see our way to submission to any “hierarchy” which does not teach the truth of God and administer discipline in accordance with it. Dr. Irons’ idea of the efficacy of baptism is intimated when he speaks of the “saints who baptized to the Trinity whole nations, ‘born in a day’ ” (Id., p. 317).

Bishop Ellicott, in the article already referred to, in sharp contrast to Dr. Irons, lifts up the Bible as “speaking to all hearts, telling clearly its divine truths to all that had ears to hear—the Bible of Protestant Christendom to which all might confidently appeal, the blessed, fresh, and living Word that to the humble spirit was its own best and truest interpreter.” He rebukes those who made it “rather the book of the Church,” which “could only be profitably read and truly understood under that specially accredited guidance” (pp. 627, 628). In this and various respects his article is of a much higher tone than that of Dr. Irons. But his Lordship warmly approves the Oxford Tract movement in respect to three features which he contends originally characterized it: 1. “That sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of the divine grace. 2. That the true efficacy of the sacraments depends on the rightfulness of the commission of those that administer them, or . . . the ‘apostolic succession’—the apostolic commission of the bishops, and under them of the presbyters of the church. . . . 3. Fixed and unwavering opposition to the teaching of the Church of Rome. ‘No peace with Rome’ was at first the watchword of the party”

(p. 622). Of the two first principles he observes "that they are liable to, and now suffering under, great exaggeration."

Of the last principle, in the bishop's estimation so necessary to balance and render safe the other two, he says: "In a few years it had become utterly obscured, and had given way to the sinister influences which from the very first had mingled with the Tractarian theology. . . . The influences to which we allude were all essentially anti-Protestant. . . . Their true representative was Hurrell Froude. . . . His opinions, says Dr. Newman, arrested and *influenced me*, even when they did not gain my assent. He professed openly his admiration of the Church of Rome, and his hatred of the Reformers. He delighted in the notion of an hierarchical system, of sacerdotal power, and of full ecclesiastical liberty [*i. e.*, freedom from state control]. He felt scorn of the maxim, 'The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants;' and he gloried in accepting tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. . . . He had a deep devotion to the real Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith. He made me to look with admiration to the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation. He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the blessed Virgin, and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence" (pp. 623, 624). Dr. Irons refers to this Mr. Froude and his modes of thinking in Oxford in terms of great respect as being "very suggestive."<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gladstone says, in the article already referred to: "The disposition of the Tractarians—may it not be said their besetting sin—was to undervalue and disparage these same reformers: a disposition of which, in the case of the 'Remains' of R. H. Froude, published by two of the authors of the Tracts, we have a glaring if not almost a scandalous instance" (p. 9).

We sympathize profoundly with the learned and pious prelate in his desire to eliminate Anglo-Romanism from the Anglo-Catholicism which took impulse and shape from the Oxford Tracts. But we should be uncandid if we disguised the fear, that the two first doctrines of the Oxford Tract school

<sup>1</sup> "First Hundred Years of Christianity," by Rev. Prebendary Irons, D.D., pp. 7, 8.

which 'he espouses, viz., that grace comes not from preaching but from the sacraments, and these only when administered by a clergy deriving their commission in the line of uninterrupted official succession from the apostles through the hierarchy of the Latin Church, will sooner or later part company with the third—opposition to Rome. They have about as much affinity for it as materialism has for idealism. There is a momentum in the first two principles which is constantly counter-working and severing in the English Church all the ties, hereditary, social, domestic, which so strongly bind men to the church of their nativity and nurture.

We here pause while unuttered thoughts still crowd upon us. We could not say less without being derelict in duty to the faith by which we live, the Saviour we trust, the God we adore, his Word to which we bow, and that vast portion of the communion of saints whose holy living and dying are the best refutation of all charges against them or their religion.

LYMAN H. ATWATER.