THE

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 7.—July, 1881.

I.

THE PLAN OF THE NEW BIBLE REVISION.

WITHIN a few weeks past there has appeared a volume which has for some time been looked for with great and growing interest. This is the New Testament as revised by a number of British and American scholars, which is now given to the world without waiting for the Old Testament, the completion of which is not expected for two or three years to come. In the next number of this REVIEW there will be a careful critical estimate of the characteristic features of this interesting and important volume. What is now proposed is to give some account of the origin and progress of the whole movement for revision, and to consider the plan upon which it has been and is to be conducted.

In regard to the authorized version there has been for a long time a substantial agreement among all the learned upon two points: first, that in point of fidelity and elegance, the English Bible, as a whole, is equal if not superior to any other version, ancient or modern; but, secondly, that in particular places it is defective, owing to the progress made in grammar, lexicography, exegesis, criticism, and archæology since the days of King James, and also to the inevitable changes in the meaning and use of many English words and phrases. Attempts, therefore, at a new version in whole or in

II.

HENRY BOYNTON SMITH.*

A GOOD biography is a work of art; so also is a portrait. Either may be perfect as a work of art, whilst in one sense incomplete. A portrait is generally better without the accessories of scenery. It thus presents, without embarrassment, the individuality of the man. A biography may be written on this principle, and thus prepared, be worthy of all praise. Yet in reading it one will wish to know more of its subject than is expressed. The life of a remarkable man cannot be fully understood without a view of the scenery in which it is set. We read between the lines what they suggest, and then turn to other records for what we instinctively feel is wanting. Hence the popularity of works which delineate not only the life, but also the "times" of one who contributes to the moulding of his age, whilst he is moulded by it in a greater or less degree. The work of Masson, of which Milton is the central figure, furnishes a ready and successful example. At the same time the extent and the elaboration of this work show the impossibility of writing most biographies upon this principle. We must ordinarily be content with what can be compressed into a single volume, and turn to other sources of information; thus making the whole picture for ourselves as complete as our personal wishes may require.

The accomplished author of the "Life and Work of Henry B. Smith" has given us more than a portrait of her distinguished husband. She has sketched in much of the scenery of his life. But admirable as is her work, it inevitably suggests more than it expresses. We have seldom seen a biography so happily introduced as is this by the picture which faces the title, and by the sonnet which follows. The picture is

* Henry B. Smith: His Life and Work. Edited by his wife. With portrait on steel by Ritchie. New York: Armstrong & Son. 1881.

striking as a likeness. It seems idealized; but when the book has been read, it seems simply true. Here is an aquiline profile, and an eye whose penetrative glance is aquiline too; but brow and mouth soften and intellectualize the expression of the eye. We turn to the sonnet:—from the picture in the author's hand to that within her heart—and honor the feeling which induced her to disclose the latter to the world.

> "Nay 'tis the Master's work, and His own touch
> Graces the picture with divinest art."

She doubtless desired that after her delineation was completed, her readers should turn with freshened interest to the legacy of thought her husband has left. She must have expected that as the result of such study, supplementary sketches would be made. In fact, a friend and an admirer cannot be quiet when such a book rouses him. Numerous independent estimates of Prof. Smith's character and work have been given to the public. There is still room and call for an estimate in these pages of the man, of his position among American scholars, and of his services to the Church of Christ.*

His character was thoroughly, if not intensely, individual. In temperament he was highly nervous. His brain quickly responded to any call which was made upon it. His mental machinery moved almost as soon as the match was touched to the fuel: and, when moving, it was apt to shake his system by the rapidity of its revolutions. His intellect was as keen and penetrative as it was swift. His instinct was to look through words to underlying principles, and having found them, to inquire into their relations. The faculty for organizing thought was as strong in him as the perceptive power. He analyzed like a chemist; he combined like an architect. But he was by no means deficient in breadth or in originality. Indeed, his mind was so comprehensive, that one observing its breadth might almost forget its sharpness. He had so much of the constructive faculty that he would still have been re-

* The admirable outline of his life given by Dr. De Witt in the last number of this REVIEW, renders such a sketch in this article unnecessary; perhaps also, some of our expressions and estimates, as here given. But as this article was mainly written before that of Dr. De Witt appeared, such expressions and estimates must be regarded as coincidences. A judgment is sometimes more readily accepted when "in the mouth of two or three witnesses."

markable, had he not been so patient a student. By natural endowment he was well adapted to philosophical investigation. His power of abstraction revealed itself whilst he pursued his boyish studies in the family sitting-room, undisturbed by the hum of conversation. His memory easily retained what he acquired from his varied readings, and kept its treasures in assorted parcels. "It seems to me," said the boy to his mother, "that I have boxes in my head where I put things to remember, and shut them up and open each one when I want the thing in it." This tendency to assortment early led to his making a commonplace book of his journal, and later to a vast accumulation of classified extracts and references such as no man could make or manage whose head is not full of "boxes." Some men have this faculty of collecting, classifying, remembering, whilst they are simply gatherers of other men's wares. Their treasure-house is an intellectual museum, a curiosity-shop of *bric-a-brac*. Prof. Smith kept his treasures for use. He could state not only what others have thought on a given subject, but also what he thought. "Metaphysics and philosophy are the subjects best adapted to his tastes. . . . . I think he will by and by be a professor in some theological or literary institution; that he will be a maker of books I have no doubt." This was his father's verdict respecting Henry whilst he was yet a lad. This was the parental prophecy—a prophecy as truly fulfilled as if it were the result of inspiration. Yet no other inspiration was needed to make it, than that which comes from the hackneyed aphorism—"The child is father of the man."

Prof. Smith was essentially a philosopher, whatever sphere of thought he entered. To him theology, history, Biblical interpretation were sciences. Interested in politics, he would have been a scientific statesman, had he devoted himself to political life. He was almost scientific as a preacher. For this reason, perhaps, he will never be counted among the great preachers of America; but few preachers could more profoundly interest and impress a well-trained mind. He could preach so simply as to delight the unlearned; yet when his preaching was most individual, it was burdened with thought. Whilst temporarily occupying the chair of Prof. B. B. Edwards at Andover, a theological student who heard him preach

occasionally in Bartlett Chapel, so far forgot himself in his enthusiasm as to say to Prof. Park, that prince of preachers: "I never heard such excellent sermons from any man"; adding, after a moment of confusion, "I mean *from a man not a professor.*" His students at New York followed him from pulpit to pulpit, as also did a large number of intelligent people. His sermons were fresh, stimulating, and full of quiet power. He was a better preacher than some who will be remembered as of greater name.

As a metaphysician, Prof. Smith occupies a recognized position among American scholars, although his direct contributions to Modern Philosophy were few. Whilst Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy at Amherst he gave some indication of what he might accomplish in this particular. He used text-books rather as introductory to thought than as guides in thinking. He supplied from his own mind what the student failed to obtain by personal thought and investigation. By the use he subsequently made of metaphysics, he showed that he was not without his philosophical system. Had he remained at Amherst he would, doubtless, have taken rank with the eminent men who now grace the presidency of Yale and of Princeton. He had been only three years at Amherst when he was removed to Union Theological Seminary, and devoted his attention to history, especially as unfolded in the origin and progress of the Church of Christ.

In this sphere he soon became an acknowledged master. The historical relations of thought were always attractive to him. At Amherst he used to wish for a good history of philosophy, and even projected such a work. His project was subsequently realized in the edition of Ueberweg, which was translated by Geo. S. Morris and edited by himself and Dr. Schaff, and presented to English readers—an admirable thesaurus. The historical relations of events were equally attractive. The highest qualities of the historian were his. Mr. George Bancroft, his intimate friend, wrote to him: "In Church history, you have no rival on this hemisphere, and you know I am bound to think history includes dogmatics and philosophy and theology." Prof. Smith had a not less comprehensive idea of this department of study, however he might have estimated himself as occupying it. He believed not only

that it includes these ranges of thought, but also that it has a philosophy of its own. In this particular he did not differ from the great historians of the world, but his theory was more profound than that of many of his predecessors. History is now universally considered one of the sciences. It has come to be so regarded by degrees. Herodotus was the first to present the facts of history in a systematic form. Thucydides was the first to use these facts in an attempt to penetrate human motives, and to unveil the secret causes of events. Polybius was the first to conceive the idea of a universal history, as delineating the life and progress of the human family. It was not until after Christianity had introduced the great fact of the spiritual unity of the race, that anything worthy of consideration as a philosophy of history appeared in literature. Augustine was the first to present with special clearness the thought that all history is the unfolding of a Divine plan through which God's purposes for man are to be realized. This he did, though still imperfectly, in his "*De Civitate Dei.*" Bossuet, following in the steps of Augustine, has often been styled the founder of the philosophy of history. Prof. Flint defines the central thought of Bossuet as this:

> "That a divine hand trains and guides collective humanity for the religion of Christ, which is incorporate in the Church, and that all historical changes may be co-ordinated with reference to a single end, the good of the Church, which is the final cause of the world."*

This theory, admirable as it is in general terms, is narrowed in its application, because the Church, as considered by Bossuet, is that of Rome. The kingdom of God is wider than this. Herder, among the Germans, suppressing the idea of Divine control in the interests of God's kingdom, found the key to history in the development of the race as an organic whole. Schlegel makes God prominent as one of the factors of history, but represents the progress of events as the struggle of a sinful human will, to be overpowered at last, and restored to its purity. He makes little of Christ, except as He is represented in the Romish hierarchy. Other great writers have sought to find the philosophy of history in the reign of law, referring only obscurely to Providence or to Christ. Thus we

* "Philosophy of History," p. 84.

have materialistic, theistic, rationalistic theories in abundance. Prof. Smith, a diligent student of all theories, found satisfaction in none, except as *Christ* is set in the centre. To him the thought of a Divine plan was not enough, nor of a kingdom as the object of such a plan. The plan and the kingdom must be conceived as focalized in Christ. Hence he quotes with approbation the "striking confession" of John von Müller, "Christ is the key to the history of the world." He adopts the motto of Hase's Church History: "The Lord of the times is God; the turning point of the times is Christ; the true spirit of the times is the Holy Spirit." He agrees with Prof. Brandiss, of Bonn:

"In proportion as historical investigations are elaborated into an universal historical science, in the same proportion will Christ be acknowledged as the eternal and divine substance of the whole historical life of the world; and His sacred person will greet us everywhere on the historic page, as it also greets us everywhere in the Scriptures of our faith."

This theory practically resolves all history into that of the Church, considered in its widest sense as the kingdom of God; for all the course of God's providence among the nations is made tributary to that kingdom, which Prof. Smith comprehensively describes as:

"Reposing for its foundation upon the purpose of the Father, centering in the God-man, divine and human both, animated by the living energy of the Holy Spirit, adjusting the relations between a holy God and a sinful world, intended to reconcile men with each other as well as with God, and having for its object the final redemption of mankind."

To this he significantly adds:

"This exhibition of the great ends to be wrought out by the Church, completes the scientific view of its history, and gives to it its fulness and roundness; that which was from the beginning in the purpose of the Father is that which is realized in the end in the kingdom of His Son. And thus the circle is completed, the end returns to the beginning, and God is all in all."*

This he considered as embodying all the elements of a philosophical basis of historical investigation. It includes all facts under a providential plan; it provides one law through all; it supposes Power sufficient to make the plan and to consummate it; it contemplates an end comprehensive enough to explain the whole flow of history.

This is a grand scheme. Its simplicity, its breadth, its fidelity to the Scriptural representation of God in His rela-

* "Faith and Philosophy," pp. 68–9.

tions to the world, and its loyalty to Christ are obvious. It is an inspiring scheme, as was amply betokened by the enthusiasm with which it was received by Prof. Smith's students. It is essentially the scheme of many of the best modern Church historians—notably that of Neander, of Kurtz, and of Schaff, whilst it is more or less distinctly adopted by Hase, Gieseler, Milman, and Robertson.

Is it a scientific scheme? A negative answer would doubtless be given by critics of the Materialistic and of the Theistic schools. The scheme of Bossuet as a theory of Providence acting for an end, has been sharply assailed. Even Hase indulges in gentle sarcasm when characterizing the History of Bossuet as written with

"an apparent insight into the ways of Providence, which implies that the clever Bishop of Meaux must have been as familiar with the court of the Most High as he was with that of his sovereign."*

Professor Flint also thinks the method of Bossuet defective as first *assuming* the idea of Providence, and then explaining the facts of history by that idea: whereas the scientific method is to reach the idea of Providence by induction from the facts. It is an example of building a pyramid by beginning at the apex.† Following this line of thought, it can be proved, he says, that secular history shows abundant marks of Providence controlling and shaping the actions of men so as to prepare the way for the advent of Christ and for the triumphs of the Gospel; but it cannot be proved "that the world exists only for the absolutely true religion, that the rise and spread of that religion is the single end or ultimate final cause of all history, the sole ground for the existence of any age or nation." Now, if this criticism is just, it might be applied to the scheme of Prof. Smith so as to discredit its scientific character. But as thus applied it fails. It may indeed be admitted that if the doctrine of a universal Providence can be certainly reached *only* by induction from the facts of history, then it is unscientific to assert that doctrine before it is thus proved. It may also be admitted that some of the facts of history are but indirectly framed into the great plan, for the execution of which any age or nation exists; just as we may admit that Paul's

* "History of the Christian Church," Am. Ed., p. 8.
† "Philosophy of History," p. 86.

need of the cloak he left at Troas was incidental to his great mission. Conceding this, we may affirm:—*First*, it is scientifically correct to apply a law in the explanation of facts, although that law has not been reached by induction, provided it is certainly established by some other means. But the law of a universal Providence is matter of *revelation:* hence, if possible, more certain than any principle reached by induction. Had the law of gravitation been unfolded in the Sermon on the Mount, it would have been scientifically correct to apply it at once, without waiting for the demonstration of Newton. This is fairly admitted by Lord Bacon himself, though he makes faith the basis of our acceptance of the truths of Revelation, as he makes reason the basis of our acceptance of the truths of nature. In either case the method is scientific. *Secondly*, it is in accordance with the spirit of science to accept a law as explaining facts of whose bearing we should otherwise be ignorant; provided that law explains all other facts of a similar kind. It is scientific, *e. g.*, to use the law of gravitation in explaining the "red spot" on Jupiter and the black spots on the face of the sun. Why not apply the law of Providence in explaining facts in history whose bearing would otherwise be obscure if that law explains other like facts whose bearing is more obvious?

Now the word of Revelation is, that God is the proprietor of the world: "The Earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein,"—that He is the universal ruler: "For God is the King of all the earth,"—that His Providence is universal: "His judgments are in all the earth." "The very hairs of your heads are all numbered,"—that His Providence moves by a fixed plan in moulding history: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation,"—that His purpose centres about His Son: "according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,"—that in Christ history is to find its consummation: "That in the dispensation of the fulness of time He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him." Here is a divine philosophy of history. About these passages alone history

crystallizes as a science. And the Bible abounds in such nuclei. It furnishes us a scientific law. That law explains everything in history to which we apply it. It enables us to understand how not only the history of the Hebrews, but also that of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Greece, Rome is tributary to the kingdom of which Christ is the centre, and the Church the outward expression. The case is more obscure when the law is applied to the history of India and of China. In what particulars may we claim that nations whose antiquity is unquestioned, but which bore no relation whatever to the Hebrews and which never so much as touched the great Roman Empire, contributed to the advent of Christ or to the establishment of His kingdom? Our first reply is, that if it can be shown that they made no such contribution, they may *yet* contribute to the glories of that kingdom. It is only a question as to whether a tributary shall flow sooner or later into a stream. The Arkansas and the Red Rivers add something to the Mississippi after it has absorbed the Missouri and the Ohio. Our next reply is, that these nations have already fulfilled a mission with reference to Christianity. They have contributed signal evidence to the proposition that no form of natural religion, though it begin with a Divine revelation, and though it have centuries for its undisturbed development, can equal Christianity, or can promote a civilization which will compare with that of Christian nations. To furnish such evidence is the negative mission of every heathen cultus.

The birthplace of heathenism was the Plain of Shinar. It is probable that one object of the Tower of Babel was idolatrous worship. The long period from the murder of Abel to the Deluge proved that fallen man could neither save himself nor keep himself out of the abyss of corruption without God. Through all the ages since the Dispersion the proof has accumulated that man cannot reach his highest development under false gods. Heathenism started in possession of all the revelations which had been handed down to Noah. These revelations were in time obscured or corrupted in various degrees. They can still be traced in some of the better features of heathen religions. They were carried to India and to China as well as to Chaldæa and to Egypt. But, notwithstanding this advantage, heathenism has always proved a failure. That

it might so prove, under every possible condition, time and opportunity have been afforded. Let us admit, if we must, that the Grecian mythology was intended to present, beneath a pictured veil, moral and spiritual ideas; let us interpret, *e. g.*, the story of Cupid and Psyche as Raphael does in his wonderful paintings on the ceiling of the Farnesina Palace, reading therein the yearning of the soul after immortal love; it will yet remain that the Greek cultus was a failure, and that the Roman cultus was worse than the Greek. Let us take the essential drops of Buddhism, which Edwin Arnold has pressed out of the dregs into a vase of crystal; let us accept the Golden Rule in the form which Confucius gave it; we shall find enough in the religions of India and of China to weary us with disgust and to make us feel more than ever that when man's last, best word has been spoken he can never sit clothed and in his right mind except at the feet of Him who spake as never man spake. The same line of inquiry will lead us to the conclusion that even the corrupt forms of Christianity have a similar negative mission. Apply the key of the Christian philosophy of history where you will—it fits the wards.

To this might be added the fact that in all prominent heathen systems is betrayed a longing for a divine incarnation which shall express to the soul what is expressed in the person of the Redeemer. The idea of Incarnation is not a novelty in the Christian system; but all the incarnations of heathenism failed to bring out the idea of Redemption by a God-man. The Greek gives to the world Hercules, the son of Zeus; but Hercules is little better than an ideal hero, not much superior to Samson. Plato, escaping from mythology, ascribed to God a trinity of attributes, but, in so doing, lost the conception of incarnation. India imagined an official trinity, and retained the idea of incarnation; but Indian thought never compassed the idea of Tri-personality in the Godhead, and none of its numerous incarnations was for the purpose of redemption. This yearning, which is never satisfied by that for which it longs, is recognized by our profoundest scholars as anticipative of the Incarnation in Christ, as heralding Him in the untaught soul, as preparing the way for His reception when He should appear; yet, as proving by its incomplete developments, that of himself, man can never find the Christ he seeks and needs.

Hence, again, we see in Christ the solution of the problems of the ages, the key to the history of all the world.

It must not be supposed, however, that Prof. Smith's work in the department of Church History was only or chiefly to put the key into his students' hands. His greatest literary achievement was the preparation of his invaluable digest, modestly entitled "History of the Christian Church in Chronological Tables," whose merit was at once attested by such scholars as Jacobi, Lieber, Trench. It was hailed in this country as a "monumental work," "the best of its kind in any language," as a book which "cannot be praised as much as it deserves," as a "lexicon of church history," as "not the mere bones of history, but history itself in miniature." One cannot read such commendations without a sad smile, on turning to a letter written to his wife, who, with her children, was among the hills of New England, whilst he sweltered over his task in New York under the July sun. "The printers are driving me about my Tables; ten are now in their hands, and will be done next week; five more will complete the job, and then, after all, *I do not believe that anybody will appreciate it.*"* In addition to these Tables, he published an edition of Gieseler which has become one of our best standards. His careful hand enriched his edition of "Hagenbach's History of Doctrines." He wrote numerous historical articles for Reviews which are of permanent value. These results are the more surprising when we remember that he was nominally in the chair of Church History only five years, and that two of these years were partially given to instruction in Systematic Theology. The explanation is, that he was still a historian after he became a professor of theology. The work we have described was distributed over many years. Had he not become so eminent as a theologian, and had he not been succeeded by such a man, we should be sorry that he ever left the chair of History.

A general regret has been expressed that he has left no authorized statement of his theological system, in detail, except in the notes he used in the lecture-room. It is to be hoped that they will yet be committed to the press, though

* "Life," p. 197.

we suspect they are largely like a collection of half-strung pearls. We are at no loss, however, for the unifying thought of his system. We have already discovered it in his philosophy of history. To his mind, theology and history have the same law, as they are twin sciences whose facts belong to one great Plan. "In God's Book they are fused; its theology glows with historical life; truth and fact, light and life are blended. God reveals Himself in historic facts. All history and all theology meet in the person of the God-man, our Saviour."* His mind and His life had one radiant point. At that point was Christ the brightness of the Father's glory. That point was early established, and in connection with a deep religious experience. Augustine found what was afterward the unifying principle of his theology in the heart-study which preceded his conversion. Luther found his after he had been picked up insensible from the floor of his cell in a monastery. Prof. Smith found his after a long struggle with philosophic doubt. His "speculative habits" drifted him away from the Cross, whilst all the currents of feeling about him were setting toward the Cross. In reaching the Cross, at last, he found there not only peace, but also his dominating thought. He subsequently said that "he should have been a pantheist but for Christ." Having found in Him a personal Saviour, Christ became to him thenceforth the harmonizer of all philosophy, the centre of all truth, the secret of all facts. Not that all this was as clear to his youthful mind as it afterward became. It was clear enough to shape his thinking, to control his life, and to forecast his system, when he should be called to present theology scientifically to other minds.

He doubtless had a "system" of his own. But this implies no essential departure from the symbols of the Church to which he belonged. It implies only an individualism such as is manifested by most of the framers of theological schemes. Luther grouped the particulars of his system about justification by faith. Calvin stated his system as unfolding "the knowledge of God and the knowledge of man," and followed the order of the Apostles' Creed. American theologians give ample and sometimes curious illustrations of the tendency of

* "Faith and Philosophy," p. 126.

each mind to shape its own system. "Human nature in its relation to Divine Grace is the central theme" of Jonathan Edwards. Hopkinsianism revolves about "disinterested benevolence." The followers of Hopkins were divided on the "Taste and Exercise schemes." Emmons carried the Exercise scheme so far that even his powerful logic could not save it. Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, centred his theology about the Moral Government of God. A similar synthesis might be applied to the theologians of our own Church. Individual systems were held during the days of its division on both sides. There is scarcely a theological professor who does not systematize his scheme according to some individual law. What is thus true as to grouping is true also as to ideas. A theologian may follow some great master, and yet reject some of his teachings. He may be an Augustinian, and yet refuse to believe in baptismal regeneration, or in the descent of Christ into Hades for the deliverance of Adam. He may be a Calvinist, and repudiate Calvin's views of toleration and of the relations of the Church to the State. He may be substantially orthodox and call no man master. Van Oosterzee went as far as he thought necessary, if not as far as he could, when he prefixed to his work on "Christian Dogmatics" the legend, "*Christianus Evangelicus mihi nomen, Reformatus cognomen.*"

We may congratulate ourselves that Prof. Smith sketched an outline of his system in the address delivered when installed at Union as Professor of Theology.* Its running title might be stated as "Redemption by Incarnation." Its first division is "Antecedents of Redemption," including the Christian doctrine respecting God as Triune and respecting man as fallen. Its second division, "Christology," including the Person and the Work of Christ as providing Redemption. Its third division, "Redemption Applied," including union with Christ as the great fact and the controlling process in justification, sanctification, and preparation for Heaven. As the result of our studies in various directions, we feel warranted in filling up this outline, so far as to bring out his characteristic ideas, thus:

* "Faith and Philosophy," pp. 137, 138.

I. *Theology* (proper). God is Triune, "which alone, so far as we can conceive, makes Redemption by an Incarnation possible." His attributes fit and incline Him to the execution of His plan of such a Redemption. That plan is embodied in His decrees and is promoted by His providences.

II. *Anthropology.* Man as needing Redemption is one with Adam, "seminally, morally, and by natural descent." Adam's first sin is imputed to his descendants *mediately;* that is because they are thus one with him and partakers in his guilt and condemnation.

III. *Christology.* In becoming incarnate, Christ, already divine, assumed a true human nature. Thus He became one Person, "uniting humanity with divinity in the integrity of both natures."

IV. *Soteriology.* In consequence of the Atonement, which is truly vicarious, the way is opened for the justification of the sinner. In appropriating Redemption by faith, we are justified because made one with Christ by the Holy Spirit. Christ's merits are imputed to us *mediately*, because we are one with Him. Thus also we are sanctified and finally glorified.

V. *Ecclesiology.* Christ is one with the Church, because one with all its members. He is central to His kingdom as the vine is central to its branches.

Comprehensively, as Prof. Smith was wont to say to his students, "Incarnation has the same relation to the renewed order of things as creation to the first; it is the second great work of the Logos. The first creation is to be resolved into the second. Christ has the same relation to the second as Adam to the first. Incarnation has the same place in revealed theology as creation in natural theology."

It will readily be seen that a vital union, first with Adam, then with Christ, and mediate imputation because of this union, are essential factors in this system. It now becomes an interesting question whether he derived these ideas from his studies of that New England theology whose atmosphere he breathed so long, or from his subsequent studies of German theology and philosophy, or from both. It might be supposed that such a system of theology is rendered logically necessary by his system of history. But that is a mistake. Both

systems were undoubtedly harmonious in his own mind. Yet all that is essential in his historical system may be and is held by many who dissent from his theological system; by those, *e. g.*, who believe that our union with Adam is federal as well as natural—that our corruption is a penal infliction for Adam's sin—that his sin is imputed to us *immediately* as the judicial ground of bringing upon us the penalty visited upon him—finally, that we are justified not because of our oneness with Christ; but because His righteousness is directly imputed to us as a forensic or judicial ground for treating us as if we were righteous. It is simply just to say that Prof. Smith believed that his system was that of the Scriptures, and substantially that of the best representatives of the Reformation. Did he then derive its elements from Luther, from Calvin, from the Shorter Catechism of Westminster, from Jonathan Edwards, from Tholuck? The true answer, probably, is that he first reached it by original process, and then availed himself of his studies in unfolding and perfecting it. Though born and trained in New England, he was early dissatisfied with the conflicts of the "Schools." On his twenty-first birthday he wrote to his friend, Mr. Goodwin:

"I have had very many speculations about religious things, and think they have not been wholly profitless. I cannot find truth in any one systematic view of it. I cannot find religious truth in the Old School or the New. I find it only in the doctrine of redemption. My object is to make and harmonize a system which shall make Christ the central point of all important religious truth and doctrine. Such, I am convinced, is the Biblical scheme; does any human scheme correspond to this? Such a system, too, would be a practical system; it would, at any rate, require that all preaching should be made in reference to redemption and sanctification, and Christ as the cause of both."*

When at a later day his system had been "made and harmonized," he discovered, as he thought, that it was essentially the same with that of President Edwards, and of the older Reformed and New England theologians. The following extracts from President Edwards are certainly significant—italics his own:

"My meaning in the whole of what has here been said may be illustrated thus: Let us suppose that *Adam* and all his posterity had *co-existed*, and that his posterity had been, through a law of nature established by the Creator, *united* to him, something as the branches of a tree are united to the root, or the members of the one body to the head, so as to constitute, as it were, *one* complex person, or *one* moral whole; so that by the law of union there should have been a *communion* and *co-existence* in acts and

* "Life," p. 32.

affections ; all jointly participating, and all concurring as *one whole*, in the disposition and action of the head ; as we see in the body natural the whole body is affected ; and the whole body concurs when the head acts. Now, in this case, all the branches of mankind, by the constitution of nature and law of union, would have been affected just as *Adam* was affected. When the heart of the root committed the first sin, the hearts of all the branches would have concurred ; and when the root, in consequence of this, became guilty, so would all the branches ; and when the root, as a punishment of the sin committed, was forsaken of God, in like manner would it have fared with the branches ; and when the root, in consequence of this, was confirmed in permanent depravity, the case would have been the same with all the branches ; and as new guilt on the soul of *Adam* would have been consequent upon this, so also would it have been with his moral branches. . . . . Now, difference of the *time* of existence does not at all hinder things succeeding in the same order any more than difference of *place* in the co-existence of time." (Note, "Original Sin," Part IV., Chap. III.)

"And therefore the sin of the apostasy is not theirs (Adam's posterity) merely because God *imputes* it to them ; but it is *truly* and *properly* theirs, and on that *ground* God imputes it to them." (Text, *Ibid.*)

"What is *real* in the union between Christ and his people is the foundation of what is *legal;* that is, it is something really in them and between them uniting them, that is the ground of the suitableness of their being accounted as one by the Judge." ("Discourse on Justification by Faith alone").

It will always be a question for dispute whether these extracts precisely represent the views of their author. Prof. Smith believed that they do, and that among the many interpreters of Edwards, he was the best Edwardean of all. Others think they do not. So many systems have been countersigned by their authors with the name of Edwards, that one is tempted to ask whether, as in the case of Augustine, and even Calvin, we may not arraign some of his utterances for trial at his own tribunal. Great men's thoughts are often like ores, to be reduced. What they really held is the gold of the final assay. No subtler chemist than Prof. Smith ever analyzed New England theology. Whoever rejects his assay must show that he followed a defective process. All acknowledge that in the famous chapter on Original Sin, from which we have quoted, President Edwards closely follows Stapfer. Is it not possible that those who think this chapter inconsistent with the remainder of the treatise may find a hint toward harmonizing the whole in one of the notes which Edwards quotes from Stapfer? It is this, italics in the original :

"Our *adversaries* contend with us, chiefly on this account, that according to our doctrine of original sin, such an *imputation* of the first sin is maintained, whereby God, without any regard to universal native *corruption*, esteems all Adam's posterity as *guilty*, and holds them liable to condemnation *purely* on account of that sinful act of their first parent ; so that they, without any respect had to *their own sin*, and so, as *innocent* in themselves, are destined to eternal punishment. I have, therefore, ever been careful to show that they do *injuriously* suppose those things to be *separated* in our doctrine, which are by *no means* to be separated. The whole of the controversy they have with

us about this matter evidently arises from this, that they suppose the *mediate* and the *immediate* imputation are distinguished, one from the other, not only in the manner of conception, but in reality. And so, indeed, they consider imputation only as *immediate*, and abstractly from *mediate;* when yet our divines suppose that neither ought to be considered *separately* from the other."

As vindicating his claim that his views were supported by the older divines of New England, Prof. Smith was accustomed to refer to the system of President Willard, of Harvard, who died when Edwards was but four years of age. It is significant, also, that President Willard's system was based upon the Shorter Catechism of Westminster, and was intended to be an explication of that. His view of the union of the race with Adam was very similar to that just quoted from Edwards. We were virtually in Adam when he fell, "as the rose is virtually in the bush," "as every branch that springs out is in the tree." "When we actually *be*, we are *actually* in him." Hence, the whole race "have a participation" in Adam's first sin; and "as we all sinned in Adam, so we fell with him; and this also ariseth from our union with him." In this connection Pres. Willard made conspicuous God's covenant with Adam; but this covenant was considered as based upon the organic union of Adam with his posterity. So, in our relations to Christ, the covenant idea is still conspicuous; but the covenant of grace implies union with Christ. This union is effected by the Holy Spirit, and is the ground of our justification. The same idea may also be found in Mr. John Cotton's "Treatise of the New Covenant," published in London, 1654, only thirty-four years after the landing on Plymouth Rock, and described on the title-page as "being the substance of sundry sermons preached by Mr. Cotton at Boston in New England some years since, and corrected by his own hand, not long before his death" (1652). In this treatise he divides the "blessings" which flow from our union with Christ into two groups, relative and positive. The relative blessings are adoption and justification; the positive are sanctification and glorification. The relative blessings "spring immediately, *simul et semel*, from the former union with Christ," and that, too, because "now is the Divine nature of Christ in us, and we are now become the Sons of God as Christ Himself is." In this particular Mr. Cotton seems to go farther than did Pres. Willard or Prof. Smith; possibly, however, because he is not so sharp in

his discriminations. His views of imputation are thus quaintly expressed:

"Look as in a man's first naturall conception, as soon as ever *Adam* doth live, there is an heir of *Adam*, even so soon as the soul liveth: So it is in this new spirituall birth, as soon as the Holy Ghost cometh and hath wrought this faith, now is the seed of God in us, and the life of Christ, and the Spirit of God, and now are we the Sons of God.—Jo. i. 12. Immediately upon this Union with Christ we are Sons by *Adoption*, and as we are Adopted, so likewise our sins are now imputed unto Christ, and His righteousness unto us, and so our persons are justified. For how and where was Adam's sin imputed unto us?—Psa. li. 5. *Behold I was shapen in iniquity*, etc. So soon as ever there was life, it was the life of *Adam*, now the imputation of Adam's sin falleth immediately upon the soule. So when we doe receive Christ by this living faith, having the life of Christ in us, we have the righteousnesse of Christ also imputed to us."

Such was the preaching which resounded from the Puritan pulpit in the colony of Massachusetts Bay at the very time when the Westminster divines were framing our symbols in the Jerusalem chamber.

But here another line of inquiry demands attention. It has been supposed by some that Prof. Smith's system had a philosophical basis, the elements of which he brought home from Germany, and which rendered that system more subtle, and perhaps on that account more dangerous than that of any of the old divines. This basis has been characterized by the scholastic name of *realism*. Was he a realist; if so, in what sense? Doubtless no one understood realism better than did he. No one more thoroughly appreciated what was good or bad in the German philosophy of his day. He did not come home from Germany to join in "the indiscriminate censure of all that is German," then so prevalent on this side of the Atlantic. Those were noble and generous words which he uttered at Andover in 1849 against "a criticism which describes a circumference of which one's ignorance is the generating radius." He spoke at that time a much-needed word for Frederick Schleiermacher, whilst admitting the unsoundness of his opinions respecting the Person of Christ and the Atonement. "Many were his errors, but much was his love to our blessed Lord." He found a reflection of his own thought in that of Schleiermacher, when he set Christ and His redemption in the centre of Christian theology; and he was not afraid to say so. He believed that in this respect German theologians were rendering an invaluable service to the Christian thought of the time. But in this particular he seems to have brought

nothing back from Germany which he did not carry there. If realism was fairly involved in his conception of theology he would not hesitate to acknowledge it. He was indeed the advocate of a form of Christian realism, such as he describes in one of his inaugural addresses*—a realism which considers all things as pre-existing "in idea and purpose" in the Divine mind. This he finely sets over against nominalism in the line of Dr. Madden:

"Words are men's daughters, but God's sons are things."

No one would object to this form of realism who admits that a truth may be in one's mind before it is enunciated, or the plan of a cathedral before it is built. Philosophically this is little more than conceptualism, which, however abused by Abelard, is wrought into some of the soundest systems of modern metaphysics. Neither is there anything to criticise in a passage in Prof. Smith's address delivered at Dartmouth and elsewhere on "The claims of theology upon young men."

"If the expression be duly guarded, it is useful to say that there is a Christian Realism which is absolutely fundamental in Christian theology; that is, there is a grand series of facts constituting the very life of the Christian system, which have an objective reality and validity; and without which the whole of Christian theology is, in principle, no better than a merely philosophical system."

It is possible to interpret this passage as favoring the realism of Anselm and of Aquinas; but it is certain that Prof. Smith rejected the theory whose philosophical expression is *Universalia ante rem.* In explaining his view of Original Sin he said once, probably often, in the class-room:

"This theory is realistic in the *proper* sense of the term, viz: as presenting an objective reality corresponding to our subjective idea; *i. e.*, there is a race of which the individuals are parts. It is *not* realistic as saying that the generic ideas *exist apart from the reality.* The human race is a reality, a genus actualized in the individuals only."

Here the formula *Universalia ante rem* is expressly repudiated. If any scholastic formula is favored, it is that of the Conceptualists, *Universalia in re.*

We are inclined to believe, however, that in his theological system, Prof. Smith did not concern himself so much with philosophy as with fact. He was like Edwards, mainly concerned to show that our connection with Adam and with

* "Faith and Philosophy," p. 129.

Christ is a *reality*, and to explain the consequences which flow therefrom. This is the more apparent from the fact that in defining our relations to Adam and to Christ, the parallelism is incomplete. In both cases union is made the ground of imputation; thus far the parallelism holds. But whilst the sin of Adam is imputed to us *because* it is ours, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us simply because of our *union* with Him; not at all because of our personal righteousness. That is, in one case, character is taken into the account; in the other it is not. Aquinas was a consistent realist when he accounted for our justification by a *unio mystica* with Christ, which rendered vicarious satisfaction impossible. As we are condemned because we are partakers in Adam's sin, so he held, we are justified because we are partakers in the righteousness of Christ, at least in *some degree*. Later Romish theologians are more explicit. Prof. Smith was at one time supposed to be committed to this theory; probably because the realism of the schoolmen was attributed to him. He emphatically denied this. His careful and discriminating statement was: "In sin our demerits are included, whilst in justification our merits are excluded." As to the relative merits of the two systems we here offer no opinion. Our object has been simply to state the system of Prof. Smith and to show on what grounds he held it. That his view was independent and individual is indicated by his declining to stand beside Placaeus. "Placaeus' view I do not fully acquiesce in. He makes the corrupt nature by descent to be the *only* ground of imputation."* In the same connection he implies that his view is based upon *reality* rather than on *realism*, identifying this view with that of Edwards, and adding: "This is simply a matter of *fact;* and is not a theory to explain the *justice* of imputation." He seems, in a word, to be simply carrying out his early intention, "to make and harmonize a system which shall make Christ the central point."

Fully to develop the Christo-centric character of his scheme, it would be necessary to study the system in all its parts. The results of such a study might be briefly summarized as follows:

---

* "Life," p. 190.

(1). The possibility of the Incarnation is found in the fact of the Trinity.

(2). The necessity of the Incarnation is not found in the metaphysical position that the Divine nature demands Incarnation, sin or no sin. Nor is it in the fact that man *has* sinned. Incarnation is rendered necessary by the great end of creation, God's glory, and by the demands of Divine Love.

(3). To meet that end and these demands, fallen man, whose sinful unity is in Adam, must be brought back to union with God through union with His Incarnate Son.

(4). Hence Predestination as applied to the individual is not abstract, but is through the Incarnation.

(5). Hence also the great end of God's Providence is the establishment of the Kingdom of Redemption in the world.

(6). In the application of Redemption, Christ is the centre of unity, both for the individual and for the Church.

(7). Thus Christ becomes the great controlling force in the individual to whom He is personally united, and in the Church which is composed of units made one with Him.

(8). The atonement, which is strictly vicarious, removes the obstacles to our union with Christ, renders possible the offer of reconciliation to all, and produces the highest moral impression upon us as exhibiting at once God's justice and His love.

(9). Finally, the Resurrection and the Last Judgment are for the eternal separation of the good and the bad, and for the consummation of Christ's union with His Church in glory.

It is no slight indication of the individual character of this scheme, as he held it, that to his catholic spirit it afforded the best basis for harmonizing theological differences. It was a habit with him in the class-room to show how the Old School and the New might be brought together. So, in his Dayton Sermon, he argued at length to establish the position that "as to the points really in dispute, it will be found that the substantial ground as to each and all of them is also common ground." To him, the Seminary with which he was identified, was not so much a New School institution as it was a *Union* Seminary. And in this respect he was historically, as well as representatively, true to it. It was founded in the same catholic spirit which pervaded his nature and his theology.

The fact that before the Reunion this Institution was connected with the New School section of our Church, may perhaps have obscured the memories we are about to recall. In 1836, a number of clergymen and laymen of New York and the vicinity, weary of the strifes of the period, carried out a purpose which had been maturing for over a year, and laid the foundations of this Seminary, with an open expression of both the hope and the design "that it might commend itself to all men of moderate views and feelings, who desire to live free from party strife, and to stand aloof from all extremes of doctrine and practice." Those who remember the controversies to which we allude will appreciate this desire. The first professors chosen were Dr. Justin Edwards, of Andover, and Prof. Joseph Addison Alexander, of Princeton—"A happy commingling of the prevalent theological tendencies of the age." Neither of these appointments was accepted; but a provisional corps of instructors was appointed, in the same happy disregard of the School initials which have since been so formidable. Soon afterward two professors were secured in the persons of Dr. Henry White and Dr. Thomas McAuley. The Seminary was opened Dec. 5, 1836. Prof. Edward Robinson, D.D., of Andover, was soon installed in the chair of Biblical Literature. The three were assisted by Dr. Thomas H. Skinner, and by the accomplished George Bush. Then in 1837 came the division of the Church. "The friends and founders of the Seminary, greatly to their grief, found themselves unwittingly on opposite sides of the dividing line, yet unwilling to identify themselves or the enterprise in which they were embarked with either of the opposing parties." But amid many discouragements the institution grew. The nucleus of a fine library was secured. In 1839 an act of incorporation was obtained. What had before been known as "The New York Theological Seminary," became the *Union Theological Seminary*, in name as it had previously been in fact.*

Early in 1848 Dr. Thomas H. Skinner was elected to the

* Dr. E. F. Hatfield, from whose Historical Discourse delivered in 1876, we have already quoted, says the name Union was "given it at Albany, to distinguish it, probably, from the Episcopal Seminary on Twentieth St.—a name not desired, much less chosen by the Board, but prophetic of the position that the Institution has ever since maintained."

chair of Sacred Rhetoric, etc. In 1850 Dr. James P. Wilson succeeded Prof. White in the chair of Theology, and Prof. Smith entered upon his duties in the chair of Ecclesiastical History.

From this time, through the whole period of his active life, Prof. Smith's identity with the Seminary was complete. His services to the Institution would have been signal had he confined them to the class-room. But he threw himself into all its interests with characteristic ardor. The student was his friend—to be advised by him in difficulty; to be stimulated in investigation; to be assisted in research; to be cared for in sickness; to be helped in pecuniary straits. The Library was under his charge, and he devoted to it many an hour when he ought to have been at rest. The finances were his concern. The reputation of the Seminary was as dear to him as his own. Its prosperity was his joy. Its struggles were his weariness. The lustre of his name was reflected upon it. He promoted its interests when he seemed to be engaged upon work at a distance. His fame as a reviewer was a part of its capital. People saw it in the background when he appeared in the pulpit. Their respect for it was deepened by whatever increased their respect for him. Young men were attracted to the Seminary by the scattered flashes of his genius, as well as by the steady brightness of his reputation as a teacher. His memory is one of the best of its endowments to-day.

But whilst the greatest of the services he rendered to the Church are thus associated with the Seminary, he will long be remembered for his activity in matters of general ecclesiastical interest, and especially for his agency in promoting the reunion which healed the breach of 1837. As we have already intimated, he found a possible ground for that reunion, theologically, before the war of 1861 shook down some of the walls which had seemed hopelessly to separate the two sections of the Church. When in 1863 he was Moderator of the General Assembly in Philadelphia, he welcomed with glowing face and eloquent speech the Commissioners from the General Assembly then in session at Peoria. The next year, at Dayton, as Retiring Moderator, he preached his famous sermon on "Christian Union and Ecclesiastical Reunion." The country was "passing from the Iliad to the

Odyssey of our republican history, and under our Ulysses, too." The watch-words of Old School and New School were lost in common bursts of patriotism. Northern Presbyterians, marching in the same regiment, sitting at the same camp-fire, forgot to ask each other to which Assembly they belonged. The time had come to raise the inquiry, whether such a question ought to be possible—whether the differences of the two Assemblies were not those "of degree, and not of kind"—of "more and less," rather than of "yes and no." "Cannot charity find a conjunction, where a logical polemic interjects a disjunctive dilemma?" Prof. Smith boldly raised the inquiry, and in answering it, disclosed the true basis of reunion. He saw that it implied but three conditions: mutual concession, an acceptance of the Presbyterian system of Church order, and uniting simply upon the standards, without private interpretation. His vision was prophetic as well as discriminative. It should be added, however, that the full text of the third "condition" was this:

"The third condition is, that the reunion be simply on the basis of the standards which we equally accept, without private interpretation; interpreted in their legitimate grammatical historic sense in the spirit of the original Adopting Act, and 'as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.'"

The latter half of this paragraph, Prof. Smith thought so important, that at the Philadelphia Convention of 1867, he moved a defining clause to the second article of a scheme for the union of all "the divided portions of the Presbyterian family." The article proposed that, "In the United Church the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." Prof. Smith's defining clause was: "It being understood that this Confession is received in its proper historical, that is, the Calvinistic or Reformed sense." In subsequent negotiations between the two Assemblies, this clause, together with the addition proposed by Dr. Gurley, was presented and discussed, but wisely dropped at last, after it had done its work in establishing a proper understanding between the two branches of the Church.

Prof. Smith was undoubtedly one of the principal agents in effecting the Reunion, which was finally consummated in May, 1869, whilst he, in broken health, was in Europe. No one

desired it more heartily, no one worked for it more earnestly. "It has been my one aim," said he, not long before he sailed. Almost his last word before embarking in February, 1869, was a word in the direction of his aim. From 1864 his pen was constantly busy with the thought; his tongue was eloquent with it. After it became a fact, he wrote from Heidelberg: "Reunion is secured; may we but live and work for the results." He felt as if he were "shut out from both the Church and the world" when he heard of the "reunion news and rejoicings"; on occasion of which Dr. Wm. Adams wrote him: "Never since Pentecost were such conventions of Christian men. You were missed by all; very frequent mention was made of your name, both in public and in private. All feel that no one has done more than you to bring about reunion."

Dr. Patton pays a graceful tribute to him in saying, in the last Number of this REVIEW: "Henry B. Smith is the hero of Reunion."

Reviewing his whole life, we should say, his great service to Christian thought was to centralize both history and theology upon Christ. Whether he was absolutely original in this, whether all can agree in the manner in which he did it, is not material. It has been said of Bacon: "The principles of his method are to be found in many writers before him; but it was Bacon's glory that he so set forth those principles as to bring mankind to act upon them." Prof. Smith could have desired no greater glory than this. He attained it with a portion of his generation. His system has proved a lasting inspiration to many who may criticise it in some of its parts. His great service to the Church is that of Christian scholarship. His great service to his branch of the Church is declared in its Reunion. Most men would think their lives fruitful, if they could produce what he produced either as reviewer, editor, translator, preacher, newspaper writer, or contributor to encyclopedias. His industry was not as marvellous as that of Origen, who is said by Jerome to have written more than any other man could read; but it was almost as incessant. There are certainly more lines in Origen's writings, which, dying, one might wish to blot.

Three great names have been lately dropped from the roll

of our Christian scholars. They are the names of men widely differing in personal characteristics, and constrained, whilst living, to take exception to some points in each other's theological systems. Dr. Bushnell made only an "altar form" of vicarious atonement; but he suggested more loving thoughts of a personal and present Christ than many a more orthodox writer. He was needed by some who were in danger of forgetting the living Christ in thinking what the dead Christ had done for them. Dr. Hodge has given us a System of Theology whose symmetry, whose thoroughness, whose scholarship, whose fidelity to the great verities of Christianity render it a fitting monument of a mind of rare balance and discrimination, of a saintly character, and of a beautiful life. He was needed in an age which forgets the supernatural in its devotion to the material; which discredits faith, and yet is not careful of works. As New York lies between Hartford and Princeton, Prof. Smith stood between his gifted contemporaries. Himself equally gifted, he had something of the poetic fervor of the one, and something of the clear sight and the steady step of the other. Like Dr. Bushnell, he understood New England Theology, and was ever mindful that its variations could not be harmonized except by a double process of excision and adoption. Like Dr. Hodge, he was a true Presbyterian, seeking to disclose in his own way the contents of our ancient symbols. If he could see more in the life-system of Hartford than was visible from Princeton, he could also see more in objective sacrifice than was visible from Hartford. He, not less than either, was needed in a period which was demanding of its teachers a catholic temper, and of its Churches a Christian union. Not less tenderly than that of either is his memory cherished. Not less close than either does he now stand to that visible Lord whom, whilst yet unseen, they so much loved.

Z. M. Humphrey.