Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/questionatissuei00well_0

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE IN THE ANDOVER CASE.

ARGUMENTS

OF

Rev. Drs. JOSHUA W. WELLMAN and ORPHEUS T. LANPHEAR,

COMPLAINANTS IN THE ANDOVER CASE.

Prepared for the Hearing before the Board of Visitors, September 1, 1892.

PREPARED BUT NOT READ.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

BOSTON:
PRESS OF SAMUEL USHER,
171 DEVONSHIRE STREET.
1893.

COPYRIGHT, 1893, BY SAMUEL USHER.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Letters 5

Amended Complaint 7

Preface 9

Arguments of Rev. O. T. Lanphear, D.D.

Argument Maintaining the Thirteenth Charge of the Amended Complaint 13

Argument Maintaining the Twelfth Charge of the Amended Complaint 51

Arguments of Rev. J. W. Wellman, D.D.

Introduction 85

I. The Particular Complaints 90

II. First Particular Complaint 93

III. Second Particular Complaint 109

IV. Third Particular Complaint 140

V. Fifth Particular Complaint 188

VI. Sixth Particular Complaint 197

VII. Fallacious Arguments in the Replies of the Defence 249

VIII. Conclusion 281

Boston, May 8, 1893.

Rev. Drs. Wellman and Lanphear.

Gentlemen, — The undersigned, believing that the Christian public wish to know all the facts of the now celebrated Andover Case, the statement of which you laboriously prepared, and the presentation of which was prevented by the decision of the Visitors; and believing that the public mind needs enlightenment on a question so important to Christian morals and Christian truth, and having heard that the argument of the Trustees prepared by Rev. Dr. D. T. Fiske has been read by him to the Essex [North] Association, would request you to prepare a copy of your arguments for publication.

[*Signed*] Cyrus Hamlin,
Daniel March,
Geo. F. Magoun,
Joseph Cook,
E. B. Webb,
F. A. Noble,
Edward P. Goodwin,
Arthur Little
Franklin Fairbanks,
Daniel L. Furber,
Thomas Laurie,
Michael Burnham,
D. O. Mears,
Samuel H. Virgin,
Simeon Gilbert,
J. L. Withrow,
W. E. Park,
Thomas Weston,
Samuel C. Bartlett,
Wolcott Calkins,
Ebenezer Cutler,
George R. Leavitt,
E. N. Packard,
J. E. Rankin,
G. R. W. Scott,
P. B. Davis,
Philip W. Moen,
S. L. Blake,
J. D. Kingsbury,
Ezra A. Slack,
H. Fairbanks,
Lewis A. Hyde,
L. S. Rowland,
John R. Thurston,
G. S. F. Savage,
John M. Greene,

and others.

BOSTON, May 16, 1893.

REV. DRS. HAMLIN, MARCH, AND OTHERS.

Gentlemen, — The undersigned do not feel at liberty to decline your request to prepare for publication a copy of their arguments which were ready, but were not presented before the Board of Visitors in the Andover Case at the Hearing, September 1, 1892. Acting from the first under the conviction that the claim of truth and duty is paramount to every other consideration, they complied with the request of Alumni, and other friends of the Seminary, in undertaking to serve as complainants, and now as at first, in compliance with your request, a copy of their arguments is at your disposal.

JOSHUA W. WELLMAN.
ORPHEUS T. LANPHEAR.

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT AGAINST EGBERT C. SMYTH AND OTHERS, PROFESSORS IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT ANDOVER.

AMENDED COMPLAINT.

To the Reverend and Honorable the Board of Visitors of the Theological Seminary at Andover: —

Pursuant to a decree of your Honorable Board, passed October 25, A.D. 1886, the undersigned respectfully ask leave to file the following Amended Complaint against Egbert C. Smyth, Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History in said Seminary, to wit:

I.

First, we charge that the said Egbert C. Smyth holds beliefs, has taught doctrines and theories, and has done other things as hereinafter enumerated, which are not in harmony with, but antagonistic to, the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary, and the "true intention" of its Founders, as expressed in those statutes.

II.

Secondly, we charge that the said Egbert C. Smyth, contrary to the requirements of Articles XI. (eleven) and XII. (twelve) of the Constitution, as modified by Article 1. (one) of the Additional Statutes, is not a man "of sound and Orthodox principles in Divinity according to" "the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel of Christ as summarily expressed in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, . . . and as more particularly expressed in the following Creed," to wit, the Creed of the Seminary; but that on the other hand, he believes and teaches in several particulars, hereinafter enumerated, what is antagonistic to the Seminary Creed, and, therefore, in violation of the Statutory requirements of the Founders.

III.

Thirdly, we charge that the said Egbert C. Smyth, in breach of the requirement of Article II. (two) of the Associate Foundation, upon which he is placed, is not an "Orthodox and Consistent Calvinist," but, on the other hand, believes and teaches, in several particulars, hereinafter enumerated, what is opposed to the Seminary Creed.

IV.

Fourthly, we charge that the several particulars of the "heterodoxy" of the said Egbert C. Smyth, and of his opposition to the Creed of the Seminary, and to the "true intention" of the Founders as expressed in their Statutes, are as follows, to wit: he holds, "maintains and inculcates": —

1. That the Bible is not "the only perfect rule of faith and practice," but is fallible and untrustworthy in some of its religious teachings.

2. That Christ in the days of his humiliation was a finite being, limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments; in other words, was not "GOD AND MAN."

3. That no man has power or capacity to repent without knowledge of God in Christ.

4. That mankind, save as they have received a knowledge of "the historic Christ," are not sinners, or, if they are, not of such sinfulness as to be in danger of being lost.

5. That no man can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ.

6. That the atonement of Christ consists essentially and chiefly in his becoming identified with the human race through his incarnation, in order that, by his union with men, he might endow them with the power to repent, and thus impart to them an augmented value in the view of God, and so render God propitious towards them.

7. That the Trinity is modal, or monarchian, and not a Trinity of Persons.

8. That the work of the Holy Spirit is chiefly confined to the sphere of historic Christianity.

9. That without the knowledge of God in Christ, men do not deserve the punishment of the law, and that therefore their salvation is not "wholly of grace."

10. That faith ought to be scientific and rational rather than scriptural.

11. That there is, and will be, probation after death for all men who do not decisively reject Christ during the earthly life; and that this should be emphasized, made influential, and even central in systematic theology.

12. That Christian missions are not to be supported and conducted on the ground that men who know not Christ are in danger of perishing forever, and must perish forever, unless saved in this life.

13. That a system of physical and metaphysical philosophy is true which by fair inference neutralizes the Christian doctrine as taught in the Creed of the Seminary.

14. That there is a "New Theology better than the Old," which, we apprehend, is not in harmony with the Creed. but fatally opposed to the same.

15. That the said Egbert C. Smyth holds and teaches many things which cannot be reconciled with that "Orthodox and consistent Calvinism," which the Statutes require of him, and to which he stands publicly committed; and that in repeated instances said Egbert C. Smyth has broken solemn promises made when he subscribed the Creed.

J. W. WELLMAN,
H. M. DEXTER,
O. T. LANPHEAR,
J. J. BLAISDELL,
By ASA FRENCH,
Their Attorney.

BOSTON, November 8, 1886.

PREFACE.

No apology is required of the complainants for publishing their arguments, which were not read before the Board of Visitors because of the decision to dismiss the Amended Complaint without further hearing.

Admitting the wisdom of the Board in dismissing the Complaint, in order to the performance of its duty in another way: the question at issue in the Andover Case is so momentous, the public interest in it so important, and the requirements of full and free discussion in the service of truth so imperative, as to require the complainants to give their arguments to the public in this manner, especially, when asked to do so by so many representatives of interested Alumni, together with others, and also since the public expectation was not to be satisfied by learning their views in any other way.

If any precedent were needed, in addition to the action of the President of the Board of Trustees in reading his argument in defence of the professors prepared for the hearing before the Board of Visitors, at a meeting of the ministerial association of which he is a member, shortly after the dismissal of the Complaint, reference might be made to the fact that The Andover Review, with other representatives of the public press, has been diligent in the defence of the professors, claiming without warrant that the dismissal of the Complaint was tantamount to their justification, and also publishing a series of essays on the Divinity of Christ, which, however they may have been intended in defence of the professors, must be taken as still further evidence of their departure from the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, as taught in the creed of the Seminary. Under these circumstances no valid reason could be given in the name of freedom of thought, and its public expression, for withholding from the public the arguments of the complainants.

These arguments are published in form and substance as they were prepared for reading before the Board of Visitors, except that in some instances reference is made to certain publications since that date and to certain recent events in illustration of the positions already taken. To correct certain misapprehensions respecting the standing of the complainants it may be proper to repeat here in brief what has been explicitly, and perhaps sufficiently, declared before: that, in the first instance, they appeared before the Visitors simply as "memorialists," and acting according to what they believed to be the deliverance of predecessors of the Visitors in office; that, instead of acting as "memorialists," they consented to act as complainants under the permission and

authority of the Visitors, when assured that they could not be heard in any other capacity; and that they were to serve in this capacity only during the pleasure of the Visitors to receive their service.

It is also proper to say that, in the mind of the complainants, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., is not regarded in any sense more amenable to the charges of the Complaint than his professorial associate editors of the book entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy." That they have to speak of him as the alone Respondent is owing to circumstances not within their control. As the Complaint was first formulated, it was made against all the associate editors jointly, but objection being made on the plea that it would be more according to equity to put but one of the professors on trial at a time, the Complaint was changed so that charges were formulated against Professor Smyth alone. But at the conclusion of the arguments of both the Defendant and of the complainants, the motion was made by counsel of the Defendant to include with him in this hearing his associate editors on their acceptance of Professor Smyth's defence as their own, with leave to make such further statements as each for himself might desire. This was agreed to by counsel of the complainants and accepted by the Visitors. But it transpired that as one of the Visitors — Dr. W. T. Eustis — was not present when the other professors made these further statements, it did not appear to him that he could consistently and legally act with the other Visitors in coming to a decision which should include the professors whom he had not heard. Consequently the Visitors decreed to remove only Professor Smyth from office, according to the plea for equity made before the hearing of the arguments. This decree of the Board of Visitors having been set aside by the Supreme Court on the ground that the Trustees were not heard in the case, as they desired, "the Amended Complaint" against Egbert C. Smyth was declared to be "still pending," on which a hearing was ordered by the Board of Visitors to be had September 1, 1892, at which the complainants were cited to be present, with others, "to be heard thereon." In obedience to this citation the complainants appeared prepared to read the arguments contained in this pamphlet, which, however, they did not read because the Amended Complaint was dismissed, as already stated.

These arguments, instead of following the numerical order of the several specifications, are arranged according to what is conceived to be the order of thought — the two first in this order written by O. T. Lanphear, and the arguments following written by J. W. Wellman.

JOSHUA W. WELLMAN.
ORPHEUS T. LANPHEAR.

ARGUMENTS

OF

REV. O. T. LANPHEAR, D.D.

ARGUMENT

Maintaining the Thirteenth Charge of the Amended Complaint.

To the Reverend and Honorable, the Board of Visitors in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

Mr. President and Gentlemen, — I am to argue before you the thirteenth charge of the Amended Complaint, which is that the Respondent, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., "holds, maintains, and inculcates that a system of physical and metaphysical philosophy is true which by fair inference neutralizes the Christian doctrine as taught in the Creed of the Seminary."

While there may be, in some respects, a variety of opinions attached to "New Theology," whether as advocated in the volume styled "Progressive Orthodoxy" or elsewhere, there is in the philosophy underlying them a common interest. This philosophy is pantheistic, whether as pertaining to the domain of physical or metaphysical inquiry.

In England, the Rev. J. B. Heard, arguing for the New Theology, says in respect to the being of God that "unless we can make an approach to what for want of a better term we must call Christian Pantheism, our theology on the most fundamental question of all will strike a note to which modern science will have no response"; and lacking this response, "theology must," in his estimation, "fossilize." That the pantheism he has in mind has no Christian element appears when he says that "what in Spinoza was an evil dream of science is now a sober reality"; since Spinoza held that "all things are but modes of God's infinite attributes."[1]

The Rev. J. R. Illingworth, in his essay on the "Incarnation in Relation to Development," in the volume entitled "Lux Mundi," argues for the "higher pantheism," which, he says, "is so common at the present day,"[2] though in this case the reason for pre-

[1] Old and New Theology, p. 58. Morell's Hist. Mod. Philos. p. 127.
[2] Lux Mundi, p. 159.

suming to make the doctrine less offensive by calling it the "higher pantheism" is not apparent.

In New England, the author of "The Continuity of Christian Thought," while declaring that Maurice "more than any other modern theologian was in accord with the fundamental principle of Hegel," and admitting that "it is common to hear Schleiermacher, Hegel, and others spoken of as pantheists," does not call them pantheists himself, on the ground that "the term," as he thinks, "has never been defined," and what "its future destiny may be is still uncertain." [1]

The New Theology, as represented in the volume entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy," has the elements of pantheistic philosophy found in this theology as represented by other writers.

It is this pantheistic philosophy which neutralizes the Christian doctrine as taught in the Creed of the Seminary.

I. In the first place, this pantheistic philosophy appears in the views held respecting the Divine Immanence.

In "Progressive Orthodoxy," page 16, there is the following passage: —

> We add a single remark upon the general philosophical conception of God and his relation to the universe which underlies these essays. It is a modification of a prevailing Latin conception of the divine transcendence by a clearer and fuller appreciation [in accordance with the highest thought of the Greek Fathers] of the divine immanence. Such a doctrine of God, we believe, is more and more approving itself in the best philosophy of our time, and the fact of the Incarnation commends it to the acceptance of the Christian theologian.

This statement is important since it furnishes the key to the situation of all that follows in the discussion of the different topics. What, then, is the divine immanence according to the Greek Fathers? This question cannot be answered without some reference to Greek philosophy, with which the theology of the Greek Fathers was in alliance. In general it may be said that the Greek philosophers had no idea of the personality of God, so that they defined creation as an emanation from God, and not as a creation in the proper sense. According to Plato, nothing has ever been created. All that is is eternal, not in form, but in substance. Something material has always existed, which would

[1] Continuity of Christian Thought, p. 427 *sq.*

be lifeless except that it has a soul — an unintelligent force by which chaotic agitation is produced. God, as the absolute or impersonal Being, endowed this unintelligent force with a portion of his own intelligence, and then this unintelligent force thus endowed becomes the world-soul, or Logos, which pervades the visible universe and constitutes one living animated whole, and is individualized in human souls. The soul of man, then, consists of the world-soul as an unintelligent force of matter, and that portion of God's own intelligence — or Logos — with which he has endowed that force.[1] Thus the Logos is the reason of God manifest in creation, which it fosters and sustains.

This notion of the Logos as the mediator between God and the world was not confined to the doctrines of Plato or the Greek philosophy, for, as Milman observes, this doctrine was held "from the shores of the Yellow Sea to the Ilissus; it was the fundamental principle of the Indian religion and Indian philosophy: it was the basis of Zoroastrianism, it was pure Platonism, it was the Platonic Judaism of the Alexandrian School."[2] Thus, the Logos is not a person, or hypostasis in the Being of God, but an emanation from him, a ray of light shot out from him, as a ray of light shot out from the sun, and to be reabsorbed in him as a ray of light may be conceived as being reabsorbed in the sun. The world exists, then, in form, by an evolution of God, by his identity with the world through the Logos, so that really there is no vital distinction between God and the world. It has been well said, therefore, that "the whole fabric of ancient and modern pantheism rests upon the *petitio principii*, that the doctrine of evolution has the same legitimate application within the sphere of the Infinite and Eternal, that it has within that of the Finite and Temporal,— a postulate which annihilates the distinction between the two."[3] But in the annihilation of this distinction, God and the world are found to be identical. Man is a God-man by the identity of the Logos with his soul.

Again, Plato made ideas eternal and immutable, and as ideas were all included in the Being of God, and as ideas constituted the only really existing beings, then, all that is phenomenal or that affects the senses being mere shadows of the real, it follows that

[1] Charles Hodge's Theology, vol. 1, p. 322. Charles Bigg's Bampton Lectures, 1886, p. 15. [2] History of Christianity, p. 45. [3] Shedd's Hist. of Christ. Doct. vol. 1, p. 13.

Plato's system in its essential character is really pantheistical. Thus all that there is of intelligence in the world, down to man, belongs, in Plato's view, to the divine substance.[1]

So the aim of Stoicism "was to bring the popular religion, allegorically explained, into union with a thoroughly pantheistic view of the world."

Aristotle held that human souls are only the divine reason in individual existence.

The Neoplatonists held that the affluence of God is emitted as fire emits heat, and that the soul of man is a mode of God's existence, a portion of his substance, and whose destiny is absorption in the Infinite Being.

According to the mysticism of the Alexandrian School, the Logos, or reason in God, is reason in man, so that in the pursuit of truth supreme authority should be ascribed to "God within us," and not to the Scriptures.

Origen held "to a spiritually conceived theory of emanation." "God, as the absolute unity, he taught, can only be a source of unity. So far as all existence springs from him, the unity of his own essence must reveal itself therein." "God therefore is to be originally contemplated as the fountain of a world of spirits, allied to his own nature."[2] As Origen held to the preëxistence of the human spirit, and that it was at length sent into this world on account of sin, this passage shows that in that previous state the origin of the human spirit was an emanation from the divine essence, and so in quality identical with the divine.

Professor Allen says that "the statement of Hegel may differ in form from that of ancient Greek theology, but it is the same thing in essential principle."[3] But according to Hegel, "Deity is a process ever going on, but never accomplished; nay, the divine consciousness is absolutely one with the advancing consciousness of mankind." "Apart from, and out of, the world, therefore, there is no God; and so also, apart from the universal consciousness of man, there is no divine consciousness or personality."[4] Such is the Hegelian pantheism. Thus as the Greek philosophy in its relation to theology shows that in all its forms

[1] C. Hodge's Theol. vol. i, p. 325, and on pantheism generally. See also Döllinger's Gentile and the Jew. [2] Neander, vol. i, p. 621. [3] Continuity of Christian Thought, p. 431. [4] Morell's Hist. Mod. Philos. pp. 473–477.

it was more or less pantheistic, and as the Greek Fathers derived the doctrine of the divine immanence from the Greek philosophy, it must be regarded as involving the identity of the human with the divine. It goes to support this view that the opinion of those who may be called experts, whether accepting or rejecting this view of the divine immanence, agree substantially in attributing to it this doctrine of identity.

Now, this pantheistic philosophy on which the doctrine of the divine immanence is based is opposed to the doctrine of Christian theism in the Andover Creed in several particulars: —

And in the first place, this opposition is seen in respect to the Creation. According to the theology of the Andover Creed, the world was created out of nothing, both in substance and form, and therefore the Creation had a beginning; while according to the Greek immanence the world is an emanation from God, and without beginning, matter being eternal, while creation regarded as an emanation applies only to the *form* of things. Thus, the Greek immanence lies at the foundation of what is called monistic pantheism, that is, that there is in reality but one Being in the universe, and that Being is God. But as opposed to this, the theology of the Andover Creed holds that God created the world to be other than himself. Thus it is consistent with its claim that "the word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is the only perfect rule of faith and practice," for the Bible everywhere recognizes as true the intuitive convictions of men. One of these convictions is that God is other than the world, that God as spirit is not matter, nor is matter spirit. Thus the realistic dualism which lies at the bottom of all human convictions underlies also all the revelations of the Bible.

Again, the Greek immanence is opposed to the divine immanence of Christian theism which is the basis of the Andover Creed. In Christian theism the divine immanence is equivalent to the divine omnipresence. As Creation had a beginning, before the Creation God filled the immensity of space with his presence. In the Creation God did not displace himself, but remained equal to himself, everywhere present in the space filled by Creation and everywhere present in space not filled by Creation. God's omnipresence or immanence is his presence everywhere in Creation, while his transcendence is his presence

everywhere beyond the Creation. In this doctrine of the divine omnipresence, or immanence, God is in no sense identical with the created universe, nor is the divine in any sense identical with the human. This doctrine of the divine omnipresence may be said to date from Augustine, who, though receiving his scientific discipline from Platonism as well as Origen, nevertheless disentangled his theology from Platonism in respect to the being of God.[1] He says that God "is entire in heaven alone, and entire in earth alone, and entire in both heaven and earth, and comprehended in no place, but everywhere entire in himself."[2]

Calvin says that "God represents his residence to be in heaven; for though, as he is incomprehensible, he fills the earth also; yet seeing that our minds, from their dulness, are continually dwelling on the earth, in order to shake off our sloth and inactivity, he properly raises us above the world."[3]

Charnock, who was a Calvinist, says that "God is most simple; his essence therefore is not mixed with anything. God is not formally one with the world or with any creature in the world by his presence in it, nor can any creature in the world, no, not the soul of man, or an angel, come to be essentially one with God, though God be essentially present with it. He fills heaven and earth; he is as much a God in the earth beneath as in heaven above, entirely in all places, not by scraps and fragments of his essence."[4]

Emmons says, "that a cause can operate where it does not exist, is utterly inconceivable; and, therefore, the presence of the Creator, must be coëxtensive with his works." It is no less a conclusion of reason than a dictate of revelation that God "fills heaven and earth."[5]

Thus in Christian theism, according to the theology of the Andover Creed, the divine immanence is the omnipresence of God in the world in such a manner that God is not "mixed," or identified with the world, nor is there any identity of the human with the divine.

But according to the Greek philosophy as taught at Andover, and the Greek theology shaped by that philosophy, the divine immanence is the omnipresence of God in such a way that God *is*

[1] Neander, vol. ii, p. 353. [2] Hodge, vol. i, p. 384. [3] Inst. i, 13. [4] Divine Attributes, p. 238. [5] Bib. Sac. vol. vii, p. 257.

identified with the world, and so as to establish the identity of the divine with the human, and thus "neutralizes the Christian doctrine as taught in the Creed of the Seminary."

It has been said by the defenders of "Progressive Orthodoxy" that it cannot be pantheistic because it admits of the divine transcendence; but the answer is that it does not admit of the divine transcendence in the sense that attaches to the transcendence in Christian theism. According to the latter, the quality of the being of God is the same whether considered in respect to his omnipresence in the world, or to his transcendence beyond the world. But, according to the Greek immanence, the identity of the human with the divine gives a quality to the being of God in the world different from the quality of the being of God in his transcendence beyond the world. In his transcendence the being of God is purely divine, but in his immanence the being of God is identified with the human, and so confounded with the world. Thus it appears that the transcendence which the Greek immanence can consistently admit must differ in kind from the transcendence of Christian theism, for in that the transcendence and immanence represent the being of God as the same in quality. The admission of *a* transcendence, therefore, does not, as some have supposed, go to prove that a theology is free from pantheism. Any representation of the transcendence as different in quality from the immanence, such as that immanence represents the actual or real being of God, while transcendence represents the ideal being of God; or that immanence represents the known being of God, while transcendence represents the unknown being of God, — is contrary to Christian theism and in the interest of pantheism.

It should be observed that the omnipresence of God, as the divine essence present everywhere, does not satisfy the advocates of the divine immanence according to the Greek Fathers. They call this omnipresence a presence merely by "contact," or "contiguity," while they are satisfied with nothing short of that "pervasive" and "permeating" presence of the divine essence which constitutes the identity of the human with the divine. They can affirm, with Professor Cocker, that "God is immanent in man, and that man is immanent in God," and that "the reason of man is a beam of the eternal reason."[1] In general, the advocates of

[1] Theistic Conception of the World, p. 353.

this Divine Immanency claim that any view of creation which represents man as other than God in being, action, reason, moral attributes, and personality, is a deistical view. To this effect Dr. Douglass says that "Divine Immanency stands opposed to dualism in all its forms."[1] It follows, then, that God and man are in no sense two, but are in reality one. When man thinks, chooses, and acts, it is not man as an individual person and free agent that does these things, but God who thinks, chooses, and acts in human form. In short, this Immanence represents God as in the continuous act of a creation which consists solely in the evolution of himself; hence there can be no dualism, and no such distinction as that between the Natural and the Supernatural, between Immanence and Transcendence, for the only proper thing to say of God is, that he is the "All."

Thus, though in "Progressive Orthodoxy" it is not indicated what definite shade of meaning is attached to the "divine immanence, in accordance with the highest thought of the Greek Fathers," yet the statements of these Fathers respecting this doctrine, as well as the interpretation of experts and the views of those holding the doctrine, show conclusively that the basis of the doctrine is pantheistic philosophy, and therefore that it is opposed to the Christian theism of the Andover Creed.

II. In the second place, the pantheistic philosophy of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is seen in the substantial rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity required in the Andover Creed, in favor of a Modal or Monarchian theory. Theologically, this has already been argued under the seventh charge of the list, so that here there is only occasion for brief reference to the philosophy on which the Modal theory rests, as illustrated by the views of Sabellius and Arius.

In the Sabellian view, the names Father, Logos, and Holy Ghost are simply "designations of three different phases under which the one divine essence reveals itself."[2] The Father — the Absolute — remains the same, but evolves himself in the Son and the Spirit, while in the Triad there is no distinction as to essence. There being no personal distinction in the Triad, there was nothing inconsistent in supposing these only seeming personalities should disappear, be annihilated, or be reabsorbed in the essence

[1] Divine Immanency, Bib. Sac. vols. xlv-xlvii. [2] Neander, vol. i, p. 595.

of the impersonal Absolute. But this implied the completed pantheistic circle of evolution and involution, in respect to which Neander justly remarks that "as Sabellius made Christ's personality to be nothing more than a transient appearance, so he must have conceived it to be also in regard to all personal existence."[1] Thus Sabellianism was based on that pantheistic philosophy of Emanation which confounded God with the world.

Arius undoubtedly supposed that he was establishing "the Oriental system of emanation and subordination which obtained a settled form through the labors of Origen."[2] But this system was pantheistic, whether in speaking of the Logos as an emanation or a radiation from God. In Origen's conception of Christ it must be kept in mind that he believed in the "preëxistence of souls," and "the original rectitude, and perfect equality, of all created spirits, as they came from the hand of their Maker; but when they all declined, though in different degrees, from their first and perfect love, and thence received their diverse assignations, in earth and skies, that, which is now the soul of Jesus, was alone found stedfast. As a reward for this integrity, and to effect the purposes of the divine Incarnation, this soul was received into the most perfect union with the Logos, they [this soul and the Logos] completely embracing each other, so as to become in a sense One Spirit. Thus united, and by this indispensable medium, God was born a man."[3] Now this pantheistic conception of the Christ, in whom the Logos of itself was not a person since only a ray shot out from the Father, but became a person through union with the preëxistent soul of Jesus, was retained in the view of Arius, as he understood it, so that when he called Christ a creature he only intended to affirm that there was a time when he did not exist, without assuming in any manner that his origin was not by emanation when at length his being began. Thus, however Sabellius and Arius may have differed in other respects, they agreed in this, that the origin of the Son was by emanation from the Father; for the thought is the same whether it be said that the Son proceeds from the Father by efflux, radiation, emanation, or evolution. To admit that evolution is legitimate in the Infinite and Eternal, and so in the divine essence; that this essence has continually the power of

[1] Neander, vol. i, p. 600. [2] Ibid. vol. ii, pp. 360, 361. [3] Bib. Repos. 1834, p. 225.

becoming, by any extension which implies that this essence exists at one time as it did not exist at another time, — is to admit a cardinal principle of pantheism. Hence the safeguard of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity consists primarily in holding fast the doctrine of the real Trinity, One God in three coëternal Persons, or Hypostases, equal in honor, power, and glory, and each God as implying the other Two.

In our theological argument on the seventh complaint we showed that in some respects the doctrine of "Progressive Orthodoxy" respecting the Trinity was far easier to reconcile with the Arian doctrine than with the orthodox Trinitarian doctrine; while in some other respects it was in accord with the Modal theory of Sabellius. And we now say that these Sabellian and Arian aspects of the Trinity, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," depend upon the pantheistic philosophy of emanation which underlies them. In either of these aspects there may be something in Christ admitted to be divine, for in either case Christ is an evolution of God, but not the Second Hypostasis of the Trinity, Incarnate, according to the Trinity of Christian theism in the Seminary Creed. Taken as such an evolution the divine in Christ might be consistently regarded as variable in degree, and progressive in the manifestation of intelligence and power. When pantheistic philosophy, modern as well as ancient, can affirm that "the divine Spirit is in embryo in man in various stages of development," then, according to this philosophy, theology will not be charged with inconsistency in affirming that he who is called the Son of God was developed through periods of comparative ignorance and knowledge, weakness and power.

III. In the third place, the conception of the Person of Christ, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," is in harmony with pantheistic philosophy.

There is no proper distinction between the divine and human natures such as is recognized in the Seminary Creed. The two natures are represented as having a natural affinity for each other, so that upon contact they mingle, "interpenetrate," and coalesce into personal identity. However they might be conceived previous to this contact, or union; as that one *was* divine nature, and the other human nature; or that one *was* supernatural and the other natural, — it is obvious that upon this union these distinctions

were no longer applicable. If used at all, they must properly refer to the *source* of this union, and not to the union as *constituted*, so that "Christ's history has for its foundation two natures," while "the act of incarnation is the union of these two,"[1] so that they appear to have become identical. This seems to be a recovery of the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria, who held to the "existence of One Christ in the united deity and humanity" in such a way that he could "transfer the human predicates to the divine essence, and the divine to the human."[2] From this, it has been said that Cyril's doctrine ought not to be charged with holding notions whereby the divine and human natures were confounded, and transferred into each other. But while this might be claimed from the paradoxical language used, yet it appears sufficiently evident that the predicates of the divine and the human were distinctly apart, only in referring to the *origin* of Christ as a union of the divine and the human; while in the *actual case* after this union the two natures should no longer be distinguished, but that both classes of attributes were alike referred to one and the same Son of God. The same thing appears in Cyril's anathemas against Nestorius, where he affirms that Christ was formed out of two natures, formed of two things into an indissoluble unity, such as to allow of "the unconditional transfer of predicates."[3] Thus, according to Giesler, "Cyril seemed entirely to do away with the two natures of Christ."[4] So "Progressive Orthodoxy" does away with the two natures of Christ. It is said that

> The constitutive act for Christ's person is the union of two natures. One of these, the human, is only potentially personal, and is capable by its very constitution, of entering into a divine life, of finding the truth of its existence in God. The other is a particular mode of the divine being, not in itself a person, but the bearer of a personal principle, and capable of self-realization in a human life. The act of incarnation is the union of these two.[5]

Thus the two natures have in their individual constitution that affinity of the one for the other which attracts them into unity. The full realization of the human nature is not attained until it finds the truth of its existence in God. Nor is the full realization

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 30. [2] Neander, vol. ii, p. 444. [3] Ibid. vol. ii, p. 464. [4] Eccl. Hist. i, p. 399. [5] Prog. Orth. pp. 30, 31.

of the divine nature attained until it finds its self-realization in a human life. The one is the complement of the other so that their completeness is found only in that union which shows their identity.

The divine nature and the human interpenetrate each other. The divine informs the human. The human receives and expresses the divine.[1]

Now that the two natures have become one, there is no longer any consistency in speaking of them as two. Only before they became one may they be referred to as, *then*, the human and the divine; but since they became one such reference is impertinent. Now, since the evolution of this unity, there is in reality but one Nature as there is but one Personality. Any attempt to represent the one, as two, ends in senseless paradox. It may be said of the personality of Christ that

It is the personality of the creative Word, but not simply this. It is the personality of the created nature, but not merely this. It is the one as affected by the other.[2]

But this mystical balancing of affirmation with negation is a waste of words, unless it should be conceived as done to mislead those who hold that Christ "continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever," according to the Seminary Creed.

Again, this personality of Christ, in which by "interpenetration" the human and divine natures are resolved into identity, continues to be subject to pantheistic evolution. As at first both the human and the divine were an evolution of God, so after the union of the human and divine in the person of Christ, this union, or person, was the subject of a further evolution.

This personality was not fully realized in the beginning. There was not only growth of the humanity of Jesus, but a progressive union with the divine.

The Incarnation itself, though real at the beginning, was also a process which had steps which the records of Jesus' life enable us in some degree to trace and understand.[3]

It is important to observe here that those who hold to "two distinct natures" in Christ, according to the Seminary Creed, find

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 30, 31. [2] Ibid. pp. 30, 31. [3] Ibid. p. 32.

that he was distinctly conscious of himself as being divine, and just as distinctly conscious of himself as being human. Thus, whatever growth or development might attach to his human nature, in which he might be considered as passing from infancy to manhood and from ignorance to knowledge, yet, none of these limitations could attach to Christ as being divine. But the theory under consideration does not admit that Christ had this consciousness of himself as being both human and divine, but affirms that there was in his consciousness a centre, a consciousness in which his individual personality was grounded; a consciousness which was

> That point of rest and union, and therefore of life and power, where the divine nature realizes the experiences of the human as its own, where the human realizes that its completeness and perfection are in God; the centre of a divine-human consciousness, and this Personal centre is the God-man.[1]

Taking this view, consistency requires the assertion that at the Incarnation the Logos, or the divine in Christ, "suspended the exercise of his attributes of Omniscience, Omnipresence, and the like," so as to furnish the necessary conditions for assuming the veritable evolution of Christ's consciousness and personality from the moment of his Incarnation. Thus, Christ in his personality is brought down near to the level of the human, since the limitation and depression of the attributes of the divine in him are not compensated by any sufficient corresponding elevation of the attributes of the human; for when it is said that "the human realizes that its completeness and perfection are in God," it must not be forgotten that this "completeness" and "perfection" are not yet attained, but to be attained some time in the future as the result of evolution. Thus while on earth Christ was much more human than divine, so that whatever greatness might be then ascribed to him was made contingent upon subsequent evolution.

This view has the support of Origen's emanation theory, undoubtedly,[2] as well as that of Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, who to some extent carried forward Origen's theory. "They adopted from Origen the doctrine that the Logos united himself by the mediation of a rational human soul with the

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 32. [2] Ibid. p. 22.

sensuous nature. The essential point of this union, the characteristic mark of the personal unity, they placed in this: namely, that the divine Logos took all the parts of human nature into fellowship with himself, and "pervaded" them. They affirmed, it is true, that this "permeation" took place potentially from the first moment of the human existence; but, with Origen, they taught at the same time that its consequences, in respect to all the parts of human nature, did not unfold themselves until after Christ's resurrection; that after his ascension to glory, his body also became transfigured to a form analagous with the divine essence."[1] This view was accepted essentially by the Antiochian School under the lead of Theodore of Mopsuestia. "The progressive deification of the human nature in Christ up to the time of his ascension to glory, he contemplated as a consequence and effect of the original and hidden union — the very end for which God had appropriated the human nature even from its birth."[2] Thus, man, being from the first a God-man as an evolution of God, becomes in a higher degree a God-man through the incarnation of the Logos, or Word, since this incarnation represents the further evolution of the divine in humanity through the Christ, so that as ultimately after Christ's resurrection his humanity became "delocalized," "deified," and "omnipresent," — reabsorbed in God,— so ultimately through Christ whose "Headship has a foundation in the permanent constitution of the human soul, and is fitly as enduring as its immortality,"[3] all the human race will become deified, reabsorbed in God. Thus it is affirmed that here is "an evolution which looks to an incarnation as to its adequate goal. All things point to man, and man as perfected in the Son of Man."[4] Held in logical consistency, free of mystical contradictions by which whatever is affirmed is also denied, and without any mere show of making it consistent with the Christian theism of the Scriptures or with the Creed of the Seminary, this doctrine of "Progressive Orthodoxy" respecting the Incarnation belongs to the pantheism of the East. In reality, man is not ever other than God, is always potentially identical with God in the quality of his being, while the Incarnation is the evolutionary process by which the identity of the human with the divine is displayed not

[1] Neander, vol. ii, p. 427; vol. i, p. 639. [2] Ibid. vol. ii, p. 437. [3] Prog. Orth. p. 34. [4] Ibid. p. 35.

only as to quality, but in all the conceivable fulness of accomplished fact.

Now, it is not to be taken as evidence of the orthodoxy of those holding this view, or that they are in harmony with the Creed of the Seminary, that they assert the divinity of Christ. For as Canon Liddon has well said, "When Jesus Christ is said by his Church to be God, that word is used in its natural, its absolute, its incommunicable sense. This must be constantly borne in mind, if we would escape from equivocations which might again obscure the true point before us." "For," continues Liddon, "Arianism will confess Christ's divinity, if, when it terms him God, it may really mean that he is a being of an inferior and created nature. Socinianism will confess Christ's divinity, if this confession involves nothing more emphatic than an acknowledgment of the fact that certain moral features of God's character shone forth from the human life of Christ with an absolutely unrivaled splendor. Pantheism will confess Christ's divinity, but then it is a divinity which he must share with the universe. Christ may well be divine, when all is divine, although pantheism too may admit that Christ is divine in a higher sense than any other man, because he has more clearly recognized or exhibited 'the eternal oneness of the finite and the Infinite, of God and humanity.' The coarsest forms of unbelief will confess our Lord's divinity, if they may proceed to add, by way of explanation, that such language is but the echo of an apotheosis, informally decreed to the prophet of Nazareth by the fervid but uncritical enthusiasm of his Church."[1]

In keeping with Liddon's statement, it must be said that it is of no avail for those who accept of the confounding of the divine with the human by their mutual "interpenetration" in the Person of Christ, to say in extenuation that they confess our Lord's divinity. For in this case, scientifically considered, our Lord is neither divine nor human. When two metals are fused together so that they interpenetrate, science gives to the amalgam a new name. It is no longer recognized by either of the two metals out of which the amalgam is produced. When by fusion copper and zinc combine, the amalgam is neither copper nor zinc, but brass. Such is the miserable alloy presented in "Progressive Orthodoxy"

[1] Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures on Our Lord's Divinity, 1866, p. 39.

as an equivalent for the declaration in the Andover Creed that "the Eternal Son of God . . . became man, and continues to be God and man in two *distinct* natures and one Person forever." The only escape from the force of this illustration in the premises is to affirm that there never was any distinction between the so-called divine and human, that in reality they were always one, and that it is only an illusion when they are spoken of as different. But this would be to make the honest and frank confession of the pantheism which really underlies the view in question.

IV. In the fourth place, the philosophy of "Progressive Orthodoxy" which requires a pantheistic Incarnation requires a pantheistic atonement. Such an atonement is consistently furnished by "Progressive Orthodoxy." Such an atonement could not be ascribed to Christ as simply the Mediator to save man from sin. As contrary to this, or according to what is claimed as a broader view, "Christ mediates God to the entire universe."[1] This, however, conforms to the pagan view of the Logos, in his cosmic relation to creation, rather than to his mediatorial character as the Redeemer of sinners. This pagan view of the Logos, not as a Person, or Hypostasis in the being of God, but as an emanation from God, has already been noticed according to the statement of Milman. The attempt has often been made to show that in the Gospel of John this pagan notion finds support, because that John declares that "without him was not anything made that was made." But since the purpose of John is to declare the equality of the Word with the Father, and as eternally preëxistent and manifested in Time and Space for the gracious ends of Divine Love in Redemption, it follows that John did not adopt in any degree the pagan view of the Logos, or the teaching of any of the existing philosophies. When John says that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life,"[2] he shows that the one ground of the divine counsel in Redemption was the salvation of men from sin. Thus it is evident that the Mediatorship of Christ according to the Scriptures cannot be considered as having its ground in the pagan, or Philo-Judean philosophy, notwithstanding the speculations to the contrary of the Tübingen School.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 43. [2] John 3: 16.

Not accepting, then, the pagan or pantheistic conception of the Logos as explanatory of John's conception of the Word, it is obvious that the conception of the atonement as founded on the former must stand in open hostility to the conception of atonement as founded on the latter. According to the pagan physical and metaphysical conception of the Logos it is legitimate to say that "The Logos, that which is absolute fulness and truth in God, is communicated into finite existences";[1] that Christ's universe "is not attached to him externally, but vitally"; that "He is not a Governor set over it, but is its life everywhere."[2] In this view Christ is not regarded as in objective relation to the universe, or to man. His relation to man is subjective: he is not attached to man externally, or objectively, but is attached to man vitally, or subjectively. Whatever benefit Christ confers on man must result from the evolution of himself as identical with man's vitality, as himself communicated into man's finite existence as an absolute fulness, or integral part of man's existence. So Christ cannot be an objective Governor of man, because he is the subjective life of man everywhere. Thus, carried out, there is no such thing as an objective Ruler, or Law. There is no external Lord of Creation, no objective King of saints, no objective Lamb of God to receive the prayers of his saints on earth, or their songs of praise hereafter in heaven. Whatever there is, called obedience and praise, under this theory, is solely the subjective evolution of Christ in men as identical with their life, because he is their life everywhere. In reality, however, there can be, according to this conception of Christ, no such thing as obedience or praise, and because that, strictly, there is nothing other than man, and objective to man, to be obeyed and praised. The poet can idealize a flower as having a self-conscious existence, and so praising its Creator in the unfolding of its blushing tint and graceful carriage. So the pantheistic poet can idealize man as praising God, while at the same time he denies to man that pure human self-conscious personality by which he could recognize and praise God as the supreme object of his regard. Of course, in the pagan notion of the Logos, there is no consistent foundation for the vicarious atonement of John and Paul. Any attempt to produce a theory of atonement on that foundation in harmony

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 43. [2] Ibid. p. 44.

with the Scriptures which everywhere assert the objective being of God in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as objective to man, while imparting help to man by the efficiency of grace, must end in the confusion and contradiction of pantheistic mysticism. This confusion is illustrated in "Progressive Orthodoxy" in the statements made respecting the Person of Christ in considering the atonement, as well as in what is said of the Incarnation. This Person is said to be

The Infinite, personally disclosed; the eternal Power that makes for righteousness realized in the Righteous One.[1]

Christ's personality is directly and indissolubly connected with that of the divine Word. The one is a true revelation and outgrowth of the other.[2]

The human nature is a person only with, in, and through the Logos. The central point of Christ's personality falls into the central point of Absolute Personality.[3]

It is said that

One view of atonement is gained by considering the historical Christ in relation to humanity and as identified with it: in which view we see that the race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it.[4]

Christ has an organic relation to the race. He is an individual, but an individual vitally related to every human being.[5]

His divinity, indeed, is in nothing more clearly shown than in his perfect humanity: in the fact that he was not merely the ideal man, but the universal man, his humanity not something strange to his divinity, but its best and purest organ.

When Christ suffers the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful the race is sorrowful.

Thus we can regard him as our substitute, not because he stands apart, not because he is one and the race another, but because he is so intimately identified with us.[6]

The race is reconstituted in Christ, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact.[7]

Christ is a new divine power in the race to turn it away from sin unto God.[8]

The extent of the atonement resides . . . in the personality of Christ.

He is the Universal Person, as we said at the outset.[9]

Humanity with Christ in it is propitiated to the divine thought from all eternity.[10]

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 35. [2] Ibid. p. 26. [3] Ibid. p. 30. [4] Ibid. p. 52. [5] Ibid. p. 52. [6] Ibid. p. 53. [7] Ibid. p. 56. [8] Ibid. p. 58. [9] Ibid. p. 63. [10] Ibid. p. 61.

Now, the confusion of thought respecting the Person of Christ as indicated in these passages arises from representing him at one time as an individual so that in his Person he is other than man; and at another time representing him as one with, or identical with, man. Though it is said that Christ is "an individual," it is also said that he "is an individual vitally related to every human being." He is related to every human being because he "has an organic relation to the race." While language is used which seems to designate the real individuality of Christ's Person, it is also positively affirmed that Christ "is the universal Person." As Hegel's pantheism would not admit the distinct, individual personality of God, but described him as "the Universal Personality, which realizes itself in every human consciousness," so here it would seem that Christ as the "Universal Person" is not represented as a personality distinct from the personalities of the human race; but that Christ as a person realizes himself in every human consciousness, so that he is the Universal Man, his humanity not something strange to his divinity, but its best and purest organ." But all this is consistent with Hegel's pantheistic Christology. He views the idea of redemption as the reunion of what he calls the individualized spirit of man with the Spirit of eternal truth and love. The race as composed of individuals becomes one with God, forming a part of his own essence, members of his mystical body. Thus being one with Christ is being one with God in essence. To this, "Progressive Orthodoxy" seems to respond without dissent in representing "the great reality of reconciliation" as "God in Christ and Christ in man," as the interpretation of Christ's words: "I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one."[1] These words of Christ, then, do not express the similarity of the unity of Christ with believers to the unity of the Son with the Father — not the moral or spiritual oneness of the Saviour with all believers; but they express unity in the "actuality of its substance, in Christ abiding in them and the Father in Christ."[2] Thus the unity of believers in Christ has actual subsistence in the divine essence of the unity of the Father in Christ. This is a phase of Maurice's Realistic theory as held by Alford. To show that the atonement was not vicarious, Alford says that "the body of Christ was not the body of

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 62. [2] Alford on John 17:21-23.

a man, but the body of man — of mankind — the pattern, and centre, and root, and head of that nature which is common to all of us, and in which every human being, of all nations, kindreds, and languages has a share." "And so, when that Victim hung upon the Cross, it was not the slaying of one mere man for another, which is impossible; nor was it a mere symbolic sacrifice, like those under the old law; but it was the offering up of Human Nature in its head and root — a taking away of sin by its penalty being paid to the uttermost." Thus, "at once, human nature, our manhood, all mankind, was in the sight of the Father acquitted from the guilt of sin, and received into his favor."[1]

Now, to say that Christ "had no human individuality"; that his was "the body of mankind — the pattern, and centre, and root, and head of that nature which is common to all of us, and in which every human being has a share," — is evidently only another way of saying that Christ was not an individual person, but a "Universal Person"; that his was the "Universal Personality," which realizes itself in every human consciousness. This is the identity of Christ with universal humanity. And as Christ took into union with his divine Person and Nature the manhood, the entire nature of man — so the human is identical with the divine. Thus the unity of Christ with humanity has actual subsistence in the divine essence of the unity of the Father in Christ. But this is a Christology evolved from the Hegelian pantheism, and held by some German theologians, as well as by some English theologians of less repute, perhaps, than Alford. There are doubtless others in this country, besides those represented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," who entertain this theory in some form. They may refuse assent to many things in the Hegelian method, and yet retain its substance. So "Progressive Orthodoxy" does "not claim for the later thought on the Incarnation any exclusive originality."[2] The Newness of this theology consists rather in gathering up and appropriating the results of past discussions along the course of Church history, and especially during the last half-century. The sources from which such results may be gathered even since the dawn of the Reformation are quite sufficient. There were others besides Osiander who held the oneness of God

[1] Alford's Sermons, preached in Quebec Chapel in 1854, p. 242 *sq.* [2] Prog. Orth. p. 38.

and man, that man is God in at least one form of his existence, so that Christ is the realized ideal of the Godhead — a view which, Baur says, at last found adequate scientific expression by Hegel.

Schwenkfeld held that Christ was begotten of God even as to his humanity, and as to both natures was *Dei filius naturalis*, natural Son of God.[1] Servetus, like Schwenkfeld, "speaks of the flesh of Christ, of his body and his soul as consubstantial with God, but in a sense which admits of an ill-defined boundary-line between nature and grace: for, according to his theosophic philosophy of nature, everything is of divine substance."[2]

As with Servetus, so in all phases of pantheistic Christology: the boundary-line between nature and grace, as between the natural and the supernatural, is ill-defined. That line cannot be clearly defined except upon the admission of that dualism which allows the individual personality of the Being giving the grace, with the individual personality of the being receiving the grace. In such proportion as this personality of the Giver and receiver are confounded or identified, grace disappears. Hence the doctrines of grace taught by Augustine, though on the authority of St. Paul, as well as of the Scriptures generally, are offensive to the advocates of the New theology, who, like Professor Allen, so identify Christ with humanity by his presence in the reason and conscience of man as not to represent him as a personal Saviour, but as a power by which men are delivered from sin, and this without any proper recognition of the Holy Spirit and his work.[3] As philosophical pantheism affirms the identity of subjective and objective so that the objective derives its seeming validity from the subjective, so theological pantheism affirms in some form the identity of the divine and the human, so that the human derives its seeming validity as an evolution of the divine. It is true, to some extent, as "Progressive Orthodoxy" admits, "that the present movement of thought seeks to find the union of objective and subjective elements."[4] But it should be observed that as the boundary-line which in truth distinguishes these elements becomes ill-defined and obliterated in this quest for their union, this Andover movement of thought is in the interest of pantheism. Accordingly, the atonement can have neither vicarious nor

[1] Dorner's Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. ii, p. 149. [2] Ibid. div. ii, vol. ii, p. 161. [3] Continuity of Christian Thought, p. 162. [4] Prog. Orth. p. 62.

substitutional significance, for it marks the union of two parties so as to form one party, when the two have no separate existence such as to furnish the necessary conditions upon which one of them can be vicarious to the other. In this case the parties, instead of being at one morally by reconciliation, are at one by identity of nature and essence. The two do not exist individually except as abstractions, for actually there is but one. Thus, if, as Alford says, "the sacrifice on the cross was the offering up of Human Nature" — "the entire nature of mankind" — so that "all mankind were summed up in it" and so that in that offering "we were offered up," — that is, that all the individuals of the race were offered, — then it could not have been said, as now, in the Scriptures respecting the sacrifice of Christ that "His *own self* bare our sins *in his own body* on the tree";[1] and that "we are sanctified through the offering of *the body of Jesus Christ* once for all."[2]

Equally at variance with the Scriptures and the Seminary Creed is McLeod Campbell's theory of "Sympathy," or "Identification," which "Progressive Orthodoxy" approves.[3] Campbell holds, in accord with a theory entitled "The Philosophy of Evangelicism," that "a clear avenue is opened between the Christ consciousness and the human consciousness, and we detect in their intercommunion the accord of the atoning act and the believing act. Our Saviour, conscious of our sins, has taken them upon himself and atoned for them; we, conscious of his righteousness, appear with it in the sight of God and are justified. Our sins are his sins; his righteousness is our righteousness; and this union of Christ and his people in moral consciousness is the central idea of the gospel." Thus, by entering into the sins of men, or making them his own, Christ may be held to have atoned for them, says Campbell, by offering up to God a perfect confession, and an adequate repentance for them, with which divine justice is satisfied, and a full expiation is made of human guilt. This perfect confession of these sins which must in its own nature have been a perfect "*Amen*" in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man; "as meeting the divine wrath against sin with a perfect response out of the depths of his [Christ's] divine humanity — is a response which [excepting the personal

[1] 1 Pet. 2:24. [2] Heb. 10:10. [3] Prog. Orth. p. 54.

consciousness of sin] has all the elements of a perfect contrition and repentance." But, in so far, how can this be called "a perfect confession and adequate repentance" for sin, while it lacks the "personal consciousness of sin"? In defending this use of the word "repentance," Campbell says that this word "repentance will have its full meaning in the personal experience of every one who accepts in faith the atonement as now represented; for every such individual sinner will add the excepted element of personal consciousness of sin." But, in the words of another, "this attempted explanation increases the difficulty. It supposes a twofold interchange or combination of penitential elements as taking place between sinners and their Saviour. On the one hand that which is lacking in the repentance of sinners, in order to make it 'a full response to the righteous judgment of God on the sins of men,' is held to be supplied by the 'adequate sorrow and contrition with which Christ makes perfect confession of sin on their behalf.' On the other hand, that which is lacking in the Saviour's confession of the sins of men, in order to give it 'all the elements of a perfect contrition and repentance on account of them,' is held to be supplied by 'the personal consciousness of sin on the part of every individual sinner who in faith accepts the atonement.' But surely, repentance, according to any reasonable or scriptural notion we can form of it, is the act or exercise of one individual person, namely, of the sinner himself, who has done the things repented of. And it seems utterly impossible to conceive of it as a combination of the feelings and dispositions of two or more individuals, whose personal feelings are so fused and blended together that each contributes to it his own quota of its essential elements."[1] It may be truly affirmed that no one can conceive of such "a combination" from the standpoint of Christian theism. It is a combination assumed upon the identity of the divine with humanity in the person of Christ, and involves the inconsistency of referring to the divine and human as separate individualities, after they have been resolved into pantheistic unity.

What is here said of the theory of Campbell applies as well to the theory maintained by the professorial authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy." This appears in the acceptance of Campbell's theory,

[1] Crawford on the Atonement, pp. 327, 328.

as well as in the quotations already made. Again, while a universal atonement is affirmed in both theories, yet in fact only a limited atonement ean be consistently maintained in either theory, without assuming the final salvation of all men. When Campbell, in order to the completeness of the atonement, in vindicating his use of the word "repentance" as applied to the confession of the sins of humanity by Jesus Christ, represents that the element of "personal consciousness of sin," excepted from Christ's contrition and repentance, is an element which every individual sinner "will add" who aeeepts in faith the atonement, it amounts to this: that for the lack of this "excepted element" there is no real atonement for any but "those who accept it in faith." Thus far then, in fact, the atonement is limited to the number "who accept it in faith." That the atonement is sufficient for all, that what is necessary for the salvation of one man is necessary for the salvation of another, and for all, is admitted by those who hold that the atonement is limited. "The righteousness of Christ, therefore, consisting in the obedience and death demanded under the law under which all men are placed, is adapted to all men. It is also of infinite value, being of the righteousness of the eternal Son of God, and therefore sufficient for all."[1] But only those will be saved who believe. It is the doctrine of the Synod of Dort that no man perishes for want of an atonement. In this respect, then, the atonement as represented by Campbell is no more universal than is the atonement as represented at Princeton and Dort. In either there is in reality no atonement for any but such as "accept it in faith." So, in "Progressive Orthodoxy," the same thing is implied, if not expressed in so many words. It is not claimed that all will believe. It is said that the Christian life is "all expressed in the personal act of repentance toward God, and of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."[2] It is admitted that there are those who will not exereise this "repentance" and "faith," for in speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit it is said, "We do not affirm that his work is irresistible. Man is his own master under Christianity as without."[3] "Everlasting destiny is determined for every person by his acceptance or rejection of Christ."[4]

[1] Princeton Essays, 1st series, p. 350. [2] Prog. Orth. p. 143. [3] Ibid. p. 118.
[4] Ibid. p. 243.

It should be observed here that the atonement in this regard is not modified by any reference to election or decrees as to who shall be saved by it, for election and decrees must be viewed as pertaining to the divine omniscience, by which all events, past or future, are seen by God as ever present in his sight, above what are now to man the relations of time; so that God no more elects and decrees from all eternity than to all eternity, and because that he is ever the same, immutable. That God knows, therefore, from all eternity who will reject Christ, before they reject him, as he knows this to all eternity after they reject him, furnishes no embarrassment to their acceptance of Christ. Therefore the claim made by both of these theorics to great progress in theology in maintaining a universal atonement has in fact no foundation, as considered from the standpoint of Christian theism. From the standpoint of pantheism it is otherwise. Here atonement stands for the evolution in the human race of Him who is identified with the race by Incarnation. Man, being a God-man, at first as an emanation from God and pursuant to that kind of divine immanence which emanation requires; the Incarnation follows as a reinforcement of the divine in man such as to give a sure propulsion to that evolution which promises at last the entire absorption of every individual of the race into the Divine. In this view, sin is a negation, and marks the starting-point of evolution, indicating the want of those attainments which are to be secured by subsequent development. Instead of sin to be atoned for, there is only attainment to be made by evolution. Instead of the atonement vicarious, there is an atonement evolutionary; an "atonement universal, absolute." "The extent of the atonement resides in the personality of Christ." "He is the Universal Person," identified with humanity, so that his divinity is in nothing more clearly shown than in his perfect humanity — the universal man — so that when Christ suffers the race suffers. Thus Christ is the life of humanity. Thus it is not what Christ does so much as what he is in humanity — its life — his Person transfused into humanity so as finally to conform all the race wholly and essentially to himself. This is the conclusion to which the most, if not all, have come who have accepted consistently the doctrine of the identity of the divine with humanity in the Incarnation, from the time of John of Damascus, who in the

eighth century drew up his doctrinal textbook composed chiefly of the expressions of the older Fathers of the Greek Church.[1] Thus, Maurice was consistent in rejecting the doctrine of future endless punishment, and in affirming that all men are adopted as the Sons of God through their identity with Christ, so that the only function of faith is that by it men at some time, in this or the future life, come to discern their identity with the Son of God as a fact that had all along been established.

So John Murray held "the universality of Christ's headship in the human race; a universal atonement made by Christ in organic and vital union with every man," and from these universalities was consistent in affirming universal salvation. Hence the inconsistency of the Andover professors that, while holding this doctrine of incarnation and atonement, they admit the possibility that some of the human race should finally be miserable: for this admission — as Occam said of this Christology in the fourteenth century — implies that something of Christ will be finally miserable because of his identity with humanity. If Judas, the betrayer, went to his own place to be forever miserable, then something of Christ, the Betrayed, must go to be forever miserable on account of his identity with the nature of the betrayer.[2] To avoid this consequence of this Christology in case any of the human race should fail "to accept" of Christ, it must be affirmed that all will finally accept of Christ. "Progressive Orthodoxy" is inconsistent because it does not so affirm, and so plant itself unhesitatingly on the basis of pantheistic universalism.

Again, "Progressive Orthodoxy" claims to have broken up the narrowness of the scheme incident to what it calls "arbitrary election" by insisting on "Universal Atonement." It says, "If we start within the limitations of an arbitrary election, we have a limited atonement and limited work of the Spirit."[3] But if by "arbitrary election" it is implied that God knew from all eternity in his own mind and thought that some would be saved, and that others would not be saved, involving all the consequences direct and contingent, then "Progressive Orthodoxy" must, to be consistent, affirm this "arbitrary election," unless it can affirm

[1] De Fide Orth. lib. iii. c. 6. [2] Item sequitur quod aliquid de essentia Christi erit miserum et damnatum, quia illa natura communis existens realiter in Christo et in damnato erit damnatum, quia in Juda. — Occam, Logica, P. I. c. 15. [3] Prog. Orth. p. 116.

that God from all eternity knew in his own mind and thought that *all* of the human race would be finally saved. The divine foreknowledge seems to be admitted. It is said that "Humanity with Christ in it is propitiated to the divine thought from all eternity. It was in the divine purpose from eternity that there should be incarnation and atonement."[1] Whatever may be said then from the historical point of view, as though God's disposition was *apparently* "changed when Christ suffered and died," yet in reality, as known to himself, God's disposition had been the same from all eternity. Now if it be admitted, notwithstanding the fact that "humanity with Christ in it is propitiated to the divine thought from all eternity" so that "it was in the divine purpose from all eternity that there should be incarnation and atonement," that some of the race will be finally lost because they do not accept of Christ, then it is certain that in the "divine thought" and "purpose" there is an election from all eternity of those that are saved. Thus "Progressive Orthodoxy" is committed to this election and to a limited atonement as relates to the thought and purpose of God in his omniscience, and as relates to the final result; while the claim that "God's disposition was changed when Christ suffered and died" rests on the historical seeming of things, as in nature the sun seems to rise when really it does not change its position. This seeming, taken by itself alone, has no place, certainly, in "real theology."

If, to escape this conclusion respecting election, the Arminian view is taken, which admits foreknowledge but denies foreordination; then it will appear that the ordination of things, instead of being concurrent in the divine mind with the certainty of foreknowledge, is reached only by a process of evolution in the divine thought and will corresponding to the temporal evolution of events. But this evolution in the Infinite is a doctrine of pantheism.

Or, if "Progressive Orthodoxy" will carry out the implications of its pantheistic Christology without wavering, so as to affirm the final salvation of all men, then it will consistently oppose what it calls the limitations of an "arbitrary election," while it affirms a universal atonement. This consistency, however, carries "Progressive Orthodoxy" beyond the sphere of Christian theism into pantheistic evolution.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 61.

Thus the Universal Atonement claimed by the Andover Professors differs essentially from the "General Atonement" of Christian theism which is expressed in the Creed of the Seminary in the words, "The Son of God, and He alone, by His suffering and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men." Through the General Atonement, on the basis of Christian theism, there is a sufficiency of grace for the salvation of all men, but not in such a way as to imply that all men will be saved. But through the Universal Atonement according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," on the basis of pantheistic Christology, in order to logical consistency the final salvation of all men must be affirmed as a necessity.

Thus "Progressive Orthodoxy," by its pantheistic Christology, in pursuance of its physical and metaphysical philosophy, by fair inference neutralizes the Christian doctrine of the atonement as taught in the Creed of the Seminary.

V. In the fifth place, "Progressive Orthodoxy" evinces its sympathy with pantheism in its treatment of the Scriptures. It does not regard the Scriptures as revelation in the highest sense, nor in any sense as a permanent and "sufficient rule of faith and practice" for all time. They served as revelation to the Jews until the Incarnation, and as a record of the beginning of the Christian Church. They contain also many things which will always remain of great value to the Church as truth pertaining to its origin, so that, for example,

"the views of Christ and of his truth contained in the apostolic Epistles must, from the nature of the case, always shape the religious and moral conceptions of the church. Not that they alone possessed the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. He is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in which he dwells, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic into which He has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries."[1] "Christ is not only the earthly culmination, but also the eternal source and principle, of revelation."[2] "The whole truth, then, is that Christ is the revealing or manifesting principle;"[3] "The Incarnation is the essential revelation: but the Incarnation is more than the presence of the man Christ Jesus on earth, and the things he did and suffered. — It is the fact of the union between the divine and the human, the awful 'mystery of godliness'; it is the relation of this union to the life of man and the life of God."[4]

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 209. [2] Ibid. p. 34. [3] Ibid. p. 43. [4] Ibid. p. 205.

Christ, then, as one with the human race in idea from the first, and in reality through the Incarnation, He is the highest revelation in being subjective revelation in man. In comparison with this revelation from the life of Christ subjective within man, the objective revelation contained in the Scriptures is of small account. They are of some value taken simply as history, as a record of events, and as related to those events at the time of their occurrence. But these Scriptures cannot be taken as authority for all time, and because that,

> The church is ever adding to its knowledge of Christ, and the exegetical process is certainly not the exclusive means of making the increment.[1]

Instead of regarding the Scriptures as a Supernatural revelation communicated by the Spirit, and under the light of the Spirit in their application as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice for all time; it is held that it was

> God's purpose to make this theanthropic Person the center of the divine revelation to man.[2]

It is not a creed, however truly representing the Scriptures themselves, nor their content, nor indeed what Christ himself *did* or *said* while on earth: but it is the life of Christ in the race, which is revelation. Thus by the evolution of the life of Christ within humanity — of Christ as one with the race — revelation is continuous and progressive through all time, so that the Church is ever adding to its knowledge of Christ, as it could not do by applying the exegetical process to the Scriptures under the light and efficiency of the Holy Spirit. This evolution of revelation is what Pantheism requires. It knows nothing of inspiration as required by Christian theism, and cannot use the word intelligently since it requires the dualism of the individual Personal God to inspire, and man as an individual person to be inspired. Hence Pantheism in all its forms has sought to impair the authority of the Bible.

It may be said that there are passages in "Progressive Orthodoxy" irreconcilable with this pantheistic interpretation. These passages, however, cannot be reconciled with the main drift of thought. They appear as inconsistencies and self-contradictions.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 212. [2] Ibid. p. 233.

On this account it has been well said that the Andover Authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy" "take back with one hand what they give with the other."[1] Thus it happens, in some instances, that what is affirmed in one place is denied, or its meaning changed, in another place. There is a lack of clear definition. There are instances in which a thing is defined, as though a heavenly body should be called a planet, and yet not so much a planet but that it might be a comet. When this peculiarity of style is duly considered, it must go far to exonerate from blame the most, if not all, of the quotations from "Progressive Orthodoxy" alleged to be unfair by its Authors. In explanation of this style by one of the Editors of The Andover Review, it is said that

> Much of the phraseology in discussion was used to make immediate connexion with existing doctrines, which it was desired to supplement or apply.[2]

The aim of "Progressive Orthodoxy" was declared to be the endeavor to Christianize or

> Christologize the doctrines passed in review.

According to this, it would seem that in the discussion of the Incarnation the aim was to "Christologize" that doctrine which, according to the Andover Creed, affirms that Christ "continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." But because this aim could not be accomplished, since the pantheistic Christology of "Progressive Orthodoxy" could not be made to connect with the Christology of Christian theism in the Andover Creed, nor be attached to it as a "supplement," or as a form of "application," the inevitable result was that, however carefully phrased, the language which seemingly accepted the existing Christology of the Andover Creed, would not harmonize with the language affirming the pantheistic Christology. This professorial Editor says that

> The immanence of Christ is an integral part of the conception of the divine immanence. It belongs to the Christian idea of God.

This certainly is a plain statement. Since by "divine immanence" the Greek immanence is meant, and since the immanence

[1] Criticisms on the Andover Movement, by Rev. F. Palmer, in The Andover Review, vol. xiii, p. 181. [2] Andover Review, vol. xiii, p. 434.

of Christ is an integral part of the Greek immanence, it requires that the Christian theism of the Andover Creed shall be superseded by Pantheism, in order that it may be Christianized, and so bring forth from previous obscurity "the Christian idea of God." It is a sufficient explanation of this style of taking back with one hand what had been given by the other, that it arose from the attempt to harmonize things which were essentially foreign to each other; such as the Seminary Creed and the New theology. The position of the Authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is in this respect not altogether unlike that of Clement and Origen when they could not withstand the pantheistic tendency of the Alexandrian School by any use of language they might employ in the interest of Christian theism, which might seem to imply the personality of God, and because that, on the whole, this personality both of God and the Logos must be regarded as Ideal rather than Real, according to their presentation. Thus admitting all that ever has been claimed by the appreciative historian respecting the piety, sincerity, and industry of these Fathers, it only shows that these qualities, dominated by a pagan philosophy, can never conserve Christianity.

Again, there is a logical inconsistency in maintaining, as the Andover professors do, that a probation for some after death is held only as an hypothesis. It has already been shown that from the premises involved in the pantheistic incarnation and atonement, the final salvation of all men is a logical necessity. The Authors may refuse to draw this logical inference, but their pupils and others will draw this inference if they do not, for it is contained in the premises. All men have Christ in them by constitution, who is the supreme revelation, so that in order to their conscious knowledge of Christ it is only necessary that there should be an evolution of the Christ already constituted in them, which is certain to proceed either here or hereafter, since it is not conditioned upon faith, or anything that man can do, as Maurice consistently presents the doctrine.

It is said in "Progressive Orthodoxy" that

> we may go so far as to say that it would not be just for God to condemn men hopelessly when they have not known him as he really is, when they have not known him in Jesus Christ.[1]

[1] p. 64.

And in the Andover Defence, as representing the absurdity of supposing that infants who die in infancy can know Christ, it is said: —

> That is, they experience in this life "conviction of sin, enlightenment in the knowledge of Christ, renewal of will, the Spirit's persuasion, and power to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered in the Gospel, pardon and acceptance as righteous in God's sight, the imputation of Christ's righteousness which is received by faith alone, reception into the number and admission to all the privileges of the sons of God, ability more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness, assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace and perseverance therein to the end." Blessed infants! But who in his senses can think of putting an interpretation on this article which commits it to such absurdities?[1]

Yes; and also "who in his senses" can claim all this attainment and knowledge of Christ as necessary for every adult in order that he may be said to have a Christian probation in this life, to say nothing of infants! The "benefits" enumerated in the Shorter Catechism are evidently given as a complete summary of the highest attainment of the elect in this life, but the attainment of the highest does not go to prove that a lesser degree of attainment may not constitute a genuine probation in this life. Calvin says in a letter to Servetus: "I do not doubt that when God removes infants from the world, they are regenerated by the secret influences of the Holy Spirit."[2] The infant so regenerated certainly has a Christian probation in this life, and requires no other, being renewed by the Spirit whom Christ sent into the world. As in a nursery a graft may be inserted into a small shoot and then be shortly removed to the permanent garden, or the graft may be set in the larger tree and be transplanted later under different conditions and environment; so the infant may be renewed by the setting of the new life in its soul and then be removed at once to the everlasting gardens, while in the case of an adult the renewal may take place under an operation of the Spirit better known. But in either case there are no data for determining the exact measure of what constitutes a Christian probation, so that it may be said of those supposed to have this measure that they have a Christian probation, and that those who fall short of this measure though in the smallest particular do not

[1] The Andover Defence, p. 138. [2] Bib. Sac. vol. iii, p. 59.

have a Christian probation. The fact of having a probation cannot be established, quantitively, in this way.

It is related that in India a poor man who had never heard of Christianity, and had long sought in vain for relief from his convictions of sin by all forms of penance, came to the conclusion that there must be some Being who could be merciful to sinners. He resolved to trust in that nameless One of his thought, and from that moment found peace. Years after while on a journey he came upon a group listening to a missionary who was talking about Jesus. While listening, the man exclaimed: "Why, this Jesus is the One I have been trusting, who has given me peace. I did not know his name, but he is my deliverer from sin." Probably no one would say that if this man had died before hearing the missionary he could not have been saved: or that in that case he did not have a sufficient Christian probation, for he was already a man of faith, though, historically, he knew not the name of him in whom he believed. There may have been many such benighted minds, who have under the mission of the Holy Spirit found the relief of faith. There is reason to believe that in "convincing the world of sin" the Holy Spirit has done considerable genuine missionary work in regions where the voice of the human preacher of the gospel has never been heard. So long as there are any facts indicating that this may be the case, and so long as the contrary cannot be shown, there is no ground for the assumption that a present probation does not furnish sufficient opportunity. Besides, the deeper fallacy of this assumption consists in supposing that a sufficient probation must, in order to meet the demands of equity, furnish an equal opportunity to every individual, and thus carry to every one the entire order of salvation begun and carried on. Such a probation according to the proposed equity must require the scheme of salvation to be communicated to every person with an equal measure of information, intelligence, argument, and with equal measure of the Holy Spirit; and also that every person should have in himself the same equal measure with all others of mental capacity to understand, of conscience so as to be susceptible of conviction of sin, with the same measure of time for consideration and reflexion; in short, in order to this equitable and therefore fair probation it must be such that no one can claim that another has had a better

or different opportunity than himself in any respect. But such an equitable probation, or fair chance, is impossible in the present varying outward conditions of human life with the different degrees of native human knowledge, moral faculty, and culture. Nor does the power to define what is called an equitable probation, fair chance, or opportunity, come within the scope of human judgment, hence any question that may be raised in respect to determining it is only idle dreaming. Furthermore this attempt to define Christian probation quantitively, and to fix it within mere historical limitations, would require the Scripture to say that Christ and the Spirit, to carry on their work, came into what is technically called Christendom, whereas it is said that Christ and the Spirit came "into the world." It is to the credit of Calvinism that it does not presume to define probation quantitively, or otherwise than to represent it as had in this life, and further than that leaving it to Him who worketh where and when and how he will.

Again, any attempt to define probation is logically repugnant to the evolution maintained in "Progressive Orthodoxy." For when once evolution has a starting point, a *terminus a quo*, thence onward it is an infinite progression, and that is all that can be said of it. Its only relation or measure is its relation to the infinite, and in that its every movement is described. In the Northern Mythology evolution is symbolized under the tree Ygdrasil, whose roots fastened in the deepest bottom ground of the universe send up its branches from sphere to sphere, arching over each in succession in new-formed trunk, thus by trunk and branch ever pushing its way from sphere to sphere through the illimitable heavens. So evolution in the New theology has its *terminus a quo*, or root, fastened in its pantheistic Christology, from whence the race starts forth in its unmeasured course, without check or reversal by any hypothetical probation or failure. It is difficult to conceive why such an hypothesis should be mentioned in "Progressive Orthodoxy" except upon the supposition of an attempt to connect itself with a Creed with which it was incompatible, through some conjuring with the word probation.

It is necessary to observe here that the objection is raised against any and all arguments drawn from the book "Progressive Orthodoxy" in support of the "Amended Complaint": that

they must be irrelevant because the book is a thing of the past, and therefore the Amended Complaint is now "stale." But the book, in respect to its philosophy and its theology pursuant to its philosophy, has always been a thing of the past and "stale." It appears that its authors and advocates have always had some hesitation about calling it New. In their uncertainty what to call it, they represent it sometimes as New, and sometimes as a return to Greek theology, and sometimes as a recovery of something, and sometimes as something respecting which men are thinking as men never thought before. But whatever it be called, the pantheistic elements of its philosophy date back to the period when converts to Christianity from paganism undertook to graft pagan philosophy upon the theology of the Church, which, as Dr. Emerson, late Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Seminary, was constrained to say of Origen, "Contributed prodigiously to swell the desolating tide that overwhelmed the Church in virtual heathenism for a thousand years."[1] The elements of this philosophy appeared in the De Fide of John of Damascus, in the eighth century; again, in more complete systematic expression by Scotus Erigena in the ninth century; again, in the revival of Greek philosophy in the twelfth century under the influence of the Arabians, in the teaching of Averroes and Almaric. This philosophy took the form of Mystical Pantheism under Eckhart in the fourteenth century, and found expression in the Theologica Germanica which at first attracted the attention of Luther, but from whose mysticism he was disenchanted by his experience with the Zwickau prophets, except that in his doctrine of Consubstantiation he held to the real presence of Christ's body with the elements of the Sacred Supper. This philosophy was revived in the pantheistic system of Spinoza, the materials for which had been furnished largely by Giordano Bruno from his studies of Greek philosophy. Thence onward, this philosophy appears tending sometimes more to physical methods, and at other times more to metaphysical methods, in the period following Kant, until in the nineteenth century it appears in greater force in the speculations of Schelling, and reaches, perhaps, its climax, in the grandeur of system, analysis, construction, and proportion, as exhibited by Hegel, whence the

[1] Bib. Repos., 1834, p. 46.

revival of the pantheistic doctrine of the Divine Immanence in Greek theology, and the pantheistic Christology of Schleiermacher, and others in Germany, with their imitators in Great Britain and the United States. The book "Progressive Orthodoxy" is not stale merely because it is six or seven years since its publication, for according to some of the principles which it inculcates it is more than two thousand years old, so that it inculcates "stale" error.

The reasons upon which abatement of the Complaints concerning the inculcation of these principles is sought are equally erroneous and "stale." Gentlemen come covered with dust from the archives of English Law, pretending to bring authority for the details of the administration of a Trust created under and by the authority of the State of Massachusetts. But the authority which these gentlemen bring has as little to do with the regulation of this Trust as has the architecture of Noah's Ark, for it is brought on the assumption that The Andover Seminary with its Trust was not created, complete, solid, independent, *sui generis*, and as though its methods were not to be expounded according to the genius of its own spirit, and as though Massachusetts were incompetent for such a creation. In the earlier history of this country this assumption finds its counterpart in the sentiment of Tories, and is therefore as "stale" as it is un-American.

But after all, truth is older than error, and therefore remains triumphant after whatever repeated assaults, or accumulations of new force, error may put in array against it. Hence the truth of Christian theism as formulated by Augustine came off victorious against all the assaults of Pantheism down to the Reformation. Therefore Calvinism in its formulation of the same truth has stood impregnable since the Reformation before every pantheistic assault. It has stood against these assaults better than Lutheranism at its best, as Lutherans themselves agree, and because that Lutheranism in its onesided insistence on Christ within us, "Christus in nobis," has left the gate open for the subjective deceits of Pantheism to rush in and take possession; while Calvinism, insisting fully on Christ within us through his presence in the efficiency of Grace, insists at the same time just as fully on Christ outside of us — "Christus pro nobis" — the Christ objective as well as subjective, "Christus pro nobis," as well as

"Christus in nobis." Thus Calvinism shuts the gate of its fortress in defence of the Truth, and makes it impregnable against all the subjective conceits, deceits, and insinuations of pantheistic craft of attack. Hence, Dr. Dorner, though unfavorable to Calvinism, nevertheless declares that "the system of Calvin is preserved from Pantheism." [1]

Thus Calvinism has stood invincible against all pantheistic Christologies, and pantheistic doctrines of the Divine Immanence fabricated on the continent of Europe, or as recovered from ancient times, as the Castle of Ehrenbreitstein has stood upon the Rhine protecting the North from the incursion of all invading armies from the South. It was to build such a fortress against error that the Fathers founded this Seminary, and stipulated that every professor should be an Orthodox and consistent Calvinist. It has transpired that, contrary to this purpose of the Founders, doctrines are here taught incapable of agreement with consistent Calvinism, however they may be represented as having such common ground with Calvinism, or such support from the Creed of the Seminary, as to be only a natural development from that Creed. Evidence for this is found in the book entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy," in the influence which it continues to exert, which could hardly be more adverse to the teaching required in the Seminary if it were formally received as a textbook, as appears from the examinations of students from the Seminary for Licensure and Ordination.

Therefore in concluding my argument on the thirteenth specification of the Amended Complaint, and having, as I believe, substantiated it, I must affirm that the respondent, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., in having composed the book, "Progressive Orthodoxy," and in being responsible for it, does hold, maintain, and inculcate "that a system of physical and metaphysical philosophy is true which by fair inference neutralizes the Christian doctrine as taught in the Creed of the Seminary."

[1] Dorner, on The Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. iii, sec. iii, p. 9.

ARGUMENT

Maintaining the Twelfth Charge of the Amended Complaint.

Mr. President and Gentlemen, — There is another specification in the amended complaint, in support of which I will, with your permission, present some arguments. This is the twelfth specification, which charges that the Respondent,

> holds, maintains, and inculcates that Christian Missions are not to be supported and conducted on the ground that men who know not Christ are in danger of perishing forever, and must perish forever, unless saved in this life.

This twelfth specification is taken after the thirteenth in the order of argument, because the logical connexion of thought seems to require it, since the discussion of the thirteenth prepares the way for the discussion of the twelfth, and saves the repetition of some topics which would otherwise ensue.

The treatment of this specification requires us to notice the near relation of the Andover Seminary to the American Board; the former having been organized and opened for the admission of students in 1808; while the latter was organized in 1810, and sent out its first missionaries in 1812. It is remarkable that the institution of the Seminary was at the time when the Holy Spirit was interesting the minds of graduates from different colleges in the work of foreign missions. It may properly be said that these young men furnished the occasion which gave rise to the Board, but it should also be said that the idea and plan of the Board arose in other minds, among whom it seems to have occurred first to Dr. Worcester. Thus, simultaneously, was the missionary spirit kindled in the hearts of the young men and in the hearts of such men as Worcester, Spring, Evarts, and the Andover professors of that time. When on his deathbed Dr. Spring was asked what portion of his life gave him the most pleasure in the review,

he replied: "That I have been permitted to preach the Gospel; that I have been enabled to preach what I believe to be the system of truth: and that I have been the unexpected instrument of establishing the Seminary at Andover."[1] As he also aided in establishing the American Board, it appears that the two institutions were founded pursuant to one and the same conception of the "system of truth."

Under this conception it was not strange that the first and most important element which pervaded the whole policy of the American Board was "a transcendent estimate of what belongs to Christianity in its relations to a future life."[2] In this estimate it was considered as an imperative necessity that "essential and spiritual Christianity" should be carried to heathen nations in order to their salvation, and on the ground that the only probation is in this life, and that all who are not saved in this life must perish forever. It adds force to this estimate that the doctrine of universalism maintaining the final salvation of all men, through a post mortem probation in which all would accept of salvation through Christ, or be purified from sin by punishment, was diligently proclaimed. In 1770 John Murray came from England, thirty-eight years before the founding of Andover Seminary, and had traveled extensively preaching his new doctrine of universalism which in its essential features respecting Christ's headship of the race does not differ from the pantheistic Christology maintained in "Progressive Orthodoxy" by the present Andover professors. The first universalist church was organized in this country by Murray in Gloucester in 1780, twenty-eight years before the founding of Andover Seminary. The first convention of universalist ministers and parishes was held in 1785, and assent to what is known by universalists as the "Winchester Confession of Faith" was given and the confession adopted in 1803: which was but five years preceding the founding of the Seminary at Andover. Thus, while universalism was extensively proclaimed, and more especially according to the doctrine of Murray; in opposition to Murray's doctrine, the doctrine of this life as the only probation was placed in the Seminary Creed and in the foundation of the American Board.

[1] Half-century Memorial Volume, A. B. C. F. M. p. 112.
[2] Ibid. Dr. Hopkins's Discourse.

It is important to observe here that interest in missions has been effective only upon the Calvinistic doctrine of the present life as the only probation. Whatever may have been said adversely to Calvinism as to promoting missions, or quoted as adverse to missions from any claiming to be Calvinists, it is nevertheless true that missions are indebted to Calvinism for the conception that organizes them, and the nerve that sustains them. It was under the auspices of the Calvinistic Baptists that Carey became impressed with the duty of giving the Gospel to the heathen, and under whom he was sustained in his ever memorable work of founding the Baptist mission at Serampore. It is also significant that the Baptist historian accounts for the decline in numbers of the Baptists in Holland because of "the spread of Socinian doctrines among them, by which all the fervor of life and missionary enterprise was lost."[1]

Now, it is in the face of this lesson from history, and in opposition to the Creed of the Seminary and to the doctrine accepted in the founding of the American Board, that the professorial authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy" project their assumptions, first, that there are those who do not have a sufficient knowledge of Christ in this life: and second, that for their benefit there is a probation after death, and thus assume that probation does not cease with this life. The argument in favor of this assumption is that, since the atonement is for all men, therefore all men must at some time hear of it, and come to know Christ so as to accept him or to reject him before the final judgment, so that if any do not come to know him in this life then there must be opportunity for such to come to this knowledge after death. Then on the assumption that there are, in fact, those who do not have the requisite knowledge in this life, it is claimed that a probation for such after this life is in the highest degree probable.

Now, in order to test the validity of these assumptions, it is necessary to ask what is meant by saying that

> every man will know Christ in his sacrifice before he meets him in judgment.[2]

What is meant by saying that there are millions who

> will never hear of the Gospel as a provision of mercy for them,[3]

[1] Johnson's Cyc. — Baptists. [2] Prog. Orth. p. 139. [3] Ibid. p. 180.

unless upon the assumption that there is for them a probation after death which shall furnish them with the opportunity of hearing the Gospel. This question is important because there is certainly a wide difference in the matter of hearing and knowing Christ in his sacrifice and atonement, between those of the smallest and those of the greatest degree of this hearing and knowing. The story is familiar of the poor ignorant Scotchwoman, who, when catechized by her minister respecting his sermon on the previous sabbath, was unable to give the text or any part of the sermon, and who, when asked what good she supposed his sermons would do her, if when she had heard them she could remember nothing about them, said that though his sermons disappeared from her mind as the water disappeared which she poured upon the cloth which she was whitening, yet was her soul like the cloth made whiter thereby. Certainly, what this woman had heard and known of Christ was vastly less than what her distinguished countryman, Thomas Chalmers, had heard and known of Christ. There was an almost infinite difference in degree, between their hearing and knowing. And yet it is to be hoped that none of the present Andover professors represented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," while admitting that Chalmers had heard and known of Christ, wonld deny that the poor woman had not also a saving knowledge of Christ. Bnt, notwithstanding this difference in degree between the hearing and knowing of this woman and of Chalmers, it cannot be affirmed that the limit of the scale of difference is reached either way, at the knowing of the woman or at that of Chalmers. As, had Chalmers lived longer his knowledge of Christ might have attained a higher degree, so the woman's knowledge of Christ was even less at an earlier stage of her Christian experience. Nor is it inconceivable that there may have been another person whose knowledge of Christ was even less than that of the woman, who was nevertheless sealed by the "Spirit of Truth" as having a saving hearing and knowing of Christ. Becanse there is a spiritual hearing and knowing from the inward sense not dependent upon the external word, and yet not opposed to that word because animated by the same "Spirit of Truth," the lowest point in the scale of the effectnal working of the Trnth cannot be determined, therefore infants may be regenerated, according to Calvin, while it is possi-

ble for a heathen to trust in a Deliverer from sin, as shown in the argument on the thirteenth specification. For these reasons it cannot be proved that there has ever been a man who did not have sufficient probation in this life, and because it cannot be proved but that Christ may be known to men spiritually — through the efficiency of the Holy Spirit — who do not know him historically by the external Word. This is consistent with New England theology. It is maintained by one of its ablest exponents, that "Men may be saved, who never exercised specific faith in the atonement. Men may not have all the applications of the atonement, and yet may be under the provisions of the atonement. All *can* be saved." "The Holy Spirit is represented as working on the hearts of Christians in the same manner as in inspiring writers of the Bible."[1] Nor is this working on the heart confined to those only who have become Christians, for the Holy Spirit's work is to convince the world, or men in the world, of every variety of condition and age, and endowment of faculty, and with such efficiency that men can accept or reject intelligently that measure of truth which the Spirit impresses upon them as suited to their capacity. Otherwise it could not be said that the Spirit convinces or reproves the world of sin. In this conviction the Holy Spirit deals with the conscience, so that his convicting agency may be recognized upon the conscience of the heathen as it bears witness to the "law written in their hearts."[2] In remarking on this passage Professor Stuart, in his Commentary on Romans, says that "Those commit a great mistake, then, who deny that men can have any sense of moral duty or obligation, without a knowledge of the Scriptures. The Apostle's argument, in order to convince the Gentiles of sin, rests on a basis entirely different from this," — though in no such way as to supersede the need of a written revelation. If the Gentiles had doubts and difficulties about some of the plainest principles of morality, it was because "their minds were blinded by their passions. Hence the voice within them was not listened to; but this does not prove that God left himself without sufficient witness among them. The Apostle most plainly and fully asserts that he did not." From this it follows that, since God has left himself with sufficient witness among the Gentiles, it must be a mistaken theodicy that

[1] John 16:8-14. Notes taken from Dr. Park's Lectures. [2] Rom. 2:15.

requires God to grant them a probation after death, as an amend, as though he had not left himself among them with sufficient witness in this life.

Besides, if the Gentiles are blinded by their passions so they do not listen to the voice within, so some men are blinded under the clearest light of the written revelation, and where the Gospel is proclaimed in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. It is evident that conversions do not take place in proportion to the means employed to convert men and turn them to Christ. Under the most conspicuous means of Grace, while some have truly repented of their sins, others by resisting these means have hardened their hearts, and have become as notorious in their rejection of Christ, and in their profligate life, as the means were distinguished for inducing them to become Christians. It is in striking contrast with such facts that men are sometimes converted by, what to human view, is the feeblest instrumentality conceivable. Under whatever instrumentality, it must be said that God exerts an influence that can be resisted by all; but which all will not resist. It is not certain but that the man who resists divine influence under a feeble instrumentality would resist that influence with even greater pertinacity under the most powerful instrumentality. The heathen who allows his passions to make him blind to the witness which God gives of himself to him in this life, might evolve from his passions a still more obdurate blindness under a probation after death. This does not go to prove that in the divine economy it may not be expedient for God to give a clearer revelation of himself to some people than any witness of himself given to the heathen, but it does go to prove that the witness given of himself to the heathen is sufficient, so that no probation after this life is needed to vindicate the divine justice and wisdom. It goes to prove also that sin is, under no conditions, simply a misfortune into which man has fallen unconsciously, and because he always sins intelligently, and of choice, so that he repents under the feeblest instrumentality, and hardens his heart against repentance under the most powerful instrumentality, while there are instances in which men have confessed to having resisted the most powerful array of motives to repentance, and to having, years after, chosen to repent under a comparatively feeble impression of motive. Thus all circumstances combine to show that

man is not a sinner for the want of a fair chance to become righteous, and that with the fairest chance conceivable it is not certain that even then any man would choose to be righteous.

It is worthy of notice that even in temporal affairs those who do not have what is considered a fair chance, many times succeed the best, while those having superior opportunities complain most of not having a fair chance and so pretend to throw the blame of their worthless lives on circumstances over which they have no control. Of this there is sufficient confirmation in the many instances where men have risen from poverty to wealth, and learning, by self-denying industry and economy, while others, for the lack of these virtues and not choosing to practice them, have descended from wealth to poverty through their choice of vice, and succeeded to none of the advantages of learning, though in possession of every facility for such success. These facts in temporal affairs, taken in connexion with corresponding facts in spiritual things, furnish ground for the discredit of a probation after death in order that any of the human race may have a fair chance, as well as for affirming that in the light of Scripture as well as of reason the present life is the only probation.

It is asserted by these Andover professors, as the most natural conclusion, that

> those who do not know of God's love in Christ while they are in the body will have knowledge of Christ after death.[1]

This assertion must be taken as including all infants, in respect to whom there is reason for denying the conclusion that they need probation after death in order to a saving knowledge of Christ. Calvin's remark on the regeneration of infants has already been quoted. Again, when Servetus concluded from the words of Christ, —

> He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him, —

that,

> infants who are incapable of believing, remain in their condemnation:

Calvin replied,

> that in this passage Christ is not speaking of the general guilt in

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 93.

which all the descendants of Adam are involved, but only threatening the despisers of the Gospel, who proudly and obstinately reject the grace which is offered to them; and this has nothing to do with infants. I likewise oppose a contrary argument; all those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God; and as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death.[1]

And when Servetus quotes as Scripture that

whosoever is born of the Spirit heareth the voice of the Spirit:

Calvin replies that,

though we were to admit it as a genuine text, yet Servetus could infer nothing more from it than that believers are formed to obedience as the Spirit operates within them. But that which is affirmed of a certain number it is wrong to apply equally to all.

Calvin also says in this connexion: —

I must again repeat, what I have so often remarked, that the doctrine of the Gospel is the incorruptible seed, to regenerate those who are capable of understanding it; but that where, by reason of age, there is not yet any capacity of learning, God has his different degrees of regenerating those whom he has adopted.[2]

Through failing to perceive the principle in the remark of Calvin that

that which is affirmed of a certain number it is wrong to apply equally to all;

Pelagius, more than a thousand years before Servetus, was in doubt as to what would become of infants. This doubt was largely, if not entirely, through applying to infants as a class the same rules and requirements as to those who having come to years of intelligence and moral perception were able to hear and receive the Gospel. Thus Pelagius must say of infants in the future state: —

Where they are not, I know, where they are, I do not know.[3]

He knew that infants were not in heaven, which, according to his doctrine that infants were born as sinless as was Adam by creation, involved the inference that God excluded innocent beings from the kingdom of heaven. As Servetus infers that infants who are incapable of believing remain in their condemnation: and

[1] Inst. iv. 16. 31. John 3:36. [2] Inst. iv. 16. 31. [3] Neander, vol. ii, p, 669.

as Pelagius infers that such infants are not in heaven: so the Respondent in "Progressive Orthodoxy" infers that such infants must have a probation after death in order that they may be capable of knowing Christ. In either case the logic is the same. The error consists in applying equally to all that which is affirmed of a certain number: in applying to infants the method of knowing Christ which is possible only for adults. As Calvin did not make this mistake in logic, he had no occasion for accepting the doctrine of Servetus or Pelagius, or of guessing that there might be a future probation for infants.

If it be said, however, as seems to be implied in "Progressive Orthodoxy," that under Calvinism none are saved but in pursuance of

> arbitrary election and reprobation:

so that the heathen

> from their very birth are doomed to everlasting woe:

and that thus occasion is furnished for

> that cruel conception of God which means that vast multitudes of his children can by no possibility be saved:[1]

it may be justly said in reply that Calvinism merits no such caricature. At any rate, whatever may be said of some who claimed to be Calvinists, no occasion is given for this caricature in that "consistent Calvinism" which is represented in the Seminary Creed. It is held as an axiom that a human court is competent to determine the election or ground upon which a decree shall be issued, in any case, when the court has in its possession all the facts in relation to the case. In respect to human destiny the Great Judge of all has all the facts from the beginning by virtue of his Omniscience. In the beginning, then, this Judge was as well prepared to issue any decree as he could be after what men call history has run its course on earth. To deny this is to deny the Divine Omniscience. God knows from the beginning everything that takes place in time, and therefore everything that takes place was certain to take place. But this furnishes no ground for saying that anything takes place by an "arbitary election" within the meaning of fatalism; for, according to the

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 106–108.

"consistent Calvinism of New England theology," "the *certainty* of human action is distinct from its *necessity*."[1] Though it should be certain that an individual or a class of the human race will be lost, this would not prove, according to Calvinism, that it is necessary that they should be lost. There is, then, no decree, nor "absolute election," which requires that any be lost of necessity. And this applies to infants as well as to adults, so that there is no "absolute election" standing in the way of the regeneration of infants when God removes them from this life.

But if infants are thus regenerated, then, for them, a future probation is unnecessary, whether in Christendom or Heathendom. Besides, if infants are saved in this way because incapable of being saved in any other way, then those adults, whether in Heathendom or Christendom, who are as incapable as infants, whether from idiocy or other cause, may be saved in the same way as infants. Granting this, considerable abatement must be made from the statement of the professorial authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," that all the heathen must of necessity be lost unless there be a probation for them after death. For those who are not incapable as infants, it is certainly "fair" that they should be judged according to the light which they have and not as though they had all the light of Christendom. If it be said that the Gospel requires specific faith in Christ, and that the heathen are incapable of this faith and so are of necessity without hope, the reply of Baxter to this objection may be made,

> that the disciples of Jesus became regenerate men before they believed that he was to die on the cross; faith in the atonement is necessary where the atonement can be known, but where this blessed truth cannot be known, there God never exacteth from men according to what they have not, but only requires a good use of what they have.

Baxter says further that,

> when penitent, the heathen have been regenerated by the Holy Ghost, on the ground of Christ's atonement, although they have never heard of their Redeemer or their Sanctifier. God often blesses men without their knowledge.[2]

Thus the heathen are under the "law of Grace" no less than other men, though they have not heard of the operation of that law to the extent that other men have.

[1] Bib. Sac. vol. ix. p. 185. [2] Ibid. vol. xii. p. 368.

But there is authority more apposite in this discussion because it is from the New England theology, and so related to the Creed of the Seminary to which the professors have subscribed and which they have promised faithfully to teach, though contrary to that they advocate a future probation. As an instance of this authority,

Dr. Bellamy teaches, in a volume which Edwards recommended, that the heathen are without excuse because they enjoy "sufficient means of knowledge"; that God's law is on a perfect level with man's "natural powers and natural advantages"; that "if God looks upon the advantages of the heathen as sufficient, no wonder that he so often speaks of the advantages of his own people as being more than barely sufficient, even although they enjoy only the outward means of grace without the inward influences of the Spirit"; "and thus we see how all mankind have not only sufficient natural powers, but also sufficient outward advantages to know God, and perfectly conform to his law, even the heathen themselves." [1]

Dr. Smalley says: —

It must, I think, be granted that we do generally suppose a man's present duty cannot exceed his present strength, suppose it to have been impaired by what means it will.[2]

Dr. Smalley often speaks of a

want of opportunity as excusing the sinner from blame.[3]

Thus,

the doctrine of the New England theology, is that any powerlessness, in the original, literal and proper meaning of the word, is incompatible with obligation.[4]

It follows, then, according to the New England theology, that because the heathen enjoy "sufficient means of knowledge," they do not require a probation after death in order to secure the degree of knowledge necessary to their salvation.

But the Andover professors tell us in "Progressive Orthodoxy" that when it is admitted that

conscientious heathen living up to the knowledge they have are actually saved through Christ and his atonement, although they have no knowledge of the actual Christ nor of his sacrifice for the sins of the world; [5]

[1] As quoted by Dr. Edwards A. Park, Bib. Sac. vol. ix, p. 179. [2] Sermon on Moral Inability, p. 5, ed. 1811. [3] Sermon on Natural Ability, p. 38, ed. 1811. [4] Bib. Sac. vol ix, p. 182. [5] Prog. Orth. p. 87.

It is perilously akin, in its postulates, to the Deism of the last century, which maintained that the knowledge of reason and the commands of conscience are sufficient, and which held Christianity to be not a supernatural redemption, but only a superior system of moral teaching.[1]

But admitting that this view is perilously akin to Deism, it does not follow that the remedy for this peril is found in the Pantheism of "Progressive Orthodoxy," for Pantheism is no remedy for Deism. It is true that many have thought, or pretended to think, otherwise, who, with their eyes fixed on Deism as the only gulf to avoid, have stumbled backward into the abyss of Pantheism. This has happened in Germany to some, in advocating what is called a "mediating theology," who seemed to think that the safe path must lie between the extremes of Deism on the one hand, and of Pantheism on the other hand: between the doctrine of the Divine transcendence and the doctrine of the Divine immanence. Such a path is untenable, and because it supposes there is hostility between transcendence and immanence, so that the truth is found only in mediation. But, according to Christian theism, there is no such hostility, for the transcendence and immanence are involved in one and the same idea — the Divine immensity. God is everywhere present, both within the created universe and beyond it, so that there is a verbal convenience in speaking of his presence in the created universe as his omnipresence, or immanence: and of his presence in all space outside of the created universe as his transcendence. But these distinctions involve no real distinction in the Divine essence, according to which the view that the heathen have a sufficient probation in this life furnishes no approach to Deism which affirms only the Divine transcendence, and thus denies the Divine omnipresence in the created universe. This, in the light of Christian theism, is equivalent to saying that there is no God, and because that any proposition that denies the Divine immensity in the whole or in part serves Atheism. So the Greek immanence, which differs from the omnipresence of Christian theism by maintaining the identity of the Divine and the human in the world, thus involving a real distinction between the Divine essence as existing in the world, and the Divine essence as existing beyond the world, is, when carried out, equivalent to saying that there is no God, and

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 89.

because this division and confusion of the Divine essence involve the denial of the Divine immensity as to indivisibility of essence. Now, while both Deism and Pantheism are errors, not merely by exaggeration of a truth, but in their essential denial of truth, so that no path of compromise laid out between them can consist with truth; still there is a sense in which Deism is the lesser of the two errors. It is easier for some minds to pass at once from Deism to Christian theism than to pass at once from Pantheism to Christian theism. Of this there is an illustration in the Annual Report of the American Board of Foreign Missions for 1857, in which Mr. Ballantine represents Hindu pantheists taking Deism as an intermediate step in their departure from Pantheism, the next step from Deism to Christianity being taken more easily by them than to have passed at once from Pantheism to Christianity.

Practically, however, there are points of agreement between Deism and Pantheism in their hostility to Christian theism. Thus they agree in denying that there is any need of, or supernatural value in, the Scriptures as a written revelation. They may make this denial on different grounds. Deism may assume that man has been created with such efficiency of natural faculty that he needs no objective supernatural instruction like that of the Bible considered as a supernatural product. On the other hand, Pantheism may assume that God is so within man, immanent, and that Christ is such an integral part in the Divine immanence as to be the supreme revelation of God to men, the subjective revelation, so that there is no need of the objective revelation in the Bible, or if there is any need of that, care must be taken not to place it above or on the same level with the supreme subjective revelation of God and Christ immanent in man. Let the Bible be put on the level of ordinary history, without any claim of being inspired, absolute, inerrant, or as being the only sufficient rule of faith and practice, and then the more moderate Pantheism may speak of it as a revelation in the sense that everything contains a revelation. Thus in the rejection of the supernatural value of the Scriptures, Pantheism becomes an ally of that Deism which it professes to oppose with tireless energy: of which Neander says well that

the Deistic and Pantheistic theories, which, although they arise from directly opposite modes of thought, agree perfectly in opposing super-

naturalism, must deny in the outset what the supernatural-theistic views hold to be essential to the idea of a genuine world-redeeming Christ.[1]

Thus, in minimizing the supernatural value of the Scriptures and asserting that the supreme revelation consists in the immanence of Christ in the human race, the doctrine of the Andover professors, as represented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," is more than "perilously akin" to Pantheism, for it is Pantheism in its Christology. And because of the coalition of Pantheism with Deism against the Scriptures, the doctrine of these professors is itself "perilously akin to Deism." It is indeed affirmed by them that

> The Bible is the supreme authority for man, because it embodies the Gospel of the only begotten Son of God.[2]

But they say also in speaking of Christ that

> He is the spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in which he dwells, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic in which he has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries.[3]

Again they say that

> The Incarnation is the essential revelation: but the Incarnation is more than the presence of the man Christ Jesus on earth, and the things he did and suffered. — It is the fact of union between the divine and the human, the awful "mystery of godliness"; it is the relation of this union to the life of man and the life of God.[4]

The professors also say that by the Incarnation Christ is

> The eternal source and principle of revelation. — In the Incarnation he has carried revelation to its highest conceivable stage and mode, however augmented it may be in degree and power.[5]

And again they say that Christ has such an affinity for all men

> that Christ has an organic relation to the race.[6]

From these statements it appears that Christ by the Incarnation is identified with the humanity of Heathendom as much as with the humanity of Christendom, for he is identified with universal humanity and because he is hereby the eternal source and principle of revelation in universal humanity. Now, it is consistent with this view to allow that this revelation of Christ in humanity

[1] Life of Jesus Christ, p. 12. [2] Prog. Orth. p. 256. [3] Ibid. p. 209. [4] Ibid. p. 205. [5] Ibid. p. 34. [6] Ibid. p. 52.

appears in different degrees of manifestation somewhat according to environment. The apostles having a favored environment manifested the revelation of Christ as identified with their humanity in a high degree. Others since the apostles have manifested this revelation in an unusual degree. Those whose environment is less favorable than that of the apostles or any since their time are incapable of this manifestation of the revelation of Christ in their humanity through the Incarnation, except in a smaller degree, for otherwise the most difficult question for theodicy must arise, in which it would be charged that God had implanted a principle of revelation in humanity without giving that principle any possible environment for its manifestation, in some instances. If this were true, then God might as well not have implanted the principle of revelation at all in humanity, in some instances. But the Incarnation, as affecting universal humanity, will not allow of such an exception. It follows, then, that a fuller manifestation of the revelation of Christ in humanity requires, in any case, not probation, but improved environment. Probation, as a test limiting environment either to a specified time or to any particular degree of opportunity, is all out of the question, for it must be conceded from this point of view that environment will be improved without limit until the revelation of Christ in universal humanity shall have been so manifested in all the race as to secure universal salvation.

It is a favorite expression of modern pantheists that "God is in embryo in every man, though in different degrees of development," hence there is an ever becoming manifestation of God in man. It is hard to find any appreciable difference between this view and that advanced in "Progressive Orthodoxy."

When the Andover professors say that

the Bible is the supreme authority for man,

to be consistent they must only mean that in this life the Bible is included in the best environment, while after death there will be a larger and better environment than any in this life with the Bible included. But on these premises it cannot be affirmed that any environment is insufficient, in its time and place. The Divine is already in man, and the evolution of the Divine in man will, throughout all ages, be appropriate in degree to the environment.

Neither can the Divine in man escape condemnation, if man is ever condemned at any day of judgment, as was shown in our discussion of the thirteenth specification. In the New England theology a man is recognized as a Christian as soon as there is a single spark of righteousness in him. This spark, however, is found only in those who through faith and repentance experience the renewing of the Holy Spirit, those not having the Scriptures experiencing this renewing by the Holy Spirit in a manner suited to their condition. But, according to the authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," this spark is not communicated through faith and repentance in the renewing of the Holy Spirit, but is communicated to the entire human race through the Incarnation, and is to manifest itself by evolution, somewhere, either in this life or hereafter, in appropriate degree: so that the office work of the Holy Spirit as the renewer and sanctifier, according to the Seminary Creed, is ignored. This evolution is impelled by the "Christ within." All objective forces must be discredited in order to avoid what is called a "mechanical view." Thus the Bible has no objective value for it is not, even,

what Christ *said* or *did*,

in such sense as to be taken as the foundation for ideas or doctrine, for it is the life of Christ already in men "*alone*" that has value. So when it is said that

the Holy Spirit in his work represents the place of motive in Christianity,[1]

it cannot be intended that he represents the place of objective motive in bringing home to human thought

what Christ *said* or *did;*

as doctrine and truth, for this is ruled out of the question. It must be meant therefore that the Holy Spirit somehow represents the place of subjective motive within man, presents Christ as motive from within the human constitution, in which the Divine and the human are identical. But Christ himself being already within man, any work of the Holy Spirit in this sense to bring Christ to man's thought from within is unnecessary and improbable, according to the doctrine of the Incarnation held by the

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 118.

professors in "Progressive Orthodoxy," for Christ is already identified with the human constitution, and therefore with the power of human thought. To say that

> the function of the Holy Spirit is to take the things of Christ, and show them unto men,[1]

is certainly a useless piece of "machinery," since Christ is already within men, unless the Holy Spirit and Christ, as within the race, are taken to be identical, thus impairing the doctrine of the Trinity.

When it is said that the

> process through which the Christian is developed: — is all expressed in the personal act of repentance toward God, and of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ;

and that

> the personal appropriation of Christ in his life and death constitutes the sinner a Christian;[2]

the language is such that it may signify nothing more than that the Christ Incarnate in the race is evolved, or "developed" through a certain "process," to which the terms "faith," "repentance," and "personal appropriation" are of no consequence, except on the supposition that they are used to make a show of some connexion with the Seminary Creed, by using some of the terms of that Creed. For all that can be said, and the only thing that can be properly said upon this theory of Incarnation and atonement, is, that every man is already a Christian, potentially, by having Christ within him: and that here or hereafter in the ages to come he will be developed in Christian life by the Christ within him. To admit that any soul of the human race will not be thus developed, and therefore be forever lost, is to admit that so much of Christ as is identified with that soul must be identified with that soul in its final condition. The New theology, in stoutly asserting the identity of the Divine and the human in its Christology, not only in "Progressive Orthodoxy," but also in later publications, has committed itself irretrievably to the logical conclusion from its premise that if any of the human race are finally miserable something of Christ must also be finally miserable.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 65. [2] Ibid. p. 143.

A recent Editorial in The Andover Review, by one of the Authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," contains the following passage: —

> Why could not the Infinite Being have so united himself to the life of a creature made in his image, as to have that life in its limitations as one of the forms of his own life? The dogmatic affirmation that he could not do this, and that the Church, in believing that he has done so, believes that something took place which cannot possibly have taken place, ought to have little weight with thoughtful minds.[1]

Now, it is obvious that if the Infinite Being has so united himself with any creature — as with the human nature of Jesus, so as to have the life of the creature Jesus in its limitations "one of the forms of his own life," then to the extent of the creature life the Infinite Being and the creature are identical. If also through the Incarnation the human "race is reconstituted," so that "the immanence of Christ is an integral part of the conception of the Divine immanence,"[2] — immanence being taken here in the Greek sense, — so that the life of universal human nature is one of the forms of the life of the Infinite Being, then the identity of the Divine with the human is maintained in harmony with the requirements of monistic Pantheism. When it is said that the affirmation of those who oppose this view "ought to have little weight with thoughtful minds": those who make this affirmation would not seem to be called on to treat those whom they oppose with such extreme delicacy as to withhold any logical arguments which the discussion might require.

It may be asked of those who have such "thoughtful minds," what advantage is gained by the advocates of future probation, over those whose views they oppose, in consistency of thought? They allege that one class of those whose views they oppose maintains that if any of the heathen are saved it must be by what they call "arbitrary election." But the odium of what they call "arbitrary election" is removed when it is replied that through the Divine omniscience all the facts in every case are known to the Divine mind, so that there is, in reality, no such thing as "arbitrary election," because that election is in harmony with the knowledge of facts.

The professors at Andover who advocate a future probation

[1] Andover Review, July, 1892, p. 82. [2] Ibid. vol. xiii, 434.

allege that another class whose views they oppose are inconsistent in supposing that any of the heathen can be saved in this life without a knowledge of the historic Christ: but they themselves are inconsistent in attaching so much importance to a knowledge of the historic Christ, after minimizing the Scriptures and the objective history of Christ in them, while at the same time they magnify the subjective Christ within all men, whether in Heathendom or Christendom.

Again, these advocates of future probation virtually allege the inconsistency of those who believe that probation in this life is sufficient since even the heathen are to be judged only according to the measure of light and knowledge which they have: and because, they say, that the heathen cannot have a sufficient objective motive for right action; but they themselves are inconsistent in requiring a future probation in distinction from that of this life in which any of the human race may become Christians, when in fact all men are already, potentially Christians, through the indwelling Christ, so that their Christian development is, even now, assured.

Again, the Andover professors, in advocating a future probation, allege that those who believe that probation in this life is sufficient are inconsistent in supposing that any can be saved through the Christ of whom they have not heard; but they themselves are inconsistent in admitting that any can be lost when Christ is declared to be in, and organically one with, the whole human race. Their claim for a future probation is inconsistent also because it requires them to separate those who, according to their assumption, know Christ in this life from those who do not know Christ in this life by an arbitrary line, so that all on one side of this line will have a future probation, while all on the other side of this line do not need a future probation, and this while all on both sides of this line have the same Christ within them. According to the premise any such distinction between a present and a future probation is absurd, for in this case probation is only another name for pantheistic evolution which is without division or limitation, whose movement is as real now as it ever can be.

Yet again, the Andover professors who maintain the hypothesis of a future probation characterize the salvation which some of

their opponents suppose men may have in this life without historic Christianity

as salvation by magic.[1]

But they themselves hold "a salvation by magic"—the "magic of mysticism." This magic rests on the pantheistic assumption of "a mutual harmony of all that exists, and that all things exist by God in nature as the immediate force that forms and sustains them." Thus "celestial magic" is defined as man in communion with God as the inmost and identical principle, and force, of man's own being. This is magic reveling in subjective vagaries of the imagination to the exclusion of the outward and objective world. In respect of Divine things it conceives of an internal illumination in the soul which is the light of God as identical with the soul. Hence Eckhart could say:—

There is in the soul something uncreated, and exalted above all that is created.[2]

According to Neander this pantheistic mysticism arose because

the longing for union with God was not ever accompanied side by side with a consciousness of the self-subsistence of the creaturely spirit, and the infinite exaltation of God above the world, with a consciousness of sin standing in contrariety with the holiness of God, with a humility never forgetting for a moment the strict line that separates the creature from the Creator.

Hence in this mysticism there was

a thoroughly anti-Christian tendency, hostile to everything supernatural, every intimation of a God above the world; a tendency which contained, first in the form of mysticism, the germ of absolute Rationalism and the deification of reason.[3]

Now, this magic of mysticism is found in the doctrine of the Andover professors as represented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," because in its conception of union with God "the consciousness of the self-subsistence of the creaturely spirit, is not accompanied side by side with the consciousness of the infinite exaltation of God above the world"; and because that "the strict line which separates the creature from the Creator is forgotten," and because that its conception of the Divine immanence either makes the human reason identical with the Divine reason, or, what is

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 133. [2] Neander, vol. v, p. 395. [3] Neander, vol. v, pp. 392, 393.

the same in result, deifies human reason, and thus becomes an ally of absolute rationalism; so that the plan of salvation proposed on these principles of mysticism is a "salvation by magic." But the salvation supposed possible for the heathen, which is opposed in "Progressive Orthodoxy," is not a "salvation by magic," for it is consistent from the standpoint of Christian theism, under which there is no identification of the human with the Divine, while the salvation is wrought under the efficiency of means compatible with the agency of the Holy Spirit. Nor, as is objected, does this salvation take place "wrought out independently of human consciousness," for in every heathen in whom this salvation should be effected there would be the human consciousness of joy and "the peace of God which passeth understanding,"[1] as in men more enlightened. If it were said that in this case salvation would be wrought out independently of that high degree of human consciousness evinced in the experience of Chalmers, the statement could be accepted. But when it is said, without qualification, that in this case salvation would be "wrought out independently of the human consciousness," the statement must be denied, for, according to the grounds on which this salvation is supposed to take place, no man is saved except upon the conscious action of his own will in choosing salvation, according to the measure of his capacity and understanding.

Again, the advocates of this future probation are inconsistent in laying down pantheistic principles respecting probation, and presuming to carry them out according to Christian theism.

And finally, the Andover professors, in advocating this future probation, are inconsistent in charging those with agnosticism who believe that in this life there is sufficient probation, while they, after all, are themselves chargeable with agnosticism, since their future probation rests on an unproven hypothesis, and is incapable of proof from either Scripture or reason. So long as they themselves fail to prove their hypothesis and are compelled to fall back on agnosticism in respect to it as their pet theory, it must be taken as a poor vindication on their part which consists in affirming, without proof and in the face of glaring inconsistencies, that their agnosticism is only something infinitesimally less in degree than the agnosticism of those whose views they

[1] Phil. 4:7.

oppose. It has been received as an axiom that "ignorance is incompetent to raise an objection." If this is true, it may be confidently asked, from the standpoint of Christian theism, what propriety there can be in assuming to have discovered a wonderful vindication of the justice of God in the hypothesis of a future probation, meanwhile confessing ignorance or agnosticism as to the truth of this hypothesis.

But without arguing the merits of this future probation in detail, further than to show that its claim is useless as compared with the view that this life furnishes a sufficient probation, we come to the main argument, which is that this future probation cannot be taught, either as a doctrine or as an unproven hypothesis on the Andover Foundation, except as a perversion of the Creed of the Seminary, for, "the doctrine of probation limited to this life lies imbedded in the original basis of the Seminary." [1] It is unnecessary to spend any time in proving the truth of this statement, since the exhaustive arguments of Dr. Park on the Associate Creed, and of Dr. Dexter on the eleventh specification, are already in the case before your Honorable Board.

It follows from these arguments that this attempted perversion of the Seminary Creed contemplates also the perversion of the principles which lie at the foundation of missions as represented in the American Board by the common Founders of both the Seminary and the Board, and thus sustaining the charge in the twelfth specification which we are now arguing.

This perversion is sought under the insidious claim that candidates for appointment under the American Board should be allowed the freedom to believe in this future probation, the absurdity of which appears in the fact that those who claim to have "thinking minds," and who come to the front in this claim, are, after all, not sure that there is such a probation. If they were sure of it, if there were no agnosticism at bottom on their part, there would be less inconsistency in this claim, though then there could be no authority for them to teach their hypothesis contrary to the provisions of the Seminary Creed. Freedom to believe what is confessed to be established by argument and accepted by honest convictions has generally been considered as quite sufficient to answer the demands of liberty. But when in the name of free-

[1] Dr. Edwards A. Park, on The Associate Creed, p. 65.

dom it is claimed that one must have liberty to believe in an unproved hypothesis, of which there is no probability that it ever can be proved, this claim seems to arrogate the right of a man to be a simpleton, rather than the right and freedom to accept and profess the certain conclusions of a truly "thoughtful mind." We have heard of the man who was so timid that he was always afraid that he should be afraid, but this timidity seems to be outdone by those who are in this case so deeply exercised by timidity that they are desperately afraid that they may not have liberty to believe what is not so, or, at least, what they themselves confess is not proved to be so. In an article under the head of "Compromising on Agnosticism," written by one of the editors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," and published in The Christian Union, November 19, 1892, it is said, in respect to the policy of the American Board as expounded by its President, that his words nowhere affirm "The Right of Opinion." The writer makes the distinction between opinion and doctrine to consist in this, that "a doctrine belongs to the formulated substance of the Gospel. It is a part of the message. It is to be preached. An opinion belongs to the philosophy of religion. It has its place, in the form of a theory or explanation, in the interpretation of Christianity especially as related to those problems which lie somewhat outside the region of absolute knowledge." This distinction is defective in that the line which separates opinion from doctrine is not drawn with the requisite sharpness. According to the standard authorities, "A doctrine is anything held as true: anything laid down as true by an instructor or master, hence the doctrines of the Gospel, the doctrines of the Bible." But "an opinion is what one thinks, as distinguished from what one knows to be true; a judgment founded on evidence that does not produce knowledge or certainty." In this clear and sharp distinction opinion does not lie "somewhat," but altogether "outside" the region of absolute knowledge, outside of knowledge in any respect as "certainty."

Now, while it is conceivable that one might hold this distinction in the abstract, yet it cannot be supposed that practically any considerable number — if indeed any — would or could hold it in respect to preaching the doctrines of the Bible, without asserting the right of opinion in such a way as to encroach upon the right

of doctrine. This encroachment is seemingly provided for when it is said by the Author of this article that opinion has its place in the form of "explanation" or "interpretation." Accordingly the preacher may be supposed to declare the doctrines of the Bible as absolute truth, knowledge; and then to resort to whatever opinion, heathen or otherwise, for the "explanation" and "interpretation" of these doctrines. Thus, though it be said as in this article that "we do not speak of believing an opinion," that "we apply that term naturally to doctrine," yet, in explaining and interpreting doctrine by opinion, it is possible that as a result there would be more belief in opinion than in doctrine. Doctrine might be confounded by opinion. In the abstract it might be conceived, as stated in the article, that "there is no reason why an opinion may not be held clearly, firmly, and honorably, without any infringement on the province of doctrine." But opinion cannot be held so, "honorably," if it must have license to dominate doctrine by interpreting and explaining it. The Protestant view is that the Scriptures should not be explained by things foreign to them, but that they should be expounded in harmony with their internal teaching; that, in case of any obscurity, "each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts." This method treats the Scriptures honorably and makes their doctrine clear and certain. But the method of expounding the doctrines of Scripture by uncertain opinion confounds them. The doctrines of Scripture are made subservient to the extraneous opinion of those who give primal authority to human reason, or to the authority of the Church, to the speculations of Deism, to the vagaries of that mysticism which rejects the Scriptures in whole or in part and affirms an internal revelation from God in every man, or to the platitudes of Pantheism.

There is an instance of confounding biblical doctrine by philosophical opinion in a sermon preached by Henry Ward Beecher, in November, 1882, advocating what he called "Christian Pantheism," in which he said that "the whole march of history is the evolution of the heart of God in the world," that "the whole world is but God's garment," and that at Mars' Hill "the apostle Paul spoke authenticating a Poem older even than he was preacher, when he said, 'The God in whom we live and move and have our being';"

thus making the apostle authenticate the Pantheism of Cleanthes the Stoic, when if Cleanthes had been at Mars' Hill he would have learned, in the words of Conybeare and Howson, that "it was no pantheistic diffusion of power and order of which the Apostle spoke, but a living centre of Government and love — that the world was ruled by the providence of a personal God — and that from the proudest philosopher repentance and meek submission were sternly exacted." Now, as it was claimed in Plymouth Pulpit that St. Paul authenticated the Pantheism of Cleanthes, it is not strange that this progressive Pulpit should require the American Board to appoint, as missionaries, men who claim the right to authenticate the Pantheism of India and China, and thus follow, what is falsely claimed to be, the example of St. Paul. Nor is it strange that this should be required by the advocates of the New theology at Andover, under the claim of "the right of opinion." The requirement goes to show that both Pulpit and Theological Seminary may be sufficiently rich in opinions, but poor in Christian doctrine. But when once the distinction between doctrine and opinion is rightly made, this requirement is shown to be a piece of sophistry. The work of the American Board is to preach the doctrine of the Gospel to the heathen, according to what the Gospel itself claims as doctrine, and not what may be any man's mere opinion of the Gospel: this doctrine as expounded in the Gospel, and not what that doctrine may be as interpreted by somebody's uncertain opinion gathered outside of the province of doctrine. It is all the same whether such opinion comes assuming the logic of a philosophy, or whether it be only the dream of a delusive hypothesis. In short, the Board is justified in its present policy, on the admission that opinion cannot be preached, for it is the function of the Board to preach doctrine, and not to allow that preaching to become entangled with "vain philosophy" through the sophistry that claims an illegitimate right of opinion.[1] Much is said, by those who claim this right of opinion, of the virtues of "sincerity" and "frankness" which they have in maintaining the "courage of their convictions," but the utility of such courage seems doubtful when associated with what, after all,

[1] The article referred to appeared some time after this argument had been prepared with the expectation that it would be read before the Board of Visitors, and is now noticed for its fitness as illustration.

are not real convictions. Whatever latitude might be granted to this freedom and courage as being simple and therefore harmless, it could not be tolerated in the Seminary because opposed to the Creed. The claim that within the Seminary the advocates of future probation have as much freedom to urge their unproven hypothesis as the Founders of the Seminary had to urge that this life furnishes a sufficient probation, and to make this a part of the Creed, is a false claim, legally and morally. Outside the Seminary, and not as professors within it, and free from the contract to teach what the Creed of the Seminary prescribes, these professors might say, as they do, respecting future probation: —

> We both demand liberty to hold it, and decline to admit superior orthodoxy on the part of those who hold another opinion, —[1]

but to say this while occupying professorial chairs in the Seminary, after having solemnly subscribed to the Seminary Creed, is, instead of making a demand for righteous liberty, to make the defiant declaration that in this case they — the professors — will act contrary to the restraints of both law and morality.

Morally it is a false claim that, in respect to future probation, candidates for appointment under the American Board should be

> welcomed without scrutiny as to their theological opinions,[2]

and thus pervert the American Board by making of it an instrument for publishing and promoting future probation.

There is no force in the apology that those who reverently claim the right to hold this hypothesis will make no bad use of it among the heathen if appointed by the Board, or that they will be silent in respect to it in their missionary work, for, if the hypothesis is to be held so impracticable, it is hardly possible to conceive that a truly reverent mind should regard it, under such conditions, as of the least consequence. It is also inconceivable that a man should be reverently strenuous for leave to hold this hypothesis, unless with the secret conviction of its truth, and the conviction of its practical utility, such as to warrant his teaching it on the first opportunity. Suppose that a man with these convictions were appointed a missionary to the heathen, and should put his convictions in practice: it may be asked of what advantage it would be toward securing the conversion of the heathen. When in the

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 109. [2] Ibid. p. 188.

seventh century king Radbod represented to the missionary that he was prepared to receive Christian baptism, "but was first desirous to learn whether on arriving at heaven, he should find there his forefathers also," the bishop, undoubtedly, made a mistake in telling him so positively that his forefathers, "having died without baptism, had assuredly been condemned to hell." To this Radbod said: "What business have I then with a few poor people in heaven; I prefer to abide by the religion of my fathers."[1] It is easy enough to see that if this bishop had been a believer in future probation, and had assured Radbod of it to relieve his mind in respect to his fathers, Radbod would still have been willing to cast his lot with them, and trust to the future probation for himself. In consistency with the doctrine that this life furnishes a sufficient probation as held by the founders of the American Board, Radbod could not have made this pretext for rejecting Christianity.

In general, whatever might be gained in securing an apparently increased number of converts among the heathen by carrying to them the notion of future probation, with its affiliations with Eastern Pantheism, it must result in paganizing Christianity instead of Christianizing paganism. Missionary societies that would carry the Gospel of Christ to the heathen are not called on to permit their missionaries to compromise the Gospel by any concessions to heathenism. There was a sufficient trial of this method by the Jesuits in the seventeenth century. They interpreted the doctrines of paganism so as to soften and diminish their opposition to the truth of the Gospel, at least in appearance. They used all their art and zeal to persuade the Indians that there was a great conformity between their ancient theology and the new religion they were called on to embrace, in which they made a false representation of both. They gave a spurious account of the ancient religion of the Chinese, representing that the teaching of Confucius differed almost in nothing from the doctrine of the Gospel, and that Jesus Christ had been known and worshiped in their nation ages ago, which they could have done only on the pantheistic notion of the Logos, which prevailed in heathendom from "the shores of the Yellow Sea to the Illissus," as related by Milman and referred to in the discussion of

[1] Neander, vol. iii, p. 44.

the thirteenth specification. This was understood by the Dominicans, who, in opposition to the Jesuits, affirmed that the ancient philosophy of the Chinese was full of blasphemy and impiety, and that, in respect of the Being of God, "it confounded the Divine nature with that of the universe."[1] As future probation involves this confounding of the Divine Nature through pantheistic Christology, its approbation in the smallest degree by the American Board were to inaugurate the missionary policy of the Jesuits, a policy not likely to receive the support of intelligent, reverent, and devout Protestants, notwithstanding the example of Clement in adopting the "doctrine of a progressive development and course of purification after death," so as to furnish some ground of consolation to heathen converts "with respect to the fate of their ancestors who had died without faith in the Gospel."[2] Since Clement's doctrine was derived from heathen philosophy, while the same is true of Origen, who, says the historian, "everywhere shows a disposition to accommodate Christian doctrines to heathen philosophy, and to make the difference appear as small as possible,"[3] thus furnishing an example for the missionary policy of the Jesuits, as well as a desirable authority for the professorial authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy"; and in view of the struggles of Protestantism with Pantheism, and above all in view of the spirit of the Founders of this "Sacred Seminary" — as they loved to call it — and the foundation upon which they built it, and the missionary use for which they designed it; in view of all this it is difficult to conceive that any "thinking mind" impelled by purity of moral purpose should presume, in this Seminary, to demand liberty to hold the hypothesis of future probation, and to use it as an instrument to dominate the American Board in the interest of this hypothesis.

That theosophists in this country, who are also pantheists, denying that the Scriptures are a divine revelation, should claim to have immediate communications from God through divine illumination within their own personal consciousness, and as spiritualists adopt a phase of the old Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls, should also find a charm in Esoteric Buddhism and consider it an improvement upon Christianity, is not

[1] Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. vol. v, pp. 8, 22, 28. [2] Neander, vol. i, pp. 655, 656. [3] Bib. Repos., 1834, p. 45.

remarkable. But when it is attempted to improve Christianity in giving it better adaptation for Christian missions by compromising it with the speculations of theosophy or of Buddhism, and this by professors in a Seminary whose Creed they solemnly accept in its palpable teaching that the only and sufficient probation is in this life; this is too remarkable for explanation if it must be maintained that the authors of this attempted improvement are strictly men of sound learning, wisdom, and honor. In view of what is called theological progress in the nineteenth century, it is a grave question whether that, as theosophy is effecting a union with "Esoteric Buddhism," and the Pantheism of the West is finding its counterpart in the Pantheism of the East, the Christian doctrine of this Seminary must, in the craze for union, be twisted into this unity in order to become most effective in the propagation of Christian missions; whether the old experiment of the Greek theologians must now be repeated of attempting to carry the Gospel of Christ to the heathen and make of it a missionary success by receiving in turn from the heathen their pantheistic philosophy in order to incorporate it into the Christian doctrine of the Church.

There is a sense in which this transaction is an infringement on the rights of various classes of people. "In the eye of the law," says Dr. Park, "the Andover Seminary is 'a charity' for certain classes of men; and its funds cannot be legally diverted from the interests of these classes to promote the interest of opposing classes." Among other classes mentioned, "Andover Seminary," continues Dr. Park, "is a charity for all those friends of Foreign missions, Congregational or Presbyterian, who may desire that young men be excited to missionary zeal by the particular system of doctrines, and by the particular doctrines of the system taught in the Creed."[1] Now, this class has an interest in, and a legal right to, the benefits of this charity. Any measure that deprives them of these benefits is an infringement of their legal rights. Without considering these rights, the perversion of the doctrines of the Seminary Creed is a grave offence, but that offence is aggravated by its action in depriving this class of the enjoyment of their rights. It is no answer to say that this class may be small in comparison with the larger number who

[1] Dr. Edwards A. Park, on The Associate Creed, p. 41.

are pleased with the perversion of the doctrine of the Seminary, — even if that number were large, — for the rights of this class, however small it might be, comparatively, do not rest on the caprice of majorities, or the shifting moods of popular sentiment, because they are guaranteed by the statutes of the Seminary which constitute it as a charity in their interest. Any attempt to raise a majority among the churches against this interest, or to fortify the perversion of the doctrines of the Seminary in its bearing upon missions by building up a constituency of the churches in its favor through securing their acceptance of pastors committed to the hypothesis of a future probation, with the view also to gain a controlling influence in the administration of the American Board, may compare well with the low scheming of political tactics, but it is at the same time an aggravated offence against that law which guarantees to a class protection in their rights independent of all such scheming and agitation. Besides, this scheming is in contravention of the declaration required of every person elected a Professor in this Seminary in the words:

> I will consult the good of this institution, and the peace of the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, on all occasions.[1]

When such a contravention of law and of rights is proposed under the cry for freedom, the counterpart of that freedom, however fascinating the cry, is found in the cry for freedom made by the pantheistic Libertines in the middle of the sixteenth century, who, denying the supreme authority of the Scriptures, declared that they were guided by a higher revelation, an inward light, and that consequently all civil and ecclesiastical order was not only useless but at variance with Christian Freedom.[2]

Thus, Mr. President, and Gentlemen of The Reverend and Honorable Board of Visitors, I think that I have shown that the Respondent, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., does hold, maintain, and inculcate, in opposition to the Creed of the Seminary, as alleged in the twelfth specification, to wit: "that Christian missions are not to be supported and conducted on the ground that men who know not Christ are in danger of perishing forever, and must perish forever unless saved in this life"; and I claim to have shown this by reference to "Progressive Orthodoxy," a book

[1] Wood's History, p. 293. [2] Bib. Sac. vol. ii, p. 737.

for which the Respondent is responsible as its editor, composer, and publisher.

Besides, sustaining the complaints which I have argued on this occasion, I claim that I have also sustained the seventh, eighth, and tenth complaints against the Respondent, argued before your Honorable Board on a former occasion.

In concluding my service as one of the complainants in behalf of those Alumni of the Seminary whom I represent, it gives me pleasure to express my satisfaction in submitting the issues of this case to your decision, for I am persuaded that you, Gentlemen, are fully sensible of the responsibility resting upon you in having it in your power to preserve this Sacred Seminary intact as constituted by its Founders, and that if it shall not be so preserved, then the responsibility is also yours.

Finally, what I have desired for myself in the service rendered, may I not also with equal fervor desire for you: that the Lord may grant you help, such, that in coming to a decision in the case now pending, you shall conform to his righteous will, and receive from him finally the plaudit,

Well done, good and faithful.

ARGUMENTS

OF

REV. JOSHUA W. WELLMAN, D.D.

INTRODUCTION.

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, — The supreme question in the Andover Case is a *moral* question. It is this: — Is it right for a Professor in Andover Seminary, once in every five years to declare solemnly and religiously his belief in the theology formulated in the Andover Creed, at the same time solemnly and religiously promising to "maintain and inculcate" that theology, and then during the intervening period of five years "maintain and inculcate" another and a so-called "new theology" which antagonizes the said Creed? In other words, is it a righteous course of action for a Professor in Andover Seminary, while supported by its funds and aided by its prestige, to defend and teach, not the theology of its Creed, but his own substitute for it, called by him "Progressive Orthodoxy," and to do this, too, when he has voluntarily placed himself under imperative and sacred obligations to teach exactly the theology of the Seminary Creed, and to teach nothing opposed to that Creed?

This question in morals does not seem to be a very hard one to understand, nor a very difficult one to answer. Yet this is the transcendent question in the now famous Andover Case. True, it implies a second question, which is strictly theological. But the moral question is supreme. The theological question is subsidiary, yet must of necessity be investigated and decided, in order that a true decision of the moral question may be reached.

The Theological Question.

The theological question, however, is not primarily whether the "new theology," called "Progressive Orthodoxy," is true or false. Nor is it whether "the Andover theology," that is, the theology of the Andover Creed, is true or false. These questions in themselves are of high moment, and at a proper time and place ought to be discussed and settled, and they doubtless will be; but they are not the primary theological questions in the Andover Case.

The theological question which is now before your Reverend and

Honorable Board, and to which your Board alone can give a final and authoritative answer, is this: — Whether "Progressive Orthodoxy" is so identical with, or in such harmony with, the theology of the Andover Creed that it can be held and taught by an Andover Professor in perfect consistency with the solemn declaration and promise he has made in taking the Creed, and without any violalation of the unalterable Constitution and Statutes provided by the Founders of the Seminary? If the decision shall be that "Progressive Orthodoxy" is not identical nor in harmony with the Seminary Creed, but is in irrepressible conflict with it, then comes of necessity the irrefutable answer to the *great moral question.* And that answer is this: that it is a flagrant wrong, and if consciously and wilfully persisted in, it is deliberate dishonesty, to maintain and inculcate "Progressive Orthodoxy" on the Andover Foundations. In other words, the Andover question, which is being argued before you, though twofold, is supremely a *moral question.* And this high moral question cannot be evaded on the part of the defendant by any jugglery of words, or by diverting your attention to personalities, literary criticisms, and questions of personal liberty, nor by wasting time in raising and discussing through months and years any other trivial side-issues, but must be faced squarely and answered clearly and unequivocally. Nor can such a momentous moral issue be dismissed on the ground of some technical informality in the proceedings of your Board. No honorable man, accused of questionable conduct, will deign to take advantage of such informalities for one moment, but will demand as imperatively as the complainants do, that, without hindrance or obstruction of any kind, the issue shall be honestly presented and honestly met, and that then a decision shall be rendered without fear or favor upon the merits of the case. Until this is done the Andover trouble cannot be ended. Such moral issues will never down until they are settled in accordance with truth and righteousness.

No Charge of Conscious Dishonesty.

We wish, however, to say at the outset, and once for all, that we do not affirm or charge that the defendant in this case is conscious of wrong doing. We know nothing about his consciousness or his conscience. But what we do say is this, that *if*

he is holding and teaching speculations or hypotheses, dogmas or doctrines which are diametrically opposed to, and subversive of, doctrines of the Andover Creed and of consistent Calvinism, which he certainly has promised, on his honor as a man of truth and a Christian, to "maintain and inculcate," then, whatever his own conscience may say, by the common standard of morals, or at the bar of public conscience, he must and will stand condemned as guilty of wrong and dishonorable action.

Now how far have we progressed in the examination and determination of these questions? What is the present *status* of the Andover Case?

Misrepresentations.

It has been said repeatedly, in public and in private, by men who were supposed to speak with authority, and who therefore should have spoken the truth, that the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in October, 1891, finished the Andover trial; that by that decision all questions in this controversy were settled; that all litigation was ended, and that full freedom had at last been gained for, and even guaranteed to, the new-departure Professors in this Seminary. And woe has been denounced upon any man who should ever again attempt to deprive these Professors of the great and priceless freedom which they have thus won.

No New Freedom Gained.

These repeated misrepresentations would deserve no notice, but for this, that such loud and triumphant language implies, if it implies anything, that the new-departure Professors are now possessed of some priceless freedom which they did not have previous to the decision of the Supreme Court, that by that decision they were released from some unjust and cruel bondage to creed or statute, to visitorial or other power, under which they previously suffered.

But we venture to affirm that these Professors are now in possession of no more freedom in this Seminary than they were before the decision of the Court was given. What *is* this great freedom which it is claimed they have gained? Freedom to do what? They have not a particle more liberty to break their promises or to violate the Constitution and Statutes of the

Seminary than they had before; not a particle more liberty to introduce a new or an old theology which contradicts in any particular that of the Creed. They have gained from the Court no freedom whatever to resist the authority of the Board of Visitors or to defy its decisions, although at vast cost to the Seminary treasury the most strenuous and prolonged efforts were made to obtain this freedom. On the other hand, they *now* have just the freedom, no more and no less than that which they declared themselves perfectly satisfied with when they voluntarily accepted their professorships, subscribed to the Creed, and promised that they would "religiously conform to the Constitution and Laws of the Seminary." More freedom than this they have no moral or legal right to demand. If any professor in this Seminary, under honest convictions, or in conscience, feels constrained to promulgate doctrines and speculations which antagonize the Andover Creed, then every dictate of common honor and honesty, to say nothing of Christian principle and obligation, requires him to vacate his chair at once, and go where he can teach his recently adopted beliefs and theories without any breaking of promises or any perversion of trust funds.

Decision of the Supreme Court.

We also venture to affirm, in opposition to repeated and public declarations to the contrary, that the recent decision of the Supreme Court has not finished the Andover Case; that it has not ended litigation, if any more shall be found necessary to a faithful execution of this great and sacred trust; that it has not settled any of the great theological and moral questions which are at issue in this case; and that it has not vindicated Professor Smyth as to a single charge made against him. So far is this Andover trial from being finished, that all the amended charges which the complainants preferred against Professor Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., in 1886, are still pending, and all the theological questions connected with these charges are still before the Visitors awaiting their decision.

Eight of the particular charges, as the complainants think, were proved by the evidence and arguments presented at the commencement of the trial of Professor Smyth in December, 1886. Your Reverend and Honorable Board, Mr. President, also

deemed this proof, in the case of at least three particular charges, ample and decisive, and consequently removed Professor Smyth from his professorship in Andover Seminary.

Cause of Delay in Legal Proceedings.

Why, then, this prolonged continuance of the Andover Case? Not simply the appeal which Professor Smyth saw fit to make from your decision to the Supreme Judicial Court in this Commonwealth, but chiefly the large and needless accumulation of side-issues raised by the Professor and by his supporters, the Board of Trustees, is responsible for the long and costly continuations of this trial, extended, as it already has been, over nearly six years. Had it been the dominant purpose of all parties concerned to try this case upon its merits, so as to ascertain what can, and what can not, be rightfully held and taught by Professors on these Andover Foundations, and had it been the high aim of *both* the Boards which are intrusted with the administration of this Seminary to be truly and greatly helpful to each other, that so they might the more effectually guard these Foundations "against all perversion, or the smallest avoidance" of the true design of the Founders, according to the Founders' statutory requirement, the whole trial might have been completed in less than one sixth — perhaps in one twelfth — of the time which has already been consumed, and at the cost of only a small fraction of the more than two scores of thousands of dollars which have now been expended.

The present resumption of the trial, however, by the Board of Visitors, and your summons to the Complainants to appear before you at another hearing, afford us opportunity to emphasize some of the evidence and arguments already presented, to add other evidence and arguments, and to present proof of some charges in the Amended Complaint which were not substantiated by argument at the trial before your Board in 1886.

I.

THE PARTICULAR COMPLAINTS.

We come now to the consideration of the specific charges found in the "Amended Complaint" which is before the Board of Visitors.

Criticisms Presented by Professor Smyth.

The defendant has severely criticized the written form in which these charges with the specifications under them were made. He has affirmed that they "are not certain or definite," "are fatally defective," and "too indefinite to require or enable" him to answer them. We have no need, Mr. President, to consume your time in demonstrating the groundlessness of these criticisms; and this for two reasons. First, we are not here before you to engage in any such petty literary discussions; and, secondly, the defendant himself long before he was through with his argument made at the beginning of this trial, gave abundant evidence that he understood perfectly well all the charges, both the general and the particular, which the complainants endeavored to substantiate; and thus he unwittingly confessed that his strictures upon the form and language of the charges were fictitious and unwarranted.

He has also animadverted repeatedly and at much length upon the manner in which citations were made by the complainants from the writings of the accused professors. It is true that some typographical mistakes, and perhaps a few other minor errors, were not corrected in the proofs. When copies of the citations which were made by the two complainants now before you went from their hands, all omissions of words, phrases, and sentences had been scrupulously and properly indicated; and in other respects it is believed the extracts from "Progressive Orthodoxy" and other writings had been correctly copied. But for some reason no proofs were returned to the complainants; and when the "Amended Complaint" appeared in print, the proper indications of omissions in some of the extracts were lacking, and a few other mistakes were noticed, none of them, however, of

more importance than some which we have noticed in the citations made by the accused professors themselves. The quotations were not "unfair," as is charged, and "misleading," except so far as they had been made so in the original writings from which they had been copied. Nor were they "twisted" and "garbled," as the defendant charges. They were intended to be made fairly and accurately, and, with the exceptions already referred to, for which the complainants were not responsible, it is believed they were so made. We deny the right of the defendant to dictate to the complainants the length of their extracts or the order in which they should be arranged. There is no orderly succession in the subjects discussed in the book entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy." They are thrown into the volume in a jumble. And often there is no such orderly succession of thoughts in the separate articles themselves as to make it possible for the complainants to make extracts which shall have any vital relation to one another, unless they jump "backwards and forwards." If the professor would have our quotations follow the order of numbers on his pages, he must have some *system* in his theology. Now there is none. In each separate article, also, his views must have expression in some orderly arrangement, and not in mere miscellaneous remarks, flung together in such pellmell fashion that one can about as well begin at the end of the article and read backwards as at the beginning and read forwards. Moreover, if the defendant and his associate professors would have extracts from their writings appear orderly and lucid, there are some other things they must do; instead of bringing laborious criticisms upon trivial literary matters into a grave discussion involving interests of immeasurable moment to the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven, they must give some attention to their own thinking and statements, and make them *clear;* and must give some lucid *definitions* of the meaning which *they* attach to theological terms, and of the doctrines which *they* believe and advocate, so as to make it utterly impossible for them to be on both sides of a great theological issue in one and the same discussion, and sometimes on neither side — so also as to make it utterly needless for them, when sharply arraigned for their quick theological somersaults and gyrations, to make the plea that they themselves are living on such a lofty plane of spirituality and ability

that they do not expect to be understood by those who are living on a vastly lower plane of spirituality and have vastly inferior ability.

The defendant makes other solemn criticisms upon such petty matters as the use of a capital letter or two, and of a few conjunctions. But, Gentlemen of the Board, we are ashamed to take up your time in replying to them. We have alluded to these frivolous strictures partly because they occupy such large space in the professor's defence of himself and of his theology and partly because we wish to hold up for public condemnation the introduction of them into this serious discussion, and the animus which they unmistakably reveal. They disclose a sad failure to appreciate the gravity of this trial, the sacredness and the immensity of the interests which are at stake.

II.

FIRST PARTICULAR COMPLAINT.

Our first particular complaint, under the fourth general charge is: that Professor Egbert C. Smyth, in opposition to the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary, "*holds, maintains, and inculcates that the Bible is* NOT *the only perfect rule of faith and practice, but is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings.*"

When the defendant subscribed to the Seminary Creed he declared: "I believe . . . that the Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice." He also solemnly promised that he would "maintain and inculcate the Christian faith as expressed" in *this* part, and in all other parts of the Creed. Our present complaint is that he holds doctrines which contradict the statements of the Creed respecting the Scriptures; and also that he has broken his promise, in that he does *not* maintain and inculcate the creed-doctrine of sacred Scripture as he solemnly promised he would do; but on the contrary is maintaining and inculcating views respecting the Bible which are *opposed* to those expressed in the Creed.

This Charge Already Sustained by the Visitors.

This complaint has already been substantiated, before your Reverend and Honorable Board, by evidence and argument; and your Board has decided that the charge is sustained. This charge thus sustained was one of the grounds on which your Board removed Professor Smyth from his professorship in this Seminary. The evidence and argument upon this charge are still before you and as they are in printed form there is no occasion for repeating them at this time.

Permit us now to present some additional facts and considerations, which, we trust, will be found to be strongly confirmative of the arguments already presented.

This Charge not Ruled upon by the Supreme Court.

1. This charge stands to-day unrefuted. Its truth has not been impugned by the recent decision of the Supreme Court. The Court did not rule on this charge, or on any other charge presented by the complainants to the Visitors. That part of the decision of the Board of Visitors which removed Professor Smyth from office the court set aside *solely* on the ground of a mere technical informality in the proceedings, which informality was that the Visitors did not accede "to the application of the Board of Trustees to appear and be heard." The court did not touch upon anything else in the decision of the Visitors. It did not rule upon one of the theological or moral questions which have been at issue in the Andover Case. Some learned writers for daily papers and some learned speakers at dinners given by the Trustees have apparently understood that every theological question and every moral question and all other questions that have been raised in the Andover trouble were ruled upon and determined by the Supreme Judicial Court in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in its decision on the Andover Case rendered in October, 1891, whereas not one of those theological and moral questions was even considered, still less decided, by that court. For instance, all that part of the decision of the Visitors in which they declared that the particular charge we are now considering and two other charges were sustained by the evidence and arguments presented by the complainants, and in which they consequently held that Professor Smyth "maintains and inculcates beliefs inconsistent with and repugnant to the Creed" of the Seminary — all that part of the decision of the Visitors the court did not rule upon, and did not consider, and therefore this particular charge which we have in hand, for all that the court said, is true now. It stands to-day unchallenged by the court.

This Charge not Refuted by Professor Smyth.

Nor, again, has this charge been refuted by the defendant. He has denied it. He denied it at the opening of this trial years ago. He denies it now. He has denied with great emphasis, and over and over, that any or all of the citations from The Andover Review, and from the book, "Progressive Orthodoxy," prove the charge. He has denied that "a scintilla of evidence,"

to use his own term, has been produced which confirms the complaint. But vehement denials repeated over and over do not refute the charge. A million of them would not refute it.

He has also presented to your Board what is ostensibly an argument in refutation of this charge. As printed in the book entitled "The Andover Defence," it covers ten and one-half pages; but by far the larger part of it has nothing whatever to do with this particular charge. His heated questions about the relation of the citations to the complaint, all his laborious criticisms upon the manner, form, and order in which the citations were made, all his mournful citations from some ancient work about the difficulties and discouragement of an English bishop who lived two centuries ago, and all his quotations from Professor Stuart upon a large variety of subjects — all these things no more show that this particular charge has not been proved to be true, and is not true, than they show that the brilliant planet Mars has not been proved to be red and is not red.

"A New Notion of the Bible."

2. According to an editorial in The Andover Review for April, 1886, — an editorial already put into this case, — "Progressive Orthodoxy," which is the defendant's new theology, and the only theology he now espouses and defends, has among its treasured discoveries and speculations "*a new notion of the Bible.*" And this "new notion of the Bible" is such that if a pastor, especially a young pastor, who has accepted it, and is fascinated with it, should be too eager to have it take possession of the minds of his people, and should blurt it out too frankly and inconsiderately, it would almost surely "wound religious feeling," produce revulsion in the minds of some of "the most valuable members of his congregation," and jeopardize pastoral relations. Still "the new notion of the Bible" must be preached, but it must be brought to the knowledge of the people slowly, indirectly, and with the greatest caution. Such are the spirit and aim of this editorial. No apology for it or explanation of it thus far offered has modified in the least degree its unmistakable significance. It has not been denied that "Progressive Orthodoxy," appearing at the close of the nineteenth Christian century, has among its tenets "a new notion of the Bible." Yet the whole tone and drift of

the editorial go to show that this "new notion" is like a package of dynamite which must be handled with the greatest caution, especially in the pulpit, or there will be an explosion which will be destructive of the pastor's ministry, if not of the church itself.

Now, Gentlemen of the Board, a "new notion of the Bible" which cannot be preached right out in its wholeness and in all its relations and bearings without wounding the religious feeling of the best, the most vigorous and earnest people in the congregation, and disrupting pastoral relations, is *not* a notion which can be held and taught by a professor in Andover Seminary, without recreancy to its Statutes and Creed. The Founders, according to their Creed, believed the Bible to be "the Word of God," most holy and blessed. And any notion of the "Word of God" which is repugnant to the Christian feeling of the wisest, the best, the most devoted members of our churches to-day is certainly repugnant also to the Christian feeling, faith, and purpose of the Founders as expressed in their Statutes and Creed. No one who has studied the character and faith of those men can doubt this. They believed that God's Word should be preached frankly and honestly, not doubtingly and timidly; preached without fear or favor, yet with persuasiveness and love; preached with all boldness and fidelity, — and that neither the Word of God nor anything about the Word of God should ever be preached with indirection or deceitfulness. Nobody who has any true understanding of the character and beliefs of those Founders can deny that *had* they anticipated that a "new notion of the Bible," repugnant to the Christian heart and faith, would ever be held and taught in their proposed sacred Institution, the Seminary would never have been founded.

An Inconsistency.

Besides, strange to say, this "religious feeling," this Christian consciousness, this inner divine light, which in this instance "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches young ministers how to get around, to overcome, and dispose of, is the very thing which "Progressive Orthodoxy" elsewhere teaches is the one sure *test* of all pretended truth — the supreme tribunal before which all *revelation* even, from men or God, must bow down and submit its

credentials. This seems to us as complete a self-contradiction and self-stultification "as it was ever our misfortune to meet with." But we must remember that "Progressive Orthodoxy," according to the testimony of one of its chief discoverers, lives and walks on a lofty plane of spirituality and ability, where it has a clear vision of things wonderful and incomprehensible, which we, and such as we, who live down on an infinitely lower plane of spirituality and ability can never behold or understand. Still, Mr. President, is it not possible that those who live forever away up in the clouds and mists *may* have only a beclouded and misty vision of some things in morals and in theology, which those of us who walk on the earth, having only feeble abilities, yet living in the bright sunshine, can see clearly and understand rightly?

The Bible Not Infallible.

3. This same editorial (Andover Review, April, 1886), for which the defendant is responsible and which he defends, represents that the Bible is a fallible book. Young ministers are counseled to adopt a certain method of pulpit instruction, by which the conclusion will be reached and commended to their hearers, "that Christian faith is not necessarily committed to the infallibility of the Bible." But if the Bible is not infallible, it is fallible; and a fallible Bible is not "a perfect rule of faith and practice" — a conclusion which contradicts the Creed. Nothing has been produced which breaks down this evidence and this argument. It has already been shown that the phrase, "the Word of God," as used in the Creed, was intended to mean exactly the Bible, the Holy Scriptures. The defendant, then, in taking the Creed, declares it to be his belief that the Bible is a "perfect rule of faith and practice"; but in his "Progressive Orthodoxy" he *teaches* that the Bible is *not* a "perfect rule of faith and practice." This will seem to most minds conclusive evidence of the truth of our charge, notwithstanding the emphatic declaration of the defendant, that "not a scintilla of evidence" has been produced which shows that he holds and teaches any view of the Scriptures that is contrary to the Creed.

The New Notion of the Bible Not New.

But this notion that the Bible is a fallible book and therefore not a "perfect rule of faith and practice," is not "a new notion."

It is as old as the completed Bible. Through all the Christian centuries, atheists and infidels, all the avowed enemies of the Word of God, and the "liberals," so called, perhaps without exception, have held this same notion that "the Bible is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings." But Andover Seminary was not founded to maintain the views of liberals, infidels, and atheists, but of Consistent Calvinists.

The Bible a Vehicle.

4. In this same editorial passage for which the defendant is responsible, "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that the Bible is "a vehicle," and "that the perfection of the vehicle is by no means implied in the preciousness of its contents," which is another way of teaching that the Holy Scriptures, which convey to us the revelations of God, *may* be, to any extent, imperfect and untrustworthy. But no man who believes that they *may* be imperfect and untrustworthy can believe that they *are* "a perfect rule of faith and practice."

The notion that the Bible is a vehicle is not new. It is found in some old religious writings, and when this representation is not pushed to the extreme there may be no objection to it. But "Progressive Orthodoxy" uses this figurative language to indicate, not simply a distinction between the Scripture which conveys the divine revelation and the revelation itself, but also to set forth what would seem to be a most harmful error, namely, that the Scripture may be fallible without any detriment to the precious burden of divine truth and revelation which it was designed to bring to us. Such a conception certainly disparages the Scriptures and impairs their trustworthiness. An old cart is a vehicle, but what value is there in an old cart that is broken and wrecked? It may have rendered valuable service once, but it will never render such service again.

But is the Bible merely a vehicle? Is it true that the relation of the Scriptures to their contents is fairly imaged to us in the relation of a cart to what it carries? We can easily separate a cart from its load without harm to either of them. There is nothing vital in their union. But can we separate the Holy Scriptures from their contents without detriment to the one or the other? Is there not something indispensable in their union?

There are lands in the world to-day in which there are no Bibles. Can the truths and revelations of the Holy Scriptures be made permanently prevalent in the knowledge and hearts of the people in those lands apart from the Scriptures themselves? Are tradition and preaching sufficient? Suppose every Bible in the world and all Scripture in the literatures of the world were to-day blotted out of existence: would all the truths and revelations of the Bible still remain in the world permanent and intact? How long would it be before the entire world would become heathen, and how could it be prevented from remaining such forever unless God in mercy should again interpose, and give men another inspired and authentic record of his revelation in Christ and in his gospel? Even *with* the Bible, some lands once Christian, and some Christian churches even, have retrograded to heathenism. But without the Bible how much swifter must they have relapsed into heathen darkness and degradation! This shows that, whatever real distinction may be made between the Scriptures and their contents, in practical Christianity the two cannot be separated. The representation of the Bible as a vehicle may be deceptive. While it is true in the case of most vehicles that there is no important relation between them and what they carry, and that the perfection of the vehicle is not implied in the preciousness of its contents, this is not true in the case of the Scriptures. There is a relation of vital moment between them and the truths and revelations which they convey. Practically in this case the vehicle and its contents cannot be separated. The world cannot have the divine truths and revelations working effectively and permanently in its history without having also the Scriptures which contain them.

Moreover, if you impair or destroy the Scriptures, for all practical ends you put the truths and revelations themselves beyond reach. It may be said that the great facts and truths of the gospel existed before they were recorded, and would exist now if there were no Scripture; that, for instance, the blessed fact that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to die for it would have remained a fact had it never been recorded. True; but when that act of infinite love has once been put into an inspired and authoritative record for practical ends in the salvation of living men, that record lives in that divine act and

that divine act lives and works through that Scripture record. To mar or destroy that Scripture would impair the working and saving power of that divine act.

A Fallible Bible Powerless.

But *how* can the Holy Scriptures be destroyed? They cannot be destroyed. Thousands of men have done their best to annihilate the Bible, but have failed utterly. Thousands are doing their best now to extinguish it, but all their labor will be brought to naught. No believer in God need ever tremble for his Word. Still in the faith of individual man, and in its power over individual minds, hearts, and lives, the Bible may be destroyed. A man's Bible exists no longer *for him* when he ceases to have confidence in its divine authority and in its trustworthiness. A fallible Bible is not a precious Bible, and when the Bible ceases to be precious to a human heart it loses power over that heart. It is an infallible Bible that has both preciousness and power. It is not true, then, that the perfection of the Scriptures is by no means implied in the preciousness of their contents. Practically the infallibility of the Bible and the preciousness of its truths and revelations go together; also, the fallibility of the Bible and the non-preciousness of its contents go together. If a man's Bible is dear to him, that *does* imply that *to him* it is infallible, the very "Word of God," having had utterance in some true and real sense from God himself. The Bible is not a toy to play with, nor a puzzle to be solved. It is for practical service in promoting the most transcendent interests of men in time and in eternity. It has been given us for redemptive uses, and for the perfecting and the comforting of God's people, and not for the training of intellectual gymnasts. It has come to us from God for the salvation of a sinful and lost world, and not for bolstering up the down-tumbling theories of "Progressive Orthodoxy."

The Founders' View of the Bible.

Now the faith of the Founders respecting the Scriptures we know. There can be no question as to what it was. They believed the Scriptures to be "the Word of God," infallible in their moral and religious teachings, "the only perfect rule of faith and

practice," and that they have a divinely ordained and practical relation to the facts, truths, and revelations which they convey to us. The Founders accepted without question the declaration of the apostle Peter: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Their interpretation of this apostolic statement was, that the sacred writers were *specially moved* upon, and directed by, the Holy Ghost in *the speaking* of the truths which God desired to make known to the world, and so also in *the writing* of such truths; that they were "*moved*" by the Holy Ghost in *speaking* and in *writing* the truth *no less* than in the reception of it into their own minds and hearts. The Founders also accepted without question the declaration of the apostle Paul: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." This apostolic statement does not imply that the sacred writers were mere pens in the hands of God; but it does imply, and the Founders understood it to imply, that all Holy *Scripture* came into being under the inspiring, inbreathing energy of God. It was the "*Scripture*," the *writing*, that was thus inspired. A knowledge and an understanding of the truth *may* at the same time have been breathed into the minds and hearts of the sacred writers; but what Paul says is that "all *Scripture* is given by inspiration of God"—the *writing* of the truth is what the divine inspiration brings about. This is what the Founders of the Seminary believed. They accepted these apostolic statements as declaring the divine origin and authority of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible was to them the "Word of God," holy, infallible, "the only perfect rule of faith and practice."

The Defendant's View of the Bible.

Now, we complain that this entire view of the origin and authority of the Holy Scripture is rejected by "Progressive Orthodoxy." These plain, positive, decisive statements of the apostles have no prominence in the professor's long chapter on "The Scriptures." They are barely alluded to, and that only for the purpose of setting them aside summarily as giving us no account of the origin of the Scriptures; while the faith of those who accept, as the Founders did, the apostolic account of their origin is treated with misrepresentation and contempt, as if they believe that the Bible was created, as the world was, by "a

special operation of Almighty power,"[1] that it is "a book of oracles," and was produced "by sheer and stark miracle."[2] Especially and most emphatically does "Progressive Orthodoxy" deny, in opposition to the belief of the Founders, that the sacred writers wrote under any moving of the Holy Spirit, or inspiration of God, other than that which influenced them in their daily speech and life, or other in kind than that under which all Christian people speak and write and act to-day. Such statements as the following are significant. Speaking of the agency of "Almighty power" in producing the Holy Scriptures, "Progressive Orthodoxy" (p. 194) says: —

> But surely in the absence of a clear revelation that such special divine power was employed, we have no right to assert its exercise. If without its use the Bible as it stands can be accounted for, it becomes unnecessary. . . . [Christian faith] says, therefore, that if the forces visible in sacred history appear to the best human vision to have produced the Bible, God must have wished man to believe that they did produce it.

Referring to the apostolic epistles, "Progressive Orthodoxy" says: —

> Whatever is peculiar in their composition, or extraordinary in their value, is to be found in the apostolic teaching generally. For there is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as soon as they sat down to write, and that, in consequence, what they wrote had a different quality from what they said.[3]

But "Progressive Orthodoxy" does not admit that the apostles had any divine aid in their oral teaching other than what they had in their daily living. It affirms that their noble deeds and their oral teaching alike flowed from their spiritual life, which spiritual life was not in the least different in kind from that of other Christians. It says: —

> The gift received by the infant church on Pentecost was not merely the bestowal of this and that capacity; it was that of living in a new and higher way. Out of its quickened and mightily invigorated life leaped its new deeds of heroic devotion. From this fresh and ever-renewed fountain flowed its teaching.[4]

But it is generally supposed that the supreme transaction on the day of Pentecost was the sudden and *special* descent of the

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 194. [2] Ibid. p. 203. [3] p. 196. [4] p. 200.

Holy Spirit of God, and that He had something special to do that day, not simply with the life of the disciples in general, but with the preaching of Peter in particular. Undoubtedly, the one hundred and twenty disciples were brought into "a new and higher way" of living, but if the eleven apostles received nothing more than a new and higher spiritual life — nothing more special — why did not all the one hundred and twenty disciples become apostles, preaching that day as Peter did, and bringing each of them three thousand souls into the kingdom, and afterwards writing, out of their own new and higher spiritual life, apostolic epistles which would live forever as "The Word of God"?

The Scriptures not Specially Inspired.

That "Progressive Orthodoxy" denies the fact of any special apostolic inspiration different from that enjoyed by all Christian teachers and writers is also made plain by the following statement: —

> We should not dwell upon what seems to us so obvious, but for the fact that the assumption of a special activity of the divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching, is a most fruitful source of confusion, in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is. It is insisted, not only that there is no evidence of such an act, but that the supposition of its existence is contrary to facts which lie on the face of the Scriptures.[1]

"Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that the daily outward life of the apostles, their preaching and their writing, all alike, come directly from their inner spiritual life. But their inner spiritual life did not keep them from wrong acts in their outward lives. Peter dissembled. Paul confessed that he had not attained to perfection. But if the inner spiritual life of the apostles did not keep them from moral error in their lives, how could it have kept them from religious error in their writings? To deny, as "Progressive Orthodoxy" does, that the sacred writers had any special divine aid in their writing is to deny that their writings themselves, the Holy Scriptures, have any special divine authority or trustworthiness.

We claim, therefore, that these "progressive" views of the

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 198.

origin of the Bible, accepted and defended by a professor in Andover Seminary, make it impossible for him to believe that the Scriptures are a "perfect rule of faith and practice." In taking the Creed he declares that they are a "perfect rule," but in accepting and defending "Progressive Orthodoxy" he declares that they are not a "perfect rule of faith and practice."

Moreover, this inner spiritual life of the sacred writers, which is said to have been the immediate source of the Holy Scriptures, must itself have come from, or have been a part of, those "forces visible in sacred history," which also are said to have produced the Bible. Yet those historical forces may be regarded as working simply according to the laws of necessary evolution. In that case the Bible would be only their natural and inevitable product. This would make the Bible, at the best, simply a survival of the fittest, in the production of which God has had no more to do than he has had in the production of the grass and the trees.

It is well known that the views of the origin of the Bible expressed in "Progressive Orthodoxy" have already led some of their zealous advocates to represent that the inspiration of David and Isaiah, of Paul and John was nothing different in kind from that of Shakespeare and Byron, Theodore Parker and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Yet "Progressive Orthodoxy" is not self-consistent. It sometimes makes statements and uses phrases which contradict the statements now quoted. This may indicate that the writer has still some lingerings in his mind of his old evangelical faith, and that the view of the dear old Book, as "The Word of God," taught him, perhaps, in his childhood home, will now and then, in spite of himself, get into verbal expression. But the views we have here presented are the real and prevailing views of "Progressive Orthodoxy"; and these accepted by any man will soon and inevitably drive out of his mind all opposing views and prevent inconsistent statements.

Now we submit, Gentlemen of the Board, that a theory of the origin and character of the Bible which sets it forth as a fallible book, and, so far as fallible, untrustworthy in its teachings and revelations; which disparages the Holy Scriptures by describing them as sustaining no essential or important relation to their contents; which discards the Bible's own representations of its origin and character; which makes the Bible simply the product

of visible forces working in sacred history; and which denies that the sacred writers wrote under any special moving influences of the Holy Spirit, or under any special inspiration of God, — we submit that such a theory of the origin and character of the Bible cannot be held, defended, and taught by a professor in Andover Seminary without undeniable and criminal disloyalty to its Creed and Statutes.

5. The attention of the Board is asked to only one more of the many other proofs of our first particular charge.

The Supreme Test of All Scriptures, "In Our Mind and Hearts."

"Progressive Orthodoxy," which the defendant accepts and defends as his own theology, teaches that all revelation, aside from Christ himself, coming to us as from God, must present its credentials to "*Christ's truth in our mind and hearts.*" That is, "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts," whatever that may mean, is the supreme test and standard by which all other pretended truth or revelation is to be tried and judged. Of course, then, the Holy Scriptures are not "the *only* perfect rule of faith and practice," for there is another and superior rule of faith and practice found "in our mind and hearts," before which all external truth and revelation must bow down and submit their credentials. This remarkable teaching, so utterly antagonistic to the doctrine of the Andover Creed, is set forth in the following extract: —

If Christ is the supreme and final revelation, He is the test of all preceding revelation. If we accept Him as God's supreme and final revelation, we must bring preceding revelations to this test. We cannot escape the process of comparison if we would. He brings us his own conception of God, of life, of duty. It claims to cover the whole horizon of truth, and demands possession of every spiritual and rational faculty. If we will have it as ours, we must hold it separate from and above every other. Whatever else comes to us as from God must present its credentials to Christ's truth in our mind and hearts. This is not only the teaching of Christian faith; it is the teaching of Christ. When He told us that certain precepts of the law were to be replaced by spiritual maxims more in harmony with the nature of God, He taught us to apply Christian principles to all the law and prophets, and to regard all in them which is not consistent with those principles as superseded by the new revelation. For no one thinks, surely, that when He made

exceptions to certain provisions of the Mosaic code, He merely amended a law which whenever not amended holds good.[1]

Our complaint against the writer of this passage is not that he recognizes "no objective divine revelation." He does recognize such a revelation. But our charge is that he makes that objective divine revelation *inferior* to that which he finds in his own mind and heart, and in the minds and hearts of others; and thus makes it impossible for him truthfully and honestly to take the Creed and say: "I believe, . . . that the Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the *only* perfect rule of faith and practice;" for at the same time, in "Progressive Orthodoxy," he is declaring his belief to be that the Word of God contained in the Scriptures must bow down before, and submit its credentials to, *another* and *superior* rule of faith and practice, which he finds in "Christ's truth in his own mind and heart." He even goes so far as to claim that by means of this supreme test and standard of truth which he has within him he himself can amend the law and the prophets (as he falsely affirms Christ did), and thus set up for himself and the world another rule of faith and practice which shall be superior to and supersede whatever he may judge erroneous in the Scriptures. Christ, he says, "taught *us*," that is, every living disciple, "to apply Christian principles to all the law and prophets, and to regard all in them which is not consistent with those principles as superseded by the new revelation." This would give every Christian, if not every man, full liberty to amend the Scriptures according to his own pleasure, all the time thinking he is piously following the example of Christ—just as if he had all power and authority to do everything Christ did; and just as if Christ ever amended, and, so far as He amended, destroyed a single ancient Scripture, when he himself said: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished." That surely does not look as if Christ had done very much at the business of amending or changing the ancient Scriptures as an example to us to do the same.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 231.

Christ in Every Man.

But what is "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts," and whence does it come? It cannot be the gospel as given by the four Evangelists, nor any other Scripture, for it is itself the test of all Scripture, and therefore superior to all Scripture. "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts" may mean "Christian consciousness"; for that is a marvelous power, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," and is superior to all Scripture as a rule of faith and practice, thus in itself furnishing us with positive proof that the defendant does not believe in the Bible as "the *only* perfect rule of faith and practice." But "Christ's truth" in us is a queer designation of Christian consciousness. More likely by "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts" is meant Christ himself, for in this same passage Christ is spoken of as "the supreme and final revelation," and "Christ's truth" in us is also described as the supreme and final revelation. Moreover, "Progressive Orthodoxy" elsewhere, speaking of the apostles, says: —

> Not that they alone possessed the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. He [Christ] is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in which He dwells.[1]

Note this statement: "Christ is the Spirit," not of wisdom only, but "of *revelation* in every soul in which He dwells." Thus every such soul, as truly as the apostles, has the Spirit and power of revelation, and the writings of the apostles are not "the *only* perfect rule of faith and practice." Moreover, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," Christ dwells in every man. "*Christ in every man*," the very person and being of Christ organically and vitally united to, and immanent in, every human being — this, as will be shown further on, is the germ and root, the primary, formative, all-pervading, all-controlling principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy." It is a pantheistic and pagan principle. It corrupts every Christian doctrine it touches, and it touches all the miscellaneous doctrines that have been included in "Progressive Orthodoxy." It touches its doctrine concerning Scripture at the point now before us. It practically says that the truth of Christ, who is immanent in every human soul, is the supreme and final revelation, before which every other revelation, including all the

[1] p. 209.

Scriptures, coming to us as from God, must bow down and submit its credentials. Such doubtless is the meaning of this notable passage in "Progressive Orthodoxy." But for our present purpose we are not obliged to show what the meaning of the phrase "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts" is. Whatever it signifies, it is something *in us* which as revelation is superior to the Holy Scriptures; and no man can believe in any such superior truth or revelation in himself, and at the same time believe that the Scriptures are the "only perfect rule of faith and practice."

It has now been proved, we submit, if anything can be proved, that our charge is true; namely, that the defendant "holds, maintains, and inculcates that the Bible is not the only perfect rule of faith and practice, but is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings."

But the proof of this allegation is proof also of our first general charge; namely, that the defendant "has taught doctrines . . . which are not in harmony with, but antagonistic to, the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary and the 'true intention' of its Founders as expressed in those Statutes."

It is proof also of our second general charge, namely, that the defendant, "contrary to the requirements of Articles XI and XII of the Constitution, as modified by Article I of the Additional Statutes, is not a man 'of sound and orthodox principles.'"

Finally, our proof of this first particular allegation is proof likewise of our third general charge; namely, that the defendant, in breach of the requirement of Article II of the Associate Foundation, upon which he is placed, is not an "orthodox and consistent Calvinist."

III.

SECOND PARTICULAR COMPLAINT.

Our second special complaint is that Professor Egbert C. Smyth holds, maintains, and inculcates, in opposition to the Creed and the Statutes of the Seminary, "*That Christ in the days of his humiliation was a finite being, limited in all his attributes, capacities, and attainments; in other words, was not* God and man."

In subscribing to the Creed of the Seminary, the defendant declares it to be his belief "that the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God, who for this purpose became man, and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." The defendant also declares, in taking the Creed, that in his belief "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and *unchangeable* in his being, wisdom, power; . . . that in the Godhead are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

The Question at Issue.

Now the question at issue is, Does the Creed allow the belief that when the eternal Son of God "became flesh" He ceased to be God, became ignorant, changeable, unwise, limited in all his attributes — so ignorant, indeed, that in some cases He did not know the nature of the diseases He healed? Does the Creed allow such a belief as this? Impossible; for it says definitely that the eternal Son of God "became man, and *continues* to be *God and man* in *two distinct natures* and one person forever." That is, from the moment of his becoming man, He "*continues* to be God *and man*" forever. He had a *human* nature with its limitations. At the same time He has a *divine* nature which is without limitations, for He is truly God as well as truly man. The Creed definitely states that He had "*two distinct natures.*" It does not permit the belief that it was his *human* nature that was *divine*, and that therefore He had only one nature, and that this one human nature was *divine* only in the sense in which all human nature is divine.

It declares that the eternal Son of God becoming incarnate continues to be, not simply a divine man, but *God and* man. This is known to have been the belief of the Founders. And it is a well-established legal as well as moral principle that a creed is to be honestly interpreted according to the known beliefs of its authors.

The Charge.

Now we charge that the defendant, who accepts and defends "Progressive Orthodoxy," holds that the eternal Son of God, in taking on our nature, did *cease to be God*, and became ignorant and mutable, became limited in all his powers and attributes; and then at his ascension and glorification became again God, immutable, omniscient, omnipresent, and infinite in all his attributes.

In proof of this charge, at the first trial of the defendant three passages were cited, two from "Progressive Orthodoxy," and one from The Andover Review. The two from "Progressive Orthodoxy" were cited to show that the defendant believes that God in becoming incarnate ceased to be God, and the third was quoted to show that he also believes that Christ, in his ascension and glorification, again became God, infinite, omnipresent, and unchangeable.

Reply of the Defendant.

The professor, in his first reply, misquoted the charge, representing it to be that the defendant holds, maintains, and inculcates "that Christ was not during his earthly life Lord and Man." The professor substitutes the phrase "Lord and Man," for the phrase used in the charge and in the Creed, "God and Man." He then replies to the charge, thus misstated by himself, in three sentences, saying first, —

> If this means that I hold that he was not two persons, I admit the allegation, and deny that I thus affirm anything contrary to the Creed and Statutes.

Of course he knew perfectly well that no such allegation had been made against him. But he must appear to say something in response to the serious charge to which he *was* called to answer. So he conjectured another charge, and dealt with that. The Creed itself distinctly affirms that the incarnate Christ was "one Person."

His second sentence in reply was: —

If it [the charge] means that I hold that He was not from his birth or Incarnation both Lord and Man, I deny the accusation.

Whether this repeated substitution of the word "Lord" for the word "God" was made designedly or by mistake, we do not know. In either case, however, the defendant would seem simply to deny the charge made against him, without rebutting or disposing of the evidence which sustains the charge.

His third sentence in reply was: —

I deny also that the "more definite specification" given yields anything which contradicts the language cited by the complainants from the Seminary Creed.

Not a word did he say in explanation or retraction of the statements found in the two citations from "Progressive Orthodoxy," which, we claim, furnish positive proof of the truth of our charge.

The professor in his second reply[1] — which was given in his public trial before the Visitors — dealt with this charge in a still more summary and evasive manner. He made not the least allusion to the two decisive quotations which we made from "Progressive Orthodoxy," but referring to our quotation from The Andover Review, which was presented to show that the defendant *does* believe that Christ after his ascension and glorification was *God*, the professor simply remarks that "the complainants . . . overlook the statement on page 524," which affirms that "Jesus Christ the Saviour" "was TRUE GOD AND TRUE MAN." But the decisive question is, *When* was He true God and true man? Not the least hint is given in the quotation suggested by the professor that our Lord and Saviour was truly *God* while in the flesh. The theory of "Progressive Orthodoxy" appears to be that the man Jesus, at his glorification, expanded into, or in some way became, *God*, and the theory may include the notion that he took his humanity with him, and so became God and man. But all this has nothing to do with our complaint. It is difficult to see how the defendant could have dealt more evasively with this most serious charge, or have made a more complete failure to vindicate himself against it.

Evidence in Support of the Complaint.

We now present again the two citations from "Progressive Orthodoxy" which contain the proof of our charge, and which

[1] The Andover Defence, p. 114.

the defendant neglected to explain or justify or retract. The first is as follows: —

> And even if one is convinced that our Lord accepted the traditional view of the authorship of the books in question [the Pentateuch], he cannot hold that His authority is committed to that view until he has satisfied himself that Christ claimed to be omniscient during the days of his humiliation — a belief irreconcilable with his own declaration that He knew neither the day nor the hour of his second coming.[1]

This is an indirect yet convincing statement on the part of the writer that he does not believe that Christ was omniscient in the days of his humiliation. But if He was not omniscient, He was not God.

The second citation was this: —

> There was not only growth of the humanity of Jesus, but a progressive union with the divine. Here is the truth in the theories of the Kenotists, who maintain that the Word, at the Incarnation, laid aside, or suspended the exercise of, his attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and the like. This is but a clumsy and somewhat violent and unethical method of appropriating certain undeniable facts; such as the limitation of Jesus' knowledge, the perfect human reality of his earthly life, the veritable growth of his consciousness and personality from the moment of the Incarnation.[2]

Among the facts which the defendant says are undeniable is "the limitation of Jesus' knowledge." But we repeat, if Christ, the eternal Son of God, in the days of his humiliation was ignorant, He was not God. If He was not omniscient, He was not all-wise; if not all-wise, He was not almighty, nor did He possess any other infinite attribute.

The third citation was designed to prove that, in the defendant's belief, this man, called Jesus, in his glorification became *true God*, even if He still continued to be *true man*. The citation is as follows: —

> The limitations to which his humanity subjected him are recognized: but as the glorified Christ, He is delocalized, unlimited, is with his church alway unto the end of the world.[3]

The absolute absurdity of representing that the finite can become infinite does not appear to have occurred to the progressive divines. But according to the citations now presented the teach-

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 227. [2] Ibid. p. 32. [3] Andover Review, May, 1886, p. 522.

ings of "Progressive Orthodoxy" upon the momentous question of the deity of our Lord during the days of his humiliation, when He made the atonement, and when He was giving to the world "the everlasting gospel," are evidently such that no man who accepts them can truthfully and honestly subscribe to that statement of the Creed which affirms that "the eternal Son of God" "became man, and *continues to be God and man,* in *two distinct natures and one person forever.*" Nor can any man who accepts such views truthfully aud honestly subscribe to the Creed-declaration that "God is a Spirit infinite, eternal, and *unchangeable* in his being, wisdom, power." For if He who is declared in the Creed to be "the eternal Son of God," "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost, became, in the days of his Incarnation, ignorant, uuwise, and limited in all his powers and attributes, and so ceased to be God, then God is a *changeable* God. His very being is in a state of flux and reflux. He may be one kind of being to-day and another kind to-morrow, infinite in all his attributes one time, finite in all his attributes at another time. True, change in an infinite Being is impossible, and nothing can exceed the absurdity of such a conception; yet this *is* the conception and teaching of "Progressive Orthodoxy." The progressive professors, in subscribing to the Creed, declare their belief to be that God is "unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power." But in their "Progressive Orthodoxy" they declare their belief to be that God is *not* unchangeable in his being, wisdom, and power; that in the Incarnation of the eternal Son, who was "the same in substance, and equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost, He became finite in his being, and limited in all his power and attributes; that is, He who *was* God *ceased to be God.*

Editorials on the Divinity of Christ.[1]

Since the last hearings upon the Andover Case before the Board of Visitors, held September 1 and 6, 1892, a series of editorial articles upon "The Divinity of Christ," in The Andover Review, has been continued. These articles furnish abundant confirmation of our charge that the editorial professors do not believe in the

[1] Since this argument was prepared, these editorials have been published in a book entitled "The Divinity of Jesus Christ."

deity of our Incarnate Lord and Saviour, and that in this particular they antagonize the Creed which they have accepted and promised to maintain.

The Incarnate Son of God Unconscious of His Deity.

First, they teach in these recent and remarkable discussions that our Lord, while on the earth, had no consciousness of his own Deity. They quote approvingly from a recent writer these words: —

> If in any one thing the man Christ Jesus knew *as God*, knew *because* He was God, knew after the . . . mode of the divine and not human knowledge — in that thing his humanity was violated, ceased to be humanity, and became or was changed into divinity. A human mind can only know in accordance with the laws and conditions of the human mind and of human knowledge. When it knows outside of these, it is not a human mind.

Upon this quotation the professors remark: —

> This is as true when the thing known is the knowing mind itself as when it is a person or fact outside of it. Hence, Jesus Christ's being the person whom the Apostles believed Him to be does not imply that his self-consciousness formerly comprehended an infinite nature, however really it reached into and vitally reflected the Divine Life, but the contrary. For the self-consciousness which comprehends the infinite is the activity of a divine, not of a human mind.[1]

This language of the professors, and of the writer whose sentiments they approvingly quote, clearly denies the Deity of our Incarnate Lord. They declare that Christ, being a man, could not be conscious that He was God without a violation of his humanity, without ceasing to be human, and becoming God. Of course, then, in the belief of the professors, Christ while in the flesh was not God. For, in their view, He was not conscious of being God. A God unconscious of his Deity is an absurdity. The Creed, however, which the professors have subscribed to, and solemnly promised to inculcate, declares that the eternal Son of God "became man, and *continues* to be *God* and man," that is, continues to be God, and of course is conscious of being God; and continues to be man, and of course is conscious of being man.

[1] Andover Review, July, 1892, p. 82.

If the professors declare that this statement of the Creed is absurd, and that they cannot believe it, then why do they subscribe to the Creed and declare that they *do* believe it? Why not be honest men and resign their professorships?

Christ did Not have Two Natures.

Secondly, the professors in the language quoted above, and repeatedly elsewhere, deny that our Incarnate Lord had "*two distinct natures.*" They teach that Christ being a man was not God, and could not have been conscious of being God. Then surely He did not have the *nature* of God, and could not have been conscious of having such a nature. The belief of the professors obviously is that Christ had a veritable human nature, but no divine nature *distinct* from his human nature. Yet the Andover Creed, which these same professors have accepted and promised to maintain and teach, affirms "that the eternal Son of God" "became man, and *continues* to be *God and man in two distinct natures* and one person forever."

Human Nature in Christ and in All Men Divine.

Yet, thirdly, the professors speak boldly of the "divine nature of Christ," of his "divinity," his "divineness," and of his "divine-human personality." But these are words of duplex and indefinite meaning, and can be used illusively. What is their import as used by the Andover progressives? It is not their custom to give definitions, and these terms, so far as we know, they have never defined. They may, therefore, use them designedly or undesignedly in such a vague and evasive sense as to make the impression on some minds that they themselves believe in the true divinity, the absolute Deity of the Incarnate Christ, when in fact they believe in nothing of the kind. Sometimes, perhaps, the professors do use this terminology as expressing the idea of absolute Deity; but more usually they appear to use it as signifying nothing more than that God was in Christ as He is in all nature and in all men, only in a larger degree. According to their conception there were not "*two distinct natures*" in Christ, one being God, or infinite, and the other being man, or finite. Christ had only one nature, which was a human nature. But his human nature was divine. His divinity

was "the divinity of humanity." God, they intimate, could "so unite himself to a human soul as to make it divine."[1]

But note, "it was a *human* soul" in Christ that was *made* divine. It was, then, only a *created* divineness that Christ had. He had a divine nature, but his divine nature was only his created *human* nature. He was conscious, therefore, of his divineness, but not of being God. While He had no divine nature distinct from his human nature (as the Andover Creed affirms He had), yet He "had divineness in a human nature."[2]

Unitarianism.

Throughout these articles on "The Divinity of Christ," the words "divine" and "divinity" are used in the same sense in which the Unitarians were wont to use them. They claimed to believe in "the divinity of Christ." They even held, as has been stated by high authority, "that he was *very* divine." It is most painful to notice in articles written by Andover professors the same evasion and ambidextrousness in the use of words which have so often been practised by the bitterest enemies of evangelical Christianity. Can this practice be introduced into Andover Seminary without shameful disloyalty to the sacred faith and purposes of the Founders? Andover Seminary was founded for the express purpose of opposing the Unitarian view of the divinity of Christ.

Naturalism.

Fourthly, the Andover progressives in these editorial articles represent Christ as belonging to an ascending order of revelations, and as completing that order. They say: —

"Nature is a revelation of God." "Humanity is a revelation of God." "Is humanity, as it is and has been, the culmination?" "If nature reveals God, affording conditions favorable to the expressions of his greatness and wisdom, so far forth there is a kinship between God and nature. It is not separate from Him, nor exclusive of Him, but is open at every point, in every atom, to his indwelling. . . . With humanity He is more closely akin. . . . Such kinship between man and God constitutes human nature the most fitting organ for the embodiment, the incarnation, of the divine grace and love which are necessary to make men the children of God. . . . And if God lives in nature so that He can be known there, if He reveals himself in and to

[1] Andover Review, July, 1892, pp. 82, 89. [2] Ibid. July, 1892, p. 89.

the reason and conscience of man, much more, it is easy to believe, could He reveal himself through, or unite himself to, or live in, that person who is confessed to be the best, the holiest, the most akin to God of all the men who have ever lived. The belief concerning Jesus is not that God in all his absoluteness, omniscience, and omnipotence took on the form of a man and walked about among men in Galilee, so that Jesus knew all occurrences on earth and through the universe, and was conscious that he created the stars, and knew more than not only the ancients, but more than the moderns, of science and philosophy; but it is the belief that God was in Christ, so far as God can manifest his life in a human personality at a given period in history, and for the purpose of bringing in his grace and love for the renewal and perfection of men."[1]

The Divine Immanence.

In the last of the above quotations the professorial editors declare dogmatically "the belief concerning Jesus"—what it is not and what it is. But whose belief is it? Surely not that of the Founders of Andover Seminary as formulated in their Creed, which the professors themselves are under the most sacred obligations to maintain and inculcate. For that Creed declares explicitly that "the eternal Son of God," who is "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and Holy Ghost, "became man, and *continues to be God* and man in *two distinct natures* and one person forever." *This* belief no sane man will say is "the belief concerning Jesus," dogmatically affirmed by the professors in the above extracts. Nor is their "belief" concerning Jesus, as they now formulate it, found in any evangelical Creed that was ever written. Nor can it be discovered in the Scriptures. It has been generally supposed by Christian people that our knowledge concerning Christ must come from the Word of God. But these professors, in determining "the belief concerning Jesus," have nothing to do with the Word of God. In all their recently published discussions upon "The Divinity of Christ," they have made only a few remote and vague allusions to scriptural statements upon the subject. Their Christ is one of their own creation. "The belief concerning Jesus," which they set forth is born of their own fancy, and they offer not a single particle of evidence in support of its truth. Their statements are presented as so many oracles.

[1] Andover Review, October, 1892, pp. 392, 393, 396–398.

"*It is the belief*," they tell us, "that God was in Christ *so far* as God can manifest his life in a *human personality* at a *given period in history*." (The italics are ours.) There is no mistaking the theory that lies back of this oracular statement. The professors are not the only men who are reading works upon evolution and studying the old pagan Pantheism of Greece and India; but it is to be hoped that they are the only men who place the authority of such sources of knowledge respecting God and his eternal Son above that of God's Holy Word.

The theory that lies back of the professor's speculative "belief concerning Jesus" is that of "the divine immanence" so called, as distinguished from the divine omnipresence; the latter meaning not only that God is everywhere present in his universe, but also that He is *other* than any of the beings, worlds, and things which He has created; the former meaning that God is organically and vitally united to all the beings, worlds, and things which make up what is called the universe, so that the universe as a whole and all the individual beings and things in it partake of the divine essence or are constituent parts of God's Person. That God is omnipresent in his created universe and beyond it is a biblical revelation. The unbiblical speculation of the progressive professors is that, while the *incarnate* Christ was not God, and did not differ essentially from any other man, yet in his *glorified* state He is God, and as such is organically and vitally united to all beings and substances in his universe. They say: —

his universe is not attached to him externally but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere.[1]

Every being and thing, then, all worlds and substances, heaven and hell and all that are in them, not only have Christ present in them, but also are *vitally* united to Him and consequently cannot exist apart from Him. They are all "*in Christ*" and Christ is "*in them*" by a *vital* union the destruction of which would be the destruction of the universe. The entire universe, therefore, and all beings and things in it, existing as they do only through their vital relation to Him, are akin to Him and so are as truly divine as He is. Indeed, as they all hold Christ in themselves up to the full measure of their capacity, and hold Him too as an

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 44.

essential part of their very being, yea, as their very life, *so far* as they *do* thus hold Him they themselves *are Christ.*

Christ and All Other Men Capacious of Deity.

Such is one of the beliefs of the progressive divines respecting Christ. Turn now to another presentation of this same belief respecting Christ — a presentation made in pure dogmatism, without the quotation of a single Scripture, or the setting forth of the least particle of any kind of evidence in proof of its truth. Speaking of Christ's humanity and comparing that with all other humanity, they say: —

> For this humanity was fashioned to be the perfect organ and instrument of revelation, to be freely swayed and controlled in all its movements by the will of God, to be more and more filled with his gifts as its powers expanded from infancy to maturity, to receive the Spirit without measure, to be transfigured by the indwelling Deity, to be glorified in God. All its experiences, whether active or passive, were those of a *nature created capacious of Deity. This is true also of other men according to their measure. Indeed, it is the highest note and attribute of humanity at large.*[1] [The italics are ours.]

Certain things in this citation should be carefully considered, and a comparison of this citation with those which immediately precede it is suggestive of certain vital questions.

Christ had Only a Created Nature.

(*a*) We are informed that all the experiences of Christ's humanity, "whether active or passive, were those of a nature *created* capacious of Deity." Christ's nature, then, was a *created* nature. But according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," as has already been shown, he had only one nature and that was his human nature. The statement of the Creed, that "the eternal Son of God," from the moment of his Incarnation "continues to be *God* and man in *two distinct natures*," is again denied *in toto* by the very men who have promised to "maintain and inculcate" that statement. Christ, then, in his earthly life had no divine nature distinct from his created human nature. He was a man, but he was not "*God* and man." Then he was simply a *creature.* He was only a man, created as all other men are. He was nothing

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 21.

more and nothing less than a man. All Unitarians would be satisfied with this view of Christ. True, these progressive divines speak of the "divine nature" of Christ, and use other phraseology which implies that our Lord was something more than a man. Yet their theory and their dominating representation, we submit, is that Christ, however unique, great, and good he may have been, had only a human nature and therefore was only a man. But this is Unitarianism; and Andover Seminary was founded and endowed with the expressed intention of opposing Unitarianism. Moreover the defendant and all his progressive compeers have given their pledge over their own names that, as honorable Christian men, they will faithfully carry out this prime intention of the Founders.

Christ had No Experience that was Not Human.

(*b*) We are also informed that "*all* the experiences" of Christ's humanity were those of a created human nature. None of his experiences, therefore, were those of an uncreated divine nature. Yet, according to the Creed, He *once* had a divine nature absolutely distinct from, and unconnected with, a human nature. Before his Incarnation He was "the eternal Son of God," "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with "the Father and the Holy Ghost." But if *He* became man, and *only* man, with no "*distinct*" divine nature, what became of "the eternal Son of God"? Did He die? Was He blotted out of existence! If not, where was He? He had become the man Christ Jesus, but in that man he was not "the eternal Son of God" conscious of his Deity. What, then, and where was He? What answer can be given to these questions? The simple truth is that the assertion of the progressive professors, that Christ in his earthly life had no *divine* uncreated nature distinct from his created *human* nature, is a positive denial that there was any Incarnation whatever of the absolute, eternal Son of God in the man Christ Jesus.

Christ Divine, but Not God.

(*c*) We are likewise instructed to believe that Christ's human nature was "created capacious of Deity." And it is frankly and significantly added that "This is true also of other men accord-

ing to their measure. Indeed, it is the highest note and attribute of humanity at large." That is, the Incarnate Christ had no distinctively divine nature, but his human nature was divine in the sense that it was a receptacle of Deity; yet in this respect he did not differ in the least from other men. All men are receptacles of Deity and therefore have a nature as truly divine as was that of Christ. Christ may have been more "capacious of Deity" than most men, estimating his capaciousness by dry measure; but all men are "capacious of Deity," each "according to his own measure."

This whole conception of God in his relation to the man Christ Jesus, and to all other men, is intensely materialistic and mechanical. God is not thought of as a Person, a Spirit, infinite, omnipresent, immutable, and indivisible, but as a certain substance called Deity, which exists in quantity and can be divided and measured off, and poured into the man called Jesus, and into every other man, according to the measurement of their capaciousness carefully estimated in figures. The process of filling up all these capacious human receptacles is evidently by emanation or efflux from God considered as the great orb or reservoir of Deity. Nor is Deity poured into *men* only. All other beings and creatures, all worlds and things are capacious of Deity, and they all receive their apportionments of Deity, each according to its measure. All nature is alive with Deity, the Deity being not a person but life. In a citation above made from The Andover Review, for October, 1892, we are told that

> there is kinship between God and nature. It is not separate from Him, nor exclusive of Him, but is open at every point, in every atom, to his indwelling. . . . With humanity He is more closely akin. . . . And if God lives in nature so that He can be known there, if He reveals himself in and to the reason and conscience of man, much more, it is easy to believe, could He reveal himself through, or unite himself to, or live in, that person who is confessed to be the best, the holiest, the most akin to God of all men who have ever lived.

That is, as God is *vitally united* to, and *lives in*, the grass and the trees and the beasts, and is akin to them, so, only more closely, He was united to and dwelt in the man Christ Jesus. Such, and only such, was the Incarnation! God was united to, and dwelt in, the man of Nazareth in precisely the same way in which He is

united to and is dwelling to-day in every man and in all nature! Then every man living to-day is an incarnation of God as truly as Christ was, and after the same manner. And the *manner* of God's dwelling in our Lord and Redeemer in his earthly life was not at all different from the manner in which He is now dwelling in all the beasts of the field and in all nature. He is "more closely" united to man than to the beast. That is all the difference. He was "more closely" united to the man Christ Jesus than to any other man. That was all. The union *in kind* is everywhere the same. Christ was a greater man, more capacious of Deity, and a better man than any other man; but all this would make him simply a *unique* man, and no amount of such *uniqueness* could make him anything more than a man. In fact, our adorable Lord and Saviour, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," in his earthly life was only a fine product of the law of natural selection, a survival of the fittest; and there have been in history multitudes of such human products and survivals, all fine and fit according to the measure of their capaciousness of Deity. Indeed, in this view, every man is as truly a God-man as was the Lord Jesus himself. If men in general are not God-men, then Christ was not a God-man, for in his earthly life Christ's relation to God was *in kind* precisely that of every other man. If Christ was not "a mere man," then no man is "a mere man." If men in general are mere men, then Christ was "a mere man." If, indeed, it be true that Christ's relation to God was not different *in kind* from that of every other man, then there was in him no incarnation of the eternal Son of God, unless every man is an incarnation of God's eternal Son.

If it should be said by the defence in reply that the historic Christ was the highest and grandest of all created beings, and therefore was something more than "a mere man," though not the absolute God, then the defendant would announce himself an Arian. But Arianism is one of the errors which the professor has solemnly promised to oppose. But he nowhere claims to be an Arian. He does, however, most emphatically deny the belief — he even attempts to ridicule the belief — that Christ in his earthly life was God. "The belief concerning Jesus," he affirms, "is not that God in all his absoluteness, omniscience, and omnipotence took on the form of a man and walked about among men in

Galilee, so that Jesus knew all occurrences on earth and through the universe, and was conscious that he created the stars." What, then, is "the belief concerning Jesus"? It is this: "that God was in Christ, *so far* as God *can* manifest his life in *a human personality* at a *given period in history.*" (Italics ours.) Surely, then, the Incarnate Son of God was nothing but "a human personality at a given period in history," having in itself as much of God's life as it had capacity to hold and manifest. But the defendant declares in "Progressive Orthodoxy," p. 21, that "This is true also of other men according to their measure." Christ had in him more of God's life than other men have, not because he was other than a man, but *only* because he was more "capacious of Deity." But this capaciousness was a part of his manhood, and, as we have already said, made him nothing but a mere man. The life of God in him was also a part of his manhood, and no more made him God than it makes any other man God, or makes a living tree God. According to this shockingly materialistic theory, we repeat, God is to be regarded as existing in quantity and as capable of being weighed and measured, divided and distributed. If the average man holds, say one measure of Deity, Christ holds, perhaps, ten measures of Deity. But neither the average man nor the Lord Jesus in his earthly life is capable of containing more than the smallest fraction of God. Our incarnate Lord and every other man have in themselves, as identical with their very life and being, measurable parts of the very life and being of God each according to the measure of his own capaciousness. We cannot help asking; when we have set aside the very *life* and *being* of a man, what is there left to be capacious of anything? Nevertheless, such is the theory of these progressive divines. The man Christ Jesus, like every other man, contains, as the life and the very essence of his being, a certain small fraction of the life and very essence of God's being; yet he is infinitely removed from beiug God. The teachers of "Progressive Orthodoxy" declare that Christ, when he "walked among men iu Galilee," was not "*God* and man," as the Creed affirms he was. He was not "the absolute God," "very God," truly God. "He was not conscious that he created the stars." If he ever did create them, he had forgotten all about it. Still he had in him as much of God as "a human personality" could have

had "*at that period in history.*" If he had been born in some other period, in our own, for instance, and had come under all its light and culture, and specially if he had been developed under the advanced thought of "Progressive Orthodoxy" and under the personal training of the progressive professors at Andover, he would doubtless have been far more capacious of Deity. But, in fact, he had in him only *so much* as was possible to him in his own little country and in his own benighted period in history. Such was the divinity of our Lord and Saviour according to "Progressive Orthodoxy." This whole conception of the being of God, and of the constitution of the Person of his eternal Son, in our view comes perilously near to blasphemy. When this "belief," as it is called, is fully understood we are much mistaken if it is not found to be simply shocking to every reverent Christian mind. But such *is* "*the belief*" of the Andover progressives respecting God and his Son Jesus Christ, and we cannot avoid the conviction that it sets forth the eternal Son of God in his Incarnate life as nothing but "*a mere man*," weak, ignorant, fallible, and utterly incompetent to be the Saviour of the world.

A Possible Reply of the Defendant.

If now in reply to all this, the defendant should say: "We use figurative language, and you have no right to interpret such language literally; we use the familiar phrase *capax Dei*, simply as a figure of speech, meaning by it that man has the capacity or *power* to receive God, and especially God in Christ, and to become united to Him, *through faith*, *repentance*, *love*, *sympathy*,"—if the defendant makes this reply, our answer is that these progressives have nowhere said that such is their meaning. But they have repeatedly represented that such is not their meaning. They have denied over and over that man of himself has any such personal power. Their teaching is that all men are "*in Christ*"; and that Christ is *in all men*, filling them with Deity, according to the measure of their capaciousness, *not* through their faith and love, but antecedent to faith, repentance, love, and obedience; that all men are united to Christ, not by any external attachment, as one separate being may become attached to another by sympathy, trust, and love, but by an internal and *vital* union; as in a human person his body from

the first moment of his existence is vitally united to his head, not in any figure of speech, but in reality. This asserted union of every man with Christ is a *vital*, *living* union, an actual identification of all human beings with the Lord Jesus, they constituting the body of which He is the Head.

It is not "Progressive Orthodoxy," but Consistent Calvinism, which teaches that only those who *believe on* Christ receive Him and become united to Him. This union, moreover, is not a union in essence of being, but in love, — a union of heart with heart, — a union which is attained only through personal repentance, faith, and the new birth, and which alone secures in man spiritual kinship to Christ and likeness to Him in character, purpose, and life. This is the closest, dearest, and most blessed bond by which a redeemed sinner can ever be united to his Redeemer. To describe this ineffably tender and holy relation of penitent and trustful sinners to their Lord and Saviour, Consistent Calvinism, as well as Christ and the apostles, uses all manner of apt illustrations. But no imagery, or any other human language, is equal to the task of adequately portraying this beatific and glorious union.

All Men in Vital Union with Christ. — Pantheism.

But this exalted, personal relation of believing sinners to the Lord Jesus is not the union which "Progressive Orthodoxy" glorifies. These progressives believe in a race-union with Christ. "The race," they say, "is reconstituted in Christ." This is not the doctrine of the reconstitution of individual sinners through their personal repentance and faith, under the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit of God, but the doctrine of the divine immanence reconstituting every human soul. "Progressive Orthodoxy" makes no account of union with Christ through faith. Its pervasive and all-controlling idea is that of the indwelling of Christ, not in believers only, but in all men, irrespective of any consent or act of their own, and irrespective of their moral character. Moreover this unscriptural and immoral idea of the indwelling of Christ in all men before they have any personal experience of the new birth, or of saving faith and repentance, is confessedly only "an integral part" of the larger conception of the indwelling of God as the one and only *life* of the universe.

This larger conception is not that God is the Creator of universal life, but that He *is* that life.[1]

It must never be forgotten that the root idea of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is Pantheism. But Pantheism does not need to be set forth in figures of speech. It is itself such a literal, organic, and vital union of the entire universe with God that each is identically the other. Not in figure of speech, but in reality, all existences are in God; and God is in them, not by his omnipresence, not as *other* than they, but as identically one with them. This, we venture to affirm, will be found to be the germinal and increasingly regnant principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy." It is an old pagan notion. It was accepted as very truth by heathen in ancient Greece and India, and thence was exported to other lands; but it has been long dead and buried in most Christian communities. The Andover progressives, however, have rediscovered and exhumed the mouldering body of this dead speculation. They have breathed into it a little spasmodic life and have baptized it with a new name. With great shoutings and blare of brazen trumpets they are now offering their discovery to the astonished world as a sample of their own new and advanced beliefs. They are fascinated with their prize very much — to change the figure — as little children might be with the flashing eye and glassy head of a deadly serpent, long torpid but just now come to life, but of whose real nature they know nothing. The deadly nature, however, of this old pagan Pantheism, once more waked to life, will not, we venture to predict, be long concealed.

(*d*) We now raise the question, What is the evangelical doctrine respecting the constitution of Christ's Person which is required by the Statutes to be taught in Andover Seminary?

The Associate Founders of the Seminary were Hopkinsians, but they called themselves, and preferred to be called, Consistent Calvinists. They accepted the doctrines of Christianity as defined and preached by Dr. Samuel Hopkins, Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger, Dr. Joseph Bellamy, and other followers of the famous Jonathan Edwards the elder. Their theology was definite, positive, and thoroughly evangelistic. Consistent Calvinism has been called "the New England Theology," and, among

[1] See Prog. Orth. pp. 43, 44; also, Andover Review, April, 1890, p. 439.

Presbyterians more especially, "the New School Theology." These names are modern, but the theology itself is substantially that which in all the Christian ages has been, under God, the inspiration of about everything that has been done for the evangelization of communities, nations, and the world. The Consistent Calvinists, who took the leading part in founding Andover Seminary under its present Statutes, intended at first to found a Theological Institution at Newbury, Massachusetts. The funds were pledged and a Creed was prepared for that proposed institution. The Creed was written by Dr. Samuel Spring in consultation with Dr. Leonard Woods, Dr. Nathanael Emmons, and other Consistent Calvinists. That Creed unchanged became, and is now, the Creed of Andover Seminary. The Seminary Creed, therefore, is not "a compromise creed." Dr. Leonard Woods, one of the authors of this famous symbol of faith, and for so many years Professor of Systematic Theology in the Seminary, and who knew whereof he affirmed, informs us in his "History of Andover Seminary" that the identical Creed which was written by Consistent Calvinists for their proposed theological institution at Newbury was accepted by the Founders and became the unalterable Creed of Andover Seminary.[1]

Thus the theology which this Seminary was founded to teach is *Consistent Calvinism.* Indeed, the Associate Statutes require, in the most positive terms, that every professor on the Associate Foundation shall be "an Orthodox and Consistent Calvinist" — a designation at first and now of most definite and well-known import.

The Evangelical Doctrine of the Constitution of Christ's Person.

What now is that doctrine respecting the constitution of Christ's Person which was and is held by all Consistent Calvinists and which is required by the Andover Creed and Statutes to be taught in the Andover Seminary? Dr. Nathanael Emmons, himself a Consistent Calvinist, and who assisted his brother-in-law, Dr. Spring, in writing the Andover Creed, has stated the doctrine of the two natures in the one Person of Christ, as it is held by all Consistent Calvinists, in language as remarkable for its scholarly

[1] See Wood's History of the Andover Seminary, pp. 99, 100.

precision and clearness as the language of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is for its unscholarly vagueness and equivocalness. In answer to the question, "What is meant by Christ's human nature being personally united with his divine nature?" he says: —

It does not mean that his human nature was made divine nature. Omnipotence could not transform his humanity into divinity, because that would be the same as to produce divinity, or create a Creator. But supposing his human nature could have been made divine nature; yet that would have prevented his being God and man in two natures and but one person, which is what he professed to be.

Nor, on the other hand, does his human nature's being personally united with his divine nature mean, that his divine nature was made human nature. For there was the same impossibility of degrading his divinity into humanity, as of exalting his humanity into divinity. And could this have been done, it would have equally prevented his being what he professed to be, God and man in one person.

Nor does his human nature's being personally united with his divine nature, mean that his two natures were mixed or blended together. For it evidently appears, from Scripture, that he personally possessed every divine perfection and every human quality, except sin. He discovered, in the course of his life, human ignorance and divine knowledge; human wants and divine fulness; human weakness and divine power; human dependence and divine independence.

But, if the personal union of the two natures in Christ does not mean, that his humanity became divinity nor his divinity became humanity, nor that these were mixed or blended together, then the question still recurs, what is meant by Christ's being one person in two natures? I answer, the man Jesus, who had a true body and a reasonable soul, was united with the second person in the Trinity, in such a manner as laid a foundation for him to say with propriety that he was man, that he was God, and that he was both God and man; and as laid a foundation also to ascribe what he did as God and suffered as man, to one and the self-same person. If any should here ask, how could his two natures be thus personally united? We can only say, it is a mystery. And there is no avoiding a mystery with respect to Christ. His conception was a mystery. And if we admit the mystery of his conception, why should we hesitate to admit the mystery of the personal union between his two natures? If we only admit this, all Christ said concerning himself is easy and intelligible.[1]

Upon the preceding page Dr. Emmons says: —

There remains no other ground, therefore, upon which he [Christ] could assert his divinity, but that of his being *God and man, in two dis-*

[1] Works of Nathanael Emmons, D.D., Boston, 1842, vol. iv, p. 591.

tinct natures and one person. [Italics ours.] A personal union between his divine and human natures would properly constitute him a divine person. And it appears from his own expressions that he did assert his divinity upon this ground. He says, 'No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.' Here he represents his one individual person as being both in heaven and on earth, at one and the same time. And upon the supposition of his human and divine natures being personally united, he might properly say this; but upon no other supposition.

A Legal Interpretation of the Creed-statement.

These statements of Dr. Emmons must be accepted as an authoritative interpretation of the language of the Andover Creed, where it says that "the eternal Son of God" "became man, and continues to be *God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever.*" The very phrase of the Creed, "*in two distinct natures and one person,*" is found in the second of the above citations from Dr. Emmons. This is significant. Dr. Emmons assisted in the writing of the Creed. He stands in history as one of the greatest of New England's great theologians. He was one of the class who called themselves Consistent Calvinists. He knew what that Consistent Calvinism is which Andover Seminary was founded to maintain and inculcate. The above citations, therefore, constitute a trustworthy and legal interpretation of the language of the Andover Creed respecting the two natures in the one Person of Christ. And we affirm, without fear of contradiction, that these declarations of Dr. Emmons, and the affirmations of the defendant already cited from The Andover Review and "Progressive Orthodoxy," upon the great doctrine of the Deity of our Lord in his earthly life, are in absolute and irreconcilable antagonism.

The Defendant in Conflict with the Creed.

Dr. Emmons and the Andover Creed declare that Christ in his earthly life was possessed of infinite attributes. The defendant affirms that our Lord was not then possessed of infinite attributes. Dr. Emmons and the Andover Creed declare that Christ in his earthly life was "God and man" — absolute God and real man. The defendant declares that our Lord was not absolute God — that is, was not "God and man" in the sense given to these

words by Consistent Calvinism. Dr. Emmons and the Andover Creed affirm that our Lord when in the flesh had "two distinct natures," a divine nature and a human nature. But the defendant, in The Andover Review and in "Progressive Orthodoxy," as already shown, denies that our Lord while in the flesh had "two distinct natures," but teaches that he had only one nature, and that a human nature, which human nature is divine only in the sense in which every man's human nature is divine. Consistent Calvinism, according to Dr. Emmons, denies that Christ's "human nature was *made* divine nature." But "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that Christ's human nature *was made* divine nature, in the same sense in which all human nature is made divine, and in no other sense. Consistent Calvinism, as represented by Dr. Emmons, denies that Christ's "divine nature was *made* human nature." But "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that Christ had no divine nature distinct from his human nature; that he had divineness, but all the divineness he had was in his human nature; and that all men have a like divineness, the amount of which in Christ and in all men is determined by the measure of the capacity of each individual to receive Deity. Consistent Calvinism, according to Dr. Emmons, affirms that the two natures in the one Person of Christ were not "mixed or blended together. For it evidently appears from Scripture that he personally possessed every divine perfection, and every human quality except sin." But "Progressive Orthodoxy," while it denies the existence of "two distinct natures" in Christ, yet sometimes appears to teach that divinity and humanity were "mixed or blended together" in Christ, and also in every other man. Consistent Calvinism, as expounded by Dr. Emmons, states the Scriptural doctrine of the union of the two natures in the one person of Christ in this language: —

> The man Jesus . . . was united with the second person in the Trinity in such a manner as laid a foundation for him to say with propriety that he was man, that he was God, and that he was God and man; and as laid a foundation also to ascribe what he did as God and suffered as man, to one and the self-same person.

Dr. Emmons, speaking as a Consistent Calvinist, does not pretend to understand and explain the *manner* of this union of "God and man" in the one Person of Christ. He simply says,

"It is a mystery." But the defendant represents that in the one person of Christ, in his earthly life, there was no such mystery as the union of a human nature with the divine nature of the eternal Son of God, who was "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost. But "it is the belief," he dogmatically affirms, "that God was in Christ *so far* as God can manifest his life in a human personality at a given period in history."[1] The defendant also declares that "*all* the experiences, whether active or passive" of Christ's humanity "were those of a nature created capacious of Deity." And he adds, "This is true also of *other men* according to their measure."[2] (Italics ours.) Thus in the view of the defendant, there is evidently no more mystery in the union of the divine and the human in the one Person of Christ than there is in the union of the divine and the human in any other man. The only mystery in either case is that of the organic and vital union of God with all men and creatures and things in the universe — the mystery of Pantheism.

But what we wish to press upon the attention of the Board of Visitors is the undeniable and irreconcilable conflict between Consistent Calvinism and "Progressive Orthodoxy" upon the great and decisive question of the Deity of our Lord in his earthly life. We claim to have demonstrated that the defendant, in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and in his other writings, does not teach, upon this vital question, the doctrine of the Creed and of Consistent Calvinism, which he has promised to teach, but that he denies this doctrine of the Creed *in toto*.

A Finite Being Becomes an Infinite Being.

(*e*) But we must not forget that while these progressives hold that the eternal Son of God in his earthly life was not "*God* and man in two distinct natures," — was not, indeed, the absolute God at all, — but only a man capacious of Deity as are all other men and creatures according to their measure, yet these divines also hold that Christ in his glorified state, both before and after his Incarnation, was truly the absolute God, omniscient, omnipresent, almighty, the Creator, who in some sense made all things, and without whom was not anything made that was made.

[1] Andover Review, October, 1892, p. 398. [2] Prog. Orth. p. 21.

It must also be kept in mind that, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," while this same eternal Son of God in his earthly life had only a human nature, and was as truly ignorant, weak, and limited in all his faculties and powers as any other man at that period in history, yet in his glorified existence He was once and is now *the life* of his own entire universe, attached to every being and thing in it "not externally but vitally," so that if the attachment were broken, the universe would perish.

Vital Questions.

(*f*) Now in view of these beliefs, set forth with so much confidence by the defendant and his progressive associates, we modestly raise this question: When the eternal Son of God, the Second Distinction in the Godhead, "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost — when *He* ceased to be God, and became man with *only* a human nature, what became of the *universe* of which He, and He alone, was the *life?* Did it perish at the first moment of the Incarnation? If it did not perish, then *did* the Creator and the Preserver of all things in his Incarnation cease to be God?

Another question: When the Second Distinction in the Trinity, "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost, ceased to be God, and became man, with only a human nature, what became of the Triune God himself? Was an infinite vacancy made in his Being? Did the immutable God become, in the Incarnation, changeable and imperfect? Was there suddenly an inconceivably vast deficiency in the very constitution of the Godhead? Was not only the universe, but even the Triune God himself, blotted out of existence at the first moment of the Incarnation? If not, then *did* the eternal Son of God cease to be God when He became man?

The defendant and his progressive compeers claim that they are standing for *liberty* to hold and teach the *truth as they understand it* — "the larger, broader truth of to-day." Judged by their own public utterances, their position appears to be that if, for instance, the Andover Creed, which they have entered into a contract to "maintain and inculcate," does not, *in their opinion*, state the *truth* respecting the Deity of our Lord in his earthly life, then the way out of their difficulty is not for them to resign their

professorships, but to *stand* at all costs for liberty to break their promises and to teach what *they* believe to be the truth upon this momentous subject, in spite of the Creed, of the decision of the Visitors, and of the known belief and intention of the Founders. We take them for a moment upon their own legally and morally false ground, and ask, What *is* the *truth* respecting the Deity of our Lord in his earthly life? Is it the simple, clear, and scriptural statement of the Creed, or is it what we have shown to be the pantheistic vagaries, the sheer dogmatism, the brazen self-contradictions, and the absolute absurdities of "Progressive Orthodoxy"? Is it true that the finite can become infinite?

The Andover Creed Glorifies Christ.

Fifthly, Consistent Calvinism, as formulated in the Andover Creed, exalts and honors our Incarnate Lord by distinctly affirming his absolute Deity, and thus instructing the Seminary students, and through them the world, to adore and glorify Him to whom, while He was yet in the flesh, his disciples unrebuked paid honors due only to the Most High, and who was declared by the Apostle Paul to be "over all, God blessed forever," at the same time that He was of human descent, or, in other words, was truly man.

The "New Theology Degrades Christ."

But "Progressive Orthodoxy," as set forth in recent editorials and in earlier publications of the progressive professors, dishonors our Incarnate Redeemer by denying that He was "*God* and man in *two distinct natures*," and by representing that he was only "capacious of Deity" in the same sense in which all other men and creatures are, thus instructing the Seminary students, and through them multitudes of people, to degrade our adorable Saviour in their thoughts and belief to the level of mere men and other creatures.

Upon this high matter, therefore, of exalting and adoring Christ as the unchangeable Son of God, the antagonism of "Progressive Orthodoxy" to the Andover Creed and Statutes is intense and absolute. The pantheistic idea of God advocated by the new-departure professors, which represents him as existing in quantity, as capable of being divided into portions and distributed to all men and creatures, to each according to his capaciousness mathematically measured, dishonors the Almighty by

divesting him of his personality. The pantheistic conception of our Incarnate Lord as having only a human nature and as being simply receptive of Deity as are all men, beings, and things in the universe according to their measure mathematically estimated, degrades Christ, by divesting him of the eternity and unchangeableness of his Deity. No indignity greater than this can be put upon the eternal Son of God. Let us not be deceived. Pantheism is a subtle and seductive error. Comparatively few people of evangelical faith, however intelligent they may be, are familiar with pantheistic thought and theories. This gives Pantheism a marked advantage, which it has not been slow to improve. To say that Christ Jesus "was capacious of Deity" may seem to some minds simply a true and orthodox statement. But "Progressive Orthodoxy" gives utterance to the same sentiment in plainer words when it says that "God was in Christ, *so far* as God can manifest his life in a human personality at a given period in history." It also gives expression to this same pantheistic conception in terms still more perspicuous when it represents that as God was in the Lord Jesus, so is He in all men, beings, and things in the universe, according to the measure of their capaciousness. The regnant principle here is unmistakable and undeniable. It is Pantheism. The man Christ Jesus and all men, all beings, and all nature are replete with Deity. They all have God in themselves, not by his presence merely, but by his being organically and vitally united to themselves. Hence, all men and all nature are as truly divine as the Lord Jesus was. They do not all, however, have the same amount of divineness, but each being and thing has its portion. The conception is largely materialistic and mechanical. The question of Christ's divinity and of the divinity of every man, beast, and thing becomes a mere question of quantity. God exists in the universe in parts, which are circumscribed and measured off. Everything has God in it, *so far* as it is capable of holding and manifesting Him. Of course God may transcend the beings and things which contain only portions of Him in vital union with themselves. Still, according to this theory, God is not infinite. Nothing is infinite that is made up of parts; but some things are more capacious of Deity than others are. A towering and broad-spreading elm tree has more of God in it than a mullein stock has. A turtle

has more of God within it and vitally united to it than an oyster has; an ox has more of God in him than a turtle has; a man has more of God than an ox has. Some men have more of God in vital union with themselves than other men have. The man Christ Jesus had more of God vitally united to himself than any other man had "*at Christ's period in history.*" He was a mere man, but among men he was a unique person. His uniqueness was his larger amount of divineness. He was conscious of his superior divineness; but he was not conscious of being God, for he was not God. Lord Bacon was a unique person on account of his extraordinary intellectual power. He was more capacious of God than most men were *at his period in history*, and this larger amount of divinity in him constituted his uniqueness. All humanity is divine because it is *vitally* united to God. God is in every man as his *life*, and therefore as an essential part of his being; and every man is in God as an essential part of his Being. This is "the divinity of humanity" of which we have recently heard so much. After the same manner God is vitally united to, and identified with, the entire universe. This is outright Pantheism. The defendant, of course, will deny this statement; but we challenge him to show how this theory of God's relation to the world and to all beings and things in it differs essentially from the old heathen Pantheism of ancient Greece and India.

The Teaching in Andover Lecture Rooms.

According to the belief and teaching of the defendant, as the complainants charge, Christ in his earthly life was a being limited in all his attributes, capacities, and attainments. In proof of this charge, we claim to have shown, from the writings of the defendant, that he holds and teaches, as a doctrine of his "new theology," that Christ, in the days of his humiliation, was not God; that he was divine only in the sense in which all men are divine; that he was a member, and nothing more than a member, of the human race; that like all other men he was ignorant; and that he made mistakes and blunders, and did not know that he made them.

In further evidence that such is the teaching of "Progressive Orthodoxy," we now add, that similar views of the ignorance of

our incarnate Lord have been set forth in at least one of the lecture rooms in Andover Seminary, under the instruction of an advocate of "the new theology." Students at the public examinations are expected to present the views which have been maintained and inculcated by their instructors. At such an examination held some two years ago, a student boldly represented that Christ in his earthly life was so ignorant that he did not always know the nature of the diseases he healed. For instance, he supposed that he cast devils out of the demoniacs at Gadara, when, without much doubt, he only cured them of epilepsy. In his own opinion, that student who was under examination, living as he does in a more enlightened "period in history," knows more than Christ knew, and can correct his errors; and at the examination he claimed that under the instruction of his theological teacher he had corrected one of them. This student, therefore, in this particular of superior personal knowledge, has more divineness in him than Christ had. The professor has more knowledge than the student has, and so in this particular has more of God in him than the student contained. For God is light as well as life; he is truth and knowledge as well as power and goodness.

The apostle John affirms that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." But according to the progressive teaching, when the Word became flesh and walked about among men in Galilee his memory failed him utterly. He had not the least recollection of his stupendous work of creation. John, it seems, knew that He who became flesh created the worlds, and that without Him was not anything made that was made. But the eternal Son of God Incarnated, the progressive professors inform us, was "not conscious that He created the stars." The disciple John, then, when he wrote the Fourth Gospel, knew more about his Lord than his Incarnate Lord knew about himself. John, therefore, had more divinity in him than Christ Incarnate had. Why, then, should we not have more confidence in the revelations of John than in those of Christ? If Christ was so ignorant in the days of his humiliation, how can we accept the declarations he then made respecting the Father and his will, respecting the

Holy Spirit and the way of salvation, or believe any of his affirmations concerning his own mission and kingdom, concerning his power to forgive sins, and to secure to penitent and believing sinners the life everlasting with himself in glory ineffable? Can any man in his public teaching impute such ignorance and fallibility to the Redeemer of lost men without doing his best to degrade the Person of that Redeemer, and to defame his character before the world? Who will deny that this debasing view of the Lord Jesus must be regarded as one of those doctrinal errors which every professor refers to, when, in taking the Creed, he solemnly promises that he will oppose "all heresies and errors, ancient or modern, which may be opposed to the gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men"? Can any intelligent person believe that the holding and teaching of such low and derogatory views respecting Christ, by any professor on the Andover Foundations, is not a gross violation of a most sacred promise and an open defiance of the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary?

Miracles of Our Lord the Product of Natural Human Forces.

But still further reproach is cast upon our Lord and Saviour by these progressive professors, in one of their recent editorials, through their manner of accounting for his miracles. They condescendingly admit that his miracles were not mere wonders and deceptions, but were real and beneficent deeds. His healing power is thought by them to have been "inherent," whatever that may mean. Their purpose evidently is to explain the miracles of our Lord as resulting from the working of purely natural forces, to the utter exclusion of all supernatural power in Christ. Referring to our Lord's power of instantaneous healing they say: —

> It has been aptly called his health-power. The healing influence of a healthy person over a diseased person has had many illustrations and, at the present time, is recognized, as it never has been before, as the exercise of a real power which is but little understood. Such a power Jesus had to the fullest degree. That which is vaguely suggested by modern mind cure, faith cure, or even, possibly, by hypnotic and mesmeric influence was complete in Jesus. It is much more probable that he had such a health-power over bodies and minds than that the narrative of his healings is a pure fabrication, or an unfounded tradition.[1]

[1] Andover Review, October, 1892, p. 398.

That is, our Lord's mighty works of mercy, wrought in relief of the blind, the lame, the deaf, the lepers, wrought in the instantaneous creating of food sufficient to feed thousands of hungry men and women, in casting out devils, and in raising the dead to life, were not supernatural at all, but were accomplished by the man Christ Jesus in the exercise of natural powers known to be possessed by other men in various degrees. These human powers were abnormally great in Christ. He was not God. He did not create the stars. But he was a monstrosity of human health-power, and of other powers merely human.

Other Christs Should Appear.

If such views of our Incarnate Redeemer are true, there is no reason whatever why other Christs should not have appeared on the earth long before this time. Indeed, among all the myriads of men there ought to be at least a few Christs living now; and if these professors are teaching a "*real* theology," as they declare they are, they are bound to find a real Christ now in the flesh and put him on exhibition. Perhaps some one of these progressive professors themselves is the very man of whom it shall soon be said, "Lo! here is Christ!" But whatever marvelous evolutions of humanity are yet to come, some things will abide. The gospel of Christ is an "everlasting" and a changeless gospel. The Andover Creed is by statute unchangeably what it is. Honesty and dishonesty will remain forever the very same things they always have been; and we submit that no man who does not believe that "the Eternal Son of God" "became man and continues to be *God* and man, in *two distinct natures* and one person forever," can ever *honestly*, or by any moral or legal right, occupy a professor's chair in Andover Seminary.

A Protest in the Name of the Founders.

We cannot close this part of our argument without, in the name of the Founders of this Seminary and in memory of their reverent piety, putting on record our protest against the derogatory and impious representation of the being and character of our Lord which the defendant and his associates have made in their explanation of his miracles. The suggestion that the Incar-

nate Son of God was a *mesmerizer*, and wrought some of his miracles "by hypnotic and mesmeric influence," seems to us to be as shocking to reverent piety as it is revolting to refined and scholarly taste. We cannot but think that such language concerning our Lord and Saviour, if heard amidst the profanity and tobacco-smoke of a crowded barroom, would even there be deemed indecent and sacrilegious. How then should it be characterized when it is uttered by a professor in an evangelical Theological Seminary? How is this utterance to be accounted for? Of what can it be the product, if not of impiety or of senility or of insanity? We judge no man; but we think it simply astounding that sensible, honorable, and well-balanced Christian men, who have voluntarily assumed the sacred task of fitting Christian young men for the gospel ministry, and who have subscribed to the solemn declarations which accompany the Andover Creed, should ever say or even suggest that our adorable Lord and Redeemer was a *mesmerizer!*

We appeal to the Board of Visitors. Can you, Gentlemen, as you remember the Christian faith and the reverent piety of the Founders, and in view of your own sacred obligations as the Supreme Guardians of Andover Seminary, allow any man, who believes and teaches that the Lord Jesus Christ was only a little more divine than other men at his period in history were, and that some of his astounding miracles were simply the performances of a *mesmerizer*, to remain a professor on the Andover Foundations any longer time than you need to write out legally and properly the official papers that shall dismiss him from his office?

IV.

THIRD PARTICULAR COMPLAINT.

Our third specific complaint is that Professor Smyth, in opposition to the requirements of the Andover Creed and Statutes, maintains and teaches *that no man has power or capacity to repent without knowledge of God in Christ.*

Professor Smyth defended himself against this charge at his trial before the Board of Visitors in December, 1886. But in their judgment he did not refute it, for in their decision they declared this charge proved, and made it one of the grounds on which they removed the professor from his office in Andover Seminary.

Every professor in taking the Seminary Creed makes this declaration: —

> I moreover believe . . . that God's decrees perfectly consist with human liberty; God's universal agency with the agency of man; and man's dependence with his accountability; *that man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him, so that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation.*

Dr. Spring on Natural and Moral Ability.

Dr. Samuel Spring, in consultation with other Consistent Calvinists, as has already been stated, wrote the Andover Creed. His views upon the question of man's ability to repent and to obey all the commands which God has addressed to men are well known. In one of his publications he wrote: —

> Natural ability is the intellectual and bodily strength of man to perform every action which God requires of him. . . . As natural ability consists in having intellectual and bodily strength to perform every action required of man, it is evident that moral ability must consist in a willing mind.[1]

In view of these statements of Dr. Spring, it is impossible to misunderstand his meaning when he affirms in the Creed "that man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God

[1] Moral Disquisitions, by Rev. Samuel Spring, D.D., pp. 172, 173.

requires of him." This declaration of the Creed means that man has "natural ability"; that is, by the very constitution of his being man has all needed power of mind and of body, real and full power, to repent, and to obey every command which God has laid upon him. That this is the meaning is also made evident by the next statement in this Creed — "so that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation." No natural inability, therefore, — no inability of mind or of body, — prevents the sinner from conforming to all the requirements of the gospel; and in conforming to them he ensures his salvation in Christ. If he does not repent, it is simply because he *will* not. His unwillingness, however, is not real inability; it is his sin. He is responsible for it, and to distinguish it from natural or real inability it is called *moral* inability. The Seminary Creed says: "that being *morally* incapable of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam, every man is justly exposed to eternal damnation; so that except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Man needs for his salvation no new capacity or faculty, no new mental or bodily power. In regeneration his aversion to holiness is taken away, but no new natural capacity or power is bestowed upon him. Every man is of himself abundantly able to do all that God requires of him. Such is the doctrine of the Creed; and every Andover professor once in every five years solemnly promises to "maintain and inculcate," so far as may appertain to his office, this doctrine, as well as every other doctrine expressed in the Seminary Creed.

The Andover Progressives on Man's Ability.

But what is the doctrine which the progressive professors are now actually maintaining and inculcating respecting man's ability to do what God requires of him? Samples of their belief and teaching in this particular are presented in the following statements quoted from "Progressive Orthodoxy": —

> It might be enough to suggest, at this point, that the power and inclination to repent are not found except when God is revealed in Christ; that only because Christ has brought God to men in a new light are they stirred to penitence.[1]
>
> So we have become accustomed to the thought that Christ has an organic relation to the race. He is an individual, but an individual vitally

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 47.

related to every human being. He preferred to be called the Son of Man. Paul sees in Him the Head of humanity, the second Adam. . . .

Humanity may thus be thought of as offering something to God of eminent value. When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful. Christ realizes what humanity could not realize for itself. The race may be conceived as approaching God, and signifying its penitence by pointing to Christ, and by giving expression in Him to repentance which no words could utter. Thus we can regard Him as our substitute, not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another, but because He is so intimately identified with us and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his. . . . Here is the truth of McLeod Campbell's view of atonement. The entire race repents or is capable of repenting through Christ. It renders in Him a complete repentance. He is the Amen of humanity to the righteousness of God's love, to the ill desert of sin, to the justice of God's judgments. . . .

In union with Christ, who brings spiritual truth and power to man, repentance is radical. Man left to himself cannot have a repentance which sets him free from sin and death. But in Christ he is moved to repentance which is revolutionary; in Christ he can express repentance, for in union with Christ he adopts the feeling of Christ concerning sin against the God of love. If man unaided could become truly repentant, he would become holy, and would be the child of God. This is admitted by Jonathan Edwards. But it is only in Christ that he has such knowledge of God and of himself as is necessary to a repentance which is revolutionary. It is not true, we admit and insist, that repentance without Christ is availing for redemption, for *man of himself cannot repent;* . . . [Italics ours] Christ's sacrifice avails with God because it is adopted to bring man to repentance. . . . He is one, in with the race, who has the power of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling toward God and toward sin, and so God looks on the race as having this power in Christ — a power which, when realized, melts away the iron fetters of what we call necessity and fate. . . .

The race is reconstituted in Christ, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing powers for repentance and holiness which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of.[1]

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting.[2]

Now our complaint is that these declarations of "Progressive Orthodoxy" upon the subject of man's ability to obey God are in sharp antagonism to the declarations of the Seminary Creed.

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 52–56. [2] Ibid. p. 58.

The Defendant in Conflict with the Creed.

1. The doctrine of the Creed is, that man of himself has real and full power to repent, and "to do all that God requires of him." The doctrine of the "new theology" is, that "*man of himself cannot repent*" (p. 55). The contradiction between the two theologies at this point is positive and uncompromising. It is idle for a new-departure professor, who has subscribed to the Creed and promised to maintain and inculcate all its doctrines, to attempt to vindicate himself against this charge of breaking his promise, by replying, as the defendant does, that in affirming man's inability to repent, he had reference simply to his "*moral* inability," or to "the moral helplessness of mankind apart from Christ." The defendant nowhere in "Progressive Orthodoxy" recognizes the vital distinction between natural inability and moral inability. Besides, it is inconceivable that had he intended to affirm simply man's "*moral* inability" to repent, he should not have used the phrase "*moral* inability." But he did not use it. On the contrary he declares in the most positive terms that "man of himself cannot repent"; that the human race without Christ "would be hopelessly destitute" "of powers for repentance and holiness"; that "the power and inclination to repent are not found, except when God is revealed in Christ"; and that to repent "is beyond man's power." If it is possible to affirm in human language that *man of himself* has no power to obey God's command to repent, "Progressive Orthodoxy" has made that affirmation. But the Andover Creed declares that *man of himself has* power to obey that divine command, and "to do all that God requires of him," and thus teaches that God is not guilty of commanding men to do what they have no power to do, and then threatening to inflict upon them everlasting punishment for not doing it.

The Sinner under No Obligation to Repent.

2. The Creed affirms "that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation." "Progressive Orthodoxy" contradicts this statement by affirming that something other than the sinner's aversion to holiness — namely, his absolute inability to repent — prevents his salvation. This teaching relieves the sinner from all obligation to repent, and thus antagonizes both

the Andover Creed and the declarations of Christ and the apostles.

Impenitence Not a Sin.

3. The affirmation of the Creed is that man has real and ample power to repent. Consequently, if he does not repent, his impenitence is his sin, and it is not safe for him to continue impenitent one moment, for in so doing he incurs augmented guilt before God. The affirmation of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is that man of himself is utterly powerless to repent. Consequently his impenitence is not his sin, and he incurs no guilt in living on impenitent and dying impenitent, for as he has no power to repent he cannot be blamed for not repenting. Andover Seminary was not founded to teach such a doctrine, but exactly the opposite doctrine. Yet this doctrine, that man is not responsible for his impenitence, is now taught on the Andover Foundations.

Personal Repentance Not a Just Condition of Salvation.

4. According to the Seminary Creed, as man has ample power to repent, God has justly made repentance one of "the personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation," or one of the conditions upon the fulfilment of which by any sinner God can graciously and righteously, on the ground of Christ's atonement for the sins of all men, grant to such penitent sinner full forgiveness and the life everlasting. But, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy," as man has no power of any kind to repent, God cannot *justly* make repentance a condition of the sinner's salvation; or, if He does make it a condition, *justice* requires that He furnish the power to repent. In this case, however, the furnishing of the power to repent is not of grace, but of debt. Such a gospel is not the gospel of the Andover Creed, nor the gospel of Christ and the apostles; nor can it be preached as Christ preached his own gospel, and as his apostles preached it. It would be ridiculously absurd for a preacher glowing with zeal and pathos to beseech his hearers to repent of their sins, when all the while he and they alike know perfectly well that they have no power whatever to do so; and equally absurd would it be to urge them by every conceivable argument to instant repentance,

and at the same time remind them that while they are in themselves utterly destitute of power to repent, yet they can, in some mysterious way, repent in the repentance of another, or by means of some mysterious power furnished them through their mysterious and vital union with Christ. Such a gospel can never be honestly preached by a minister of common sense to common-sense people. Such a gospel, it is believed, never has been preached or accepted, save by a few visionary men who may be properly designated as pantheistic Universalists; for the doctrine that the entire race repents in Christ is outright Universalism.

Repentance in Union with Christ.

5. The Statute of Andover Seminary which embodies its Creed requires every professor to "maintain and inculcate" the doctrine, that man of himself has natural and complete ability to repent of his sins, and to do all things which God requires of him. But the advocates of "Progressive Orthodoxy," who are now holding chairs in Andovor Seminary, are maintaining and inculcating the doctrine, that while man of himself has no natural ability, no moral ability, no ability of any kind, to repent of his sins, or to do anything which God in the gospel of his Son requires him to do, yet, "in Christ," "in union with Christ," "in with Christ," in the *knowledge* of himself, of truth, and of God that comes to him by being "in Christ," man *receives* real and full power to repent of his sins, and to do all which God requires of him. The mutual antagonism of these two doctrines is absolute and uncompromising. Such samples of progressive teaching as the following should be kept in mind: —

> *In union with Christ*, who brings spiritual truth and power to man, repentance is radical. Man left to himself cannot have a repentance which sets him free from sin and death. But *in Christ* he is moved to repentance which is revolutionary; *in Christ* he can express repentance, for *in union with Christ* he adopts the feeling of Christ concerning sin against the God of love. . . . But it is only *in Christ* that he has such knowledge of God and of himself as is *necessary to a repentance* which is revolutionary. . . . He [Christ] is one, *in with the race*, who has the power of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling toward God and toward sin.[1] [The italics are ours.]

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 55, 56.

THE CENTRAL AND VITAL PRINCIPLE IN "PROGRESSIVE ORTHODOXY."

If such statements as these are true, it is of supreme moment to every human being to know precisely what "Progressive Orthodoxy" means when it speaks of "*man*," that is, of every member of the human race, as being "*in Christ*," "*in union with Christ*," and of Christ as being "*in with the race*." But to raise this question is to ask, What is the theory which is accepted and advocated by the progressive professors in Andover Seminary respecting the relation of the human race, and of every member of it, to Christ, and to God in Christ. The following statements of the advocates of this theory will set it forth with sufficient clearness for our present purpose: —

For the most part, a single line of inquiry has been followed, under the guidance of a central and vital principle of Christianity, namely, the reality of Christ's personal relation to the human race as a whole and to every member of it, — the principle of the universality of Christianity.

This principle has been rapidly gaining of late in its power over men's thoughts and lives. It is involved in the church doctrine of the constitution of Christ's person. . . . We have sought to apply this principle to the solution of questions which are now more than ever before engaging the attention of serious and devout minds. We have endeavored to follow its guidance faithfully and loyally, and wherso-ever it might lead. We have trusted it wholly and practically. . . . If we have anywhere overestimated or underestimated the validity and value of our guiding principle, we hope that this will be pointed out. . . . On the other hand, if we have been true to a great and cardinal doctrine of our holy religion, and have developed its necessary implications and consequences, we ask that any further discussion of these conclusions should *recognize their connection with the principle from which they are derived, and their legitimacy, unless this principle is itself to be abandoned.*[1]

PANTHEISM.

It should be noticed that "*the principle*" referred to in this extract is represented as "a central and vital principle of Christianity," as "involved in the church doctrine of the constitution of Christ's person," and finally as "a great and cardinal doctrine of our holy religion." Our view of these representations is that they are sheer dogmatism and absolutely false. "The principle" thus dogmatically affirmed and glorified is, as will be shown, simply the old speculation or theory that the human race as a

[1] Prog. Orth. Introduction, pp. 3, 4.

whole, and every member of it, are organically and vitally united to Christ, and that this is only a part of the larger theory of the organic and vital union and identity of the entire world with God. This larger theory, beyond question, is not of Christian but of heathen origin. It is ancient *Pantheism.* Indeed, it is not only an amazing assumption, but also a severe reflection upon Christianity, to represent that this old pagan Pantheism in itself, or in any application of it, is "a great and cardinal doctrine of our holy religion"; that "it is involved in the church doctrine of the constitution of Christ's person"; and that it is "a central and vital principle of Christianity." The truth is that Pantheism had its origin, not in Christianity nor in the Holy Scriptures, but in the ancient philosophies of pagan Greece and India; and nothing could be more opposed to the Andover Confession of Faith than this old pagan speculation respecting the identity of God and the world, or any use of it in the way of explaining the relation of Christ to the human race. It is preposterous for the Andover progressives to speak deprecatingly, as they do, about "*abandoning* this principle," for it was never adopted by the Christian Church at large; and as to Andover Seminary, *that* was founded for the very purpose of *opposing*, among other false and hurtful errors prevailing at that time, this same "principle" of pagan Pantheism, as then set forth in its application to Christianity by John Murray, "the father of Universalism in America."

This theory of God's relation to the world, which is confessedly the fundamental and guiding principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy," is further set forth in the following language: —

> We add a single remark upon the general philosophical conception of God and his relation to the universe which underlies these essays. It is a modification of a prevailing Latin conception of the divine transcendence by a clearer and fuller appreciation (in accordance with the highest thought of the Greek fathers) of the divine immanence. Such a doctrine of God, we believe, is more and more approving itself in the best philosophy of our time, and the fact of the Incarnation commends it to the acceptance of the Christian theologian.[1]

The Greek and Latin Conceptions of God.

Attention is called to the frank confession made in this extract, that it is the Latin, and not the Greek, conception of God that is

[1] Prog. Orth. Introduction, p. 16.

modified in "Progressive Orthodoxy." The old Greek conception of God remains intact in the so-called "new theology." Speaking briefly and generally we may say that the *Latin* conception represents God as other than the universe He has created, and while it emphasizes his personality, transcendence, and sovereignty, it also represents Him as filling the created universe with his preserving, controlling, and gracious presence. It emphasizes the divine omnipresence in the world, no less than the divine transcendence. On the other hand, the *Greek* conception of God fails to distinguish sharply between God and the created universe or the world. It emphasizes the divine immanence, not as identical with the divine omnipresence, but as the organic and vital union of God with the world. The Latin conception of God is scriptural. It is Christian theism. The Greek conception is unscriptural, and either is, or tends to, pure Pantheism. The former has its origin in divine Revelation; the latter has its origin in Paganism. The Latin conception is the prevailing one in orthodox, evangelistic churches, and wherever accepted it is a revealed truth of marvelous vitality and power, energizing men for the service of righteousness and of God, and especially for irrepressible missionary and evangelistic endeavors. The Greek conception is found in the liberal, so called, or unevangelical, churches. The religious faith that springs from this conception is sometimes indifferent, but oftener intensely hostile to all evangelistic labors. In competition with the energizing, evangelical conception of God, it will occasionally put forth a few languid efforts in the line of education and philanthropy, always, however, vigorously excluding all evangelistic labor and influence; but left to itself it quickly ceases to do anything for God or man, and soon dies from mere inanition. This liberal faith can seldom be moved by any impulsion to take the lead in founding permanent Christian institutions for the good of men; it is more likely to adopt the principles of the highwayman, and, by methods amounting to fraud and robbery, seize such educational, ecclesiastical, and other institutions as it needs for its own support and propagation.

The Pantheistic Idea Regnant in "Progressive Orthodoxy."

Now it is this Greek, pantheistic conception of God that the defendant and his progressive associates are enamored with.

Such is the regnant and all-pervading principle in their "new theology." The progressive professors at Andover, speaking of this principle, frankly say: —

> We have endeavored to follow its guidance faithfully and loyally, and whithersoever it might lead. We have trusted it wholly and practically.[1]

But this Greek, pantheistic notion of the vital union and real identity of God and the world, if introduced into the evangelical, Christian system of faith, will poison and corrupt every scriptural doctrine which it touches. And surely no notion coming from pagan philosophy, or from any source, can be more antagonistic than Pantheism to the theology of the Andover Creed and to all evangelical faith. Even the Incarnate Son of God, according to this pantheistic philosophy, becomes, as has already been shown, simply the archetype of all human beings, and thus every man comes to be regarded as truly a God-man as is Christ himself.

Another statement of this pantheistic theory of Christ's relation to the world, and to the human race as a part of the world, which is now held and taught in Andover Seminary is found in these words: —

> What is commonly, though in too limited a way, called his [Christ's] mediatorial kingdom will come to an end when the creation, in the Person of its redemptive Head and Lord, will bow before the throne, and God will be all in all. That cycle of history introduced by Adam's transgression, or earlier in the sin of angelic spirits, will come to a close, and with it that form of dominion determined by the existence of unvanquished rebellion.[2]

According to this statement, "the creation," or the entire universe which is commonly spoken of as having been created, is not to be conceived of as other than "the Person of its redemptive Head and Lord," but as united to and *included in* his Person, and as constituting an essential part of his being, so that when He bows before the throne the entire universe bows *in Him*, "and God will be all in all." The conception appears to be that of emanation. As under necessary law a ray emanates from the sun, imparts its light and heat, and then is reabsorbed into its source, so the universe of dependent worlds, beings, and things is only

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 3, 4. [2] Ibid. p. 24.

a necessary emanation or evolution from the being of God, and, having accomplished under necessary law its historic cycle of divine manifestations and changes, will be reabsorbed into Deity. This is Pantheism; and no theory of God's relation to the universe can more violently antagonize, than does this, the scriptural conception of that relation as set forth in the Andover Creed where it affirms, that "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and *unchangeable in his being*," and "that God *created* man."

Universalism.

According to the pantheistic theory now taught at Andover, God in Christ is changeable. Changes in the universe and in the human race are simply so many changes in Christ. When Christ bows before the throne the universe *in Him* bows also. When Christ feels pain in view of human sin, every man, as vitally united to Christ and so a constituent part of his being, really, though not consciously, feels that same pain. When Christ sorrows for the sins of the human race, confesses them, and so repents of them, every member of the human race, though he may have no knowledge or consciousness of it, repents in that perfect repentance of Christ because he is "so identified" with Him. This is not simply Pantheism, but also Universalism; for if every man offers to God a perfect repentance in Christ, every man not merely will be but is saved.

Christ the Life of Every Man and of the Universe.

Again, the pantheistic nature of Christ's relation to the world, including the human race, as that relation is depicted by "Progressive Orthodoxy," is made evident by such language as the following: —

> The whole truth, then, is that Christ is the revealing or manifesting principle; or, more exactly, that through the Logos, the Word, the Second Person of the Trinity, that which is absolute fulness and truth in God is communicated *into* finite existences; . . . *The created universe and all rational beings* are through Christ and *in Christ.* Therefore He mediates or reveals God to any part of His universe according to the condition or need which may exist in that part. . . . Christ cannot be indifferent to the least of His creatures in its pain and wickedness, *for* His universe is not attached to Him *externally, but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere.* He feels its every move-

ment, most of all its spiritual life and feebleness or disease, and appears in His glorious power even at the remotest point.[1] [Italics ours.]

But if the universe is attached to Christ, not externally, but *vitally*, and if He is "not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere and feels its every movement," especially its spiritual life, feebleness, or disease, then Christ and the universe are one person and Christ is responsible for the life of that person, for his character, for his every movement, even for his guilt, if he sins. On the other hand, as the Supreme Governor of the universe, as the Lord of lords and the King of kings, He is not responsible for all the movements, sins, and sufferings of free and accountable beings in the universe. But if he is not Lord of all, if he and the universe are one person, and he allows pain, sickness, or wickedness in any part of his own being, it must be because he is either not almighty or not all-good, and in either case he is not God. Moreover, if Christ's sympathy for men in their woes and wickedness is not the sympathy of one being for other beings, but of one being for himself, why are not all the woes and wickedness of men Christ's own woes and wickedness? And if Christ and the entire human race, by their organic and vital union, constitute one person, so that He can repent of all their sins, while they of themselves cannot repent of them, why *ought He not* to repent of them, and why is He not guilty to an inconceivable degree of the sin of impenitence if He does not repent of them? But if He offers a repentance which He *ought* to offer, which is due to himself and to all men as included in himself, to whom He is attached not "externally but vitally," even as the head is attached to the members of its own body, then the salvation of all men through the repentance of Christ their Head is simply an act of justice, and not at all of grace on Christ's part. But the Creed, which every Andover professor accepts and promises to maintain, declares that "our salvation is wholly of grace."

This strange doctrine of repentance is founded upon the speculative and pantheistic notion that Christ, in his relation to the universe, "is its life everywhere." Of course, then, He is the life of every man, and the human race is not to be thought of as existing apart from, or as other than, the immanent Christ, but as

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 43, 44.

constituting with Him, who is its life, one being, feeling what He feels, doing what He does. Then follows naturally the teaching that men cannot repent apart from Christ, or of themselves, but can repent *in Christ*, who is their life, and who always feels pain and sorrow in view of sin. But as He is the life of all men He feels pain and sorrow *in* all men in view of their sins, and thus all men, through their vital union with Christ, offer to God a perfect and acceptable repentance. Thus we find again that "Progressive Orthodoxy" is thoroughgoing Universalism. And Universalism is one of the errors specified in the Creed which every Andover professor has religiously promised to oppose.

The Vital Union of the Race with Christ Unproved.

Now "Progressive Orthodoxy" offers no evidence whatever in support of this theory of the organic and vital union of all men with Christ. It everywhere assumes, and often dogmatically affirms, the reality of such a union. apparently seeking by this frequent assertion and implication of such a reality to make the minds of its readers familiar with the notion. At length it says, with a sigh of relief, as if believing that at last the reader's *familiarity with the doctrine* must have convinced him of its truth:

> So we have become accustomed to the thought that Christ has an organic relation to the race. He is an individual, but an individual vitally related to every human being. He preferred to be called the Son of man. Paul sees in Him the Head of humanity, the second Adam. . . . He was not merely the ideal man, but the universal man. . . .
>
> Humanity may thus be thought of as offering something to God of eminent value. When Christ suffers the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful the race is sorrowful. Christ realizes what humanity could not realize for itself. The race may be conceived as approaching God and signifying its penitence by pointing to Christ, and by giving expression in Him to repentance which no words could utter. Thus we can regard Him as our substitute, not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another, but because He is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his. The representative power which belongs to man in his various relations comes to its perfect realization in Christ. In the family, in government, in business, in society, representative or substitutionary relations are the rule, not the exception. Much more has Christ the power perfectly to represent us or to be substituted for us, because there is no point of our real life where He is not

in contact with us. Here is the truth of McLeod Campbell's view of atonement. The entire race repents, or is capable of repenting, through Christ. It renders in Him a complete repentance. He is the Amen of humanity to the righteousness of God's love, to the ill desert of sin, to the justice of God's judgments.[1]

The Nature of Man's Union with Christ.

In these statements the pantheistic philosophy or theory of "Progressive Orthodoxy" respecting the relation of Christ to the human race is set forth with some inconsistencies, yet with considerable explicitness. Several of the representations made in these quotations should receive special attention.

The Union Vital.

First, there is here a positive declaration that while Christ is "an individual" He is yet "an individual *vitally* related to every human being." But what is the meaning of the word "*vitally*" as here used? Its import is distinctly set forth in the statement already noticed, that Christ "is not a governor set over" his universe, "but is its *life* everywhere." Of course, then, He is the life of every man. God in Christ is conceived of in "Progressive Orthodoxy" as a vast individual Existence coming into manifested life in all living beings and things: in the trees and grass, in the ox and the worm, in all angels, in all insects, and in all men. Christ is not simply omnipresent. "His universe is not attached to him externally, but vitally." He "is its life everywhere." "He was not merely the ideal man, but the universal man." His life and the life of every man are identical. The Life in the universe is one, is a unit, is Christ. Therefore his person includes in itself all men. Elsewhere He is declared to be "the universal Person" (p. 63). Can such pantheistic Universalism be lawfully and righteously taught on the Andover Foundations?

The Race the Body of Christ.

Secondly, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy" Christ is not simply the Head of his Church considered as including all chosen out of the world, but is "the Head of humanity. He is the second Adam." The entire human race, then, is the body of Christ, the one true Church of God. Every human being is a

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 52-54.

member of Christ's body. All men alike, the wicked and the righteous, Judas and John, Pilate and Peter, heathen and Christians, the worst criminals and the holiest saints who have ever lived or ever will live on earth, constitute the one body of Christ, the true Christian Church. Was Andover Seminary founded to teach such a theology as this?

What Christ Does the Race Does.

Thirdly, "Progressive Orthodoxy" consistently maintains that what the Head does the whole body does. "When Christ suffers the race suffers. When Christ sorrows the race sorrows." Of course, then, when Christ repents the race repents. Christ feels the pain of regret and grief in view of human sins. If that pain can be called repentance, then Christ repents. And as all men constitute the body of Christ, making with Him one person, they all repent in his repentance, and "the race" may signify "its penitence by pointing to Christ and by giving expression *in Him* to repentance which no words could utter." Man's repentance, so called, is imperfect, absolutely ineffective and worthless. But Christ's repentance is perfect, and as in his repentance all men repent, they all offer a repentance that is perfect, revolutionary, recuperative, regenerative, redemptive, and saving. Can such a doctrine as this be held and taught in Andover Seminary by an honest man who has solemnly promised to oppose Universalism?

The Race Not Other than Christ.

Fourthly, "Progressive Orthodoxy" holds that Christ is our substitute, not in the sense of standing in our place and doing and suffering in our stead, but in the sense of being "intimately identified with us." He is a substitute for, and a representative of, *the race*, "not because He is one and the race another," but because the life of the race and of every member of it is his life, so that what He does the race does, and what He suffers the race suffers. On this theory no action or suffering of Christ in the place of the sinner as being other than himself is possible. The new-departure teaching is that man of himself does not and can not repent; but when Christ repents He represents the race, not as being other than himself, in whose stead He can act, but as being a constituent part of his own person, as

being the body of which He is the Head, and as containing his very life. But is such a repentance one of the "*personal* requisites" to, or conditions of, salvation, which must be fulfilled *personally* by the sinner, and not by another, according to the Andover Creed? To ask this question is to answer it. Every professor in this Seminary who teaches that the race repents in Christ, and may signify its penitence by pointing to Christ's repentance as its own perfect repentance, is teaching a doctrine which he has promised as under oath not to teach but to oppose.

The Vital Question.

We are prepared now to answer the vital question already raised: What does "Progressive Orthodoxy" mean by the phrases, "in Christ," "in union with Christ," "Christ in us," "the indwelling Christ," "the divine immanence"? The progressive professors tell us that "man of himself cannot repent," but "in Christ," "in union with Christ," because "Christ is in with the race," "immanent" in every human being, man *can* repent; and his repentance in this case is not imperfect, ineffective, unreal, and worthless, but complete, radical, revolutionary, and recuperative to the utmost degree. But if this be true, nothing can exceed the urgency of the question, What is this union of *man* — of every man, of the entire human race — with Christ?

1. This union is not oneness with Christ in character and conduct. Some members of the human race are Christlike, but all of them are not. Even the Andover progressives cannot claim that all men bear the image of the Lord Jesus, and manifest his mind and spirit; but they do claim that all men are "in Christ," and that Christ is in every man. The union to which they refer, therefore, cannot possibly be a oneness of all human beings with Christ in purity and righteousness, in spirit and conduct.

2. This alleged union of all mankind with Christ is not a connection with Him attained through the new birth. Indeed it is not *attained* at all. The theory is that it is coexistent with the being of man. The moment man begins to be, he is "*in Christ*" and Christ is *in him*. Moreover, the new birth of which the gospel speaks, and without which no man can enter the Kingdom of God, while it does bring those who experience it into the closest

and dearest relation to the Lord Jesus, is not experienced by all men, and therefore cannot be that union of the entire human race with Christ — or even the occasion of that union — which is set forth by "Progressive Orthodoxy" as "the central and vital principle of Christianity." The apostle Paul says: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." "Progressive Orthodoxy" represents that all men are "in Christ," but as it does not and can not add that every man is a "new creature," it evidently does not use the phrases "*in Christ*" and "*Christ in us*" in the same sense in which Paul used them. It must, then, use them in an unscriptural sense, whatever that sense may be.

3. Nor does this union of all men with Christ result from their repenting of sin and believing on Christ, for this simple reason, among others, that it *precedes* repentance and faith. According to "Progressive Orthodoxy," man must be "in Christ" in order that he *may be able* to repent. Of himself he cannot repent, but "*in Christ*" he can and does repent. This union of the race with Christ, whatever it is, does not result from repentance and faith, but repentance and faith result from this union. According to the Scriptures there *is* a blessed union of Christ with his disciples in which He dwells in them through their abiding love to Him, sympathy with Him, and faith in Him. But in this case, the love, sympathy, and faith precede the indwelling of Christ in his disciples and are the occasion of it: whereas the indwelling of Christ in *all* men, of which "Progressive Orthodoxy" speaks, precedes personal love, sympathy, and faith, and does not ensure them. Paul's prayer for the saints at Ephesus was, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." In this case Christian faith is represented as preceding the divine indwelling and as the condition of it. But the indwelling of Christ in all men, which "Progressive Orthodoxy" sets forth as a cardinal Christian doctrine, is represented as preceding personal faith in Christ, without in all cases, if in any case, making that faith actual. Such teaching is not simply unscriptural, but anti-scriptural; and, if anti-scriptural, it is also absolutely antagonistic to the Seminary Creed.

4. These phrases, "Christ in us," "Christ in with the race," "Christ immanent in all men," do not signify simply the omnipresence of Christ in the human family. The common belief

of our churches has been that He who became flesh was the Creator; that "without Him was not any thing made that was made"; and that He is everywhere present in his creation and beyond it, yet is himself other than the things and beings He has made. Some theologians have designated this universal divine presence in creation as the divine immanence. But evidently "Progressive Orthodoxy" does not regard the divine immanence as identical with the divine omnipresence. It never uses the one phrase as equivalent to the other.

Positive Answer to the Vital Question.

5. Our main question, therefore, is still pressing for an answer: What is this immanence of Christ in the human race, this union of all men with the Lord Jesus, which is represented to us as a transcendent verity in Christianity, and as a fundamental doctrine in "Progressive Orthodoxy"?

This union is defined only by the frequent use of two words. It is said to be "*organic*" and "*vital*." It is the organic and vital union of all human beings with the Lord Jesus. The Son of God is represented as having "an organic relation to the race," like that of Adam to his posterity, and like that between the head and members of the human body. It is such a solidarity of the human race in Christ that He and the race constitute, in some sense, one being, one person; so that what Christ does all men do: what Christ suffers all men suffer.

This union of every man with Christ is also declared to be *vital* as well as organic. What is meant by this, we repeat, is disclosed in the statement that Christ's

> universe is not attached to Him externally but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere.[1]

Of course, then, He is the life of every man. The Son of God is so identified with all men that his life and their life are one and the same life. This is essentially Pantheism. Thus this vaunted union of Christ and the human race turns out to be a pantheistic union, the identity of Christ and the human race, the solidarity of all men in Christ, constituting Him and them one being, so that what the Head does the members do.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 44.

When Christ suffers the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful the race is sorrowful. . . . The race may be conceived as approaching God, and signifying its penitence by pointing to Christ, and by giving expression in Him to repentance which no words could utter.[1]

Thus when Christ repents the race repents.

According to this pantheistic conception, all men, irrespective of their moral character, are one with Christ. It is a oneness in being, not in holiness. Most Christian people, if we are not mistaken, will be shocked at the idea that all members of the human race alike, the dead and the living, all the heathen and all Christians, the wicked and the righteous, the regenerate and the unregenerate, the penitent and the impenitent, are *in Christ, vitally* united to Him and *included in his person.* The conception seems blasphemous. It represents our adorable Lord as a horrible monstrosity. It is essentially a heathen notion, and the entertainment of it by a professor in a Christian Seminary dishonors his scholarship, if it does not impugn both his piety and his common sense. Yet such is the theory of the constitution of Christ's person and of his relation to the human race, now accepted and taught by professors in Andover Seminary.

Inconsistencies of the Andover Progressives.

True, they are not always consistent with themselves. Their writings abound in self-contradictions. For instance, they affirm that "man of himself cannot repent," yet talk of man's being "stirred to penitence," "moved to repentance," and declare that "under appropriate influences, he is *capable* of repenting," that is, *can* repent if he will. Thus they affirm and deny the same thing. Yet in spite of all their inconsistencies and absolute self-contradictions, the dominating theory of the progressive professors is that man cannot repent except through his organic and vital, that is, his pantheistic, union with Christ. Indeed, they themselves affirm that "Christ's personal relation to the human race as a whole and to every member of it" is "a central and vital principle of Christianity," and that they have committed themselves wholly to the guidance of that principle. Their inconsistencies are a contradiction of their fundamental principle.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 53.

Rellyanism.

In the next place, we propose to show that this central principle of "Progressive Orthodoxy," namely, the organic and vital union of the entire human race with Christ, is identically the central principle of that form of Universalism which the Founders of Andover Seminary had chiefly in mind when they put into their Statutes the requirement that every professor in their Seminary, to the end of time, should solemnly promise to oppose Universalism. In 1807, when Andover Seminary was founded, the only form of Universalism which had attracted much popular attention in New England was termed *Rellyanism*, it having been preached by one James Relly in London, England. It was first preached in this country by John Murray, who is called "the Father of Universalism in America." He was a loyal disciple of James Relly.

James Relly.

This progressive divine began to preach his new gospel in London near the middle of the last century. He was an unlearned man, yet he appears to have fascinated a certain class of people for a brief time by his rough and ready eloquence. The crowds rushed to hear him. He was the sensation of the day in London. He claimed to be the only man of advanced thought in his time, the only progressive theologian in that age of the world, and the first man who had preached the true gospel since the days of Christ and the apostles. The Wesleys and other evangelical preachers in England at that time opposed him strenuously, believing that the doctrines he proclaimed were hazardous to the souls of men.

John Murray.

Relly's most famous disciple, John Murray, came to this country in 1770. Both of these men at one time claimed to have been converted under the preaching of George Whitefield, but both abandoned the faith of that great preacher. Upon reaching this country, Murray began at once to preach the new gospel which he had learned from James Relly. Like his teacher he had received no training in the schools, but was of ready speech, and his style of preaching is said to have strikingly resembled that of his

master. He preached first in New Jersey. He was an impecunious man, and for several years obtained his support from evangelical Christians, concealing the fact that he was a Universalist. He adroitly worked his way into pulpits in all, or nearly all, the evangelical denominations, doing this sometimes during the temporary absence or the sickness of the pastors. His habit was to make missionary tours through the country, and to preach wherever and whenever he could obtain admission to a house of worship. In this way he preached from Maryland to Maine, producing division and discord in evangelical churches wherever he went. He became a notorious character. Dr. Ezra Stiles, at a later day President of Yale College, wrote a letter which was afterwards published, and in which he denounced Murray and warned Christian people against him. Murray was well known to the Founders of Andover Seminary. He married his wife in Salem, where John Norris, one of the Founders, resided. He preached repeatedly in Newburyport, where Dr. Samuel Spring, who wrote the Andover Creed, William Bartlet, and Moses Brown, two other Founders, resided. Murray, after rending asunder the Congregational church in Gloucester, Massachusetts, during the last sickness of its pastor, organized there a church of his own faith — the first Universalist church in this country. In 1793 he became pastor of the First Universalist Church in Boston, Massachusetts. He was preaching in Boston in 1807, the year Andover Seminary was founded. He continued to preach until 1810, and died in 1815.

John Murray was fond of theological debate. He had a long discussion with the famous theologian Dr. Samuel Hopkins while they were riding together on horseback. There is a record that he had a public debate with Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger, at New Haven, Connecticut. Murray published accounts of many of his private theological discussions, but it is significant that he never gave the world any account of his public discussion with Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger. Edwards, however, published a brief refutation of Rellyanism, in which he apologizes for troubling his readers with "remarks on such wild and confused mysticism — such horrid doctrine."[1] Dr. Nathanael Emmons also preached against the doctrines of Relly and

[1] Works of President Edwards, vol. i, p. 269.

Murray.[1] Dr. Emmons was a brother-in-law of Dr. Spring, and was repeatedly consulted by Dr. Spring when the latter was writing the Andover Creed. Certain phrases in this Creed beyond question are aimed against Rellyanism, and were designed to make it impossible that that particular form of Universalism, or any other form, should ever be taught in Andover Seminary.

"The New Theology" of the Last Century.

What now is Rellyanism? Its central and dominating principle is the dogma of the organic and vital *union* of the entire human race with Christ. Relly dwelt continually upon the constitution of the Person of Christ, and upon Christ's relation to the human race, representing that Christ is the life of every man, and that thus He is in *vital* union with all men, and that the entire race is included in his person. His principal theological treatise is entitled "Union," as it treats of Christ's union, or oneness, with the human race. The full title of this work is: "*Union:* or, *A Treatise* of the *Consanguinity* and *Affinity* between *Christ* and His *Church. By James Relly.* 1 Cor. xii. 12. *London, 1759.*"

"*The Church,*" in Relly's view, is the human race, or Adam and his posterity. Sometimes he designates mankind as "the people," but more usually as "*the Church.* At first Adam was "the Church"; yet he is considered as including all men in his person.

The Union of the Race with Christ.

Relly's notion of the union of all men with Christ may be set forth in a few quotations from his writings. For instance he illustrates this union by that of Adam and Eve.

As Eve Existed in Adam, so the Race Exists in Christ.

Thus [he says] were the *Twain* created in *one:* the *Woman* in her *Husband*, where they had *one* name given them; He called *their* name *Adam.* It was whilst they were in *this* condition, that the Lord God breathed into their nostrils the breath of Life; and Man became a living soul. It was whilst they were in *this* capacity, undistinguished in person, that the Lord God commanded Man. . . . Yea, it was whilst the Person of *Adam* was *plural*, as containing the Woman in Himself, that the Lord

[1] Sermon on the General Judgment, Emmons's Works, vol. v, p. 566. Edition of Crocker & Brewster, Boston, 1842.

God said unto them, '*be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it.*' . . . The *twain* were created in *one;* the woman in her Husband. Similar with *this*, the Church [the human race] existed in *Christ; according as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world.* . . . *Eve* when taken from *Adam* into a distinct consciousness of existence, was not less related unto him, than when she was only a Rib in his Side; as appears from *Adam's* testimony; she is *now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh.* In like manner, the *Church* when put forth in the creation of *Adam*, into a distinct personality from her *Head* and *Husband Christ*, was not less *united* to him, than when she only existed *in* him; which she did, before the earthly Man was created, or ever the worlds were made.[1]

Christ the Second Adam.

Again, speaking of the fall of Adam, and of the race in him, Relly says: —

Hence we gather, that *Adam* was not deceived in His own Person; but knowing what *Eve* had done, and seeing their ruin inevitable, He voluntarily put himself into her condition, by receiving the fruit from her hand, and eating thereof; such was his love unto his wife. And as they were not, (tho' distinct in person), without each the other in the Lord, *her* transgression extended unto *him:* and *His Union* unto *her* made it equitable, for the curse and condemnation of *her* folly, to fall upon *him;* and that without the consideration of *his* consent, and compliance with Her.

In like manner, *Christ* the *Husband* was not deceived: but his *Wife*, the *Church*, being deceived was in the transgression. Yet as the *Union* was such, that *Christ* was not without the *Church*, nor the *Church* without *him*, at any time, it was equitable for *her* Curse and Condemnation to fall upon *him*. . . . Moreover, the Scriptures affirm, that *by the offence of one, Judgment came upon all men, unto condemnation. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.* It is evident hence, that in *Adam's* offence, all offended; which supposes such a *Union* between *Adam* and his Offspring; that *his* sin was *their* sin; and *his* ruin *their* ruin; thus by *his* offence, were *they* made sinners; whilst *They* included in *him* were in Passivity, and He the active consciousness of the whole. . . . If it be granted, that there was such an *Union* between *Adam* and his *Offspring*, as rendered *his* sin *theirs;* why should it be thought a thing incredible, that the like *Union*, subsisting between *Jesus* and *his Seed*, renders *his* condition *theirs?* . . . This manifests such an *Union* to *him*, such an inclusion of the whole seed in *him*, as renders *his* condition *theirs*, in every state which he passes through; insomuch that *his* righteousness, with all the blessings and fruits thereof, is *theirs*, before they have known it, believed it, or ever were conscious of Existence.[2]

[1] Union, pp. 15–18, London edition, 1759. [2] Ibid. pp. 18–21.

Christ the Vine, All Men the Branches.

As another illustration of the nature of Christ's union with the human race, Relly takes and perverts our Lord's beautiful parable of The Vine and the Branches. Christ uses this similitude to set forth the relation of *his own disciples only* to himself. Relly uses it to set forth the relation of *all men* to Christ. Our Lord seeks, in this parable, to illustrate the close but *voluntary* relation which he desires his disciples to sustain to himself. He exhorts them to abide in him, and depicts the terrible consequences to *them* in case they should not, of their own choice and action, abide in him. Relly seeks by the same parable to illustrate the *involuntary* and *necessary* relation which all men do actually sustain to Christ even in their own passivity, or irrospective of their own choice and action. Speaking of the vine, Relly says: —

When the *Stock*, or *Set*, is first planted, there are no *Branches* thereon; but nevertheless, the Husbandman, knowing its seed to be in itself, planteth in hope; being well assured of its putting forth its *Branches*, and bearing fruit thereon in due season. All his skill, care and sufficiency standing ingaged for the same.

Thus *Jesus*, when first planted by the Father's hand, as the first, and only Begotten, Chosen, and Beloved, was as the *Stock* or *Set*, whose *Branches* doth not appear. But having *then* his seed in himself, he was to put them forth in his *Branches* in due season; according to the appointment, and foreknowledge of the Great Husbandman: His Wisdom, Power, Care, and All-sufficiency, standing ingaged for the same. As the *Stem*, and *Branches*, make one Tree, so *Jesus*, and the People [the human race] make one Body, one Man, one *Christ*, one Elect, one Beloved of the Father, one crucified, raised, and everliving. The *Stock* and *Branches*, making one Tree, grow in one soil: so *Christ* and the People, are jointly rooted, and grounded, in the Father's Love: *And hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Heirs of God and Joint-Heirs with Christ:* Standing with *Him*, in the same relation to the Divine Majesty. . . . The Root and Branches making one Tree, have but one and the same Life, Sap, and Fruitfulness. So *Christ* and the People have both one, and the same eternal Life: *God hath given us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son.* Therefore the Saviour saith, *because I live, ye shall live also.* They have also the same Fruit, for the fruit is not of the branches distinct from the stem, nor of the stem without the branches. So also is *Christ*, who says, *from me is thy Fruit found.* [Hesea 14:8.]

In brief, if Jesus meant to teach us the *Union* subsisting between himself and his *Church* under the similitude of the Vine and its Branches, which he certainly did: *Then*, whatever *can* be said of the oneness of

the Tree, consisting of Stock and Branches, as a Figure, *can*, with *much* more propriety, be said of Christ and the people united, as the Thing signified. The date of that *Union* which the Branches hath to the stem, is equal to their existence: Yea, as considered in the stock, the *Union* which made them one therewith was before they had any apparent existence. And, though the Vine-stock in *itself* may have the most fruitful qualities; yet it cannot exhibit the same, by bringing forth Fruit to perfection, except it first put forth its proper Branches: Therefore the existence of the Branches, yea the *Union* thereof to the Stem, and their Life therein, is *before*, yea necessarily *antecedent* to all their fruitful productions. So also is *Christ;* our *Union* to him bearing a superior Date to our apparent, personal existence. Therefore, said to be *chosen in Him*, and to have *grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began*. . . . In order to their fruitfulness, the Branches were purged in the Vine: There the superfluities of the whole were cut off, and all necessary for their perpetual fruitfulness accomplished. In like manner, the Church [all men] included in *Christ*, were purged *in him*, in order to their fruitfulness. . . . The Vine thus purged, brings its fruit upon the native Branches: having no other medium of bringing it forth. Thus *Christ* brought forth all the fruit of his pure conception, his spotless birth, his circumcision, and holy Life, his bloody, shameful and terrible Death, his glorious resurrection and ascension, upon the people, as the Branches. Having taken on him the seed of *Abraham*, *he* in *them*, and *they* in *him*, fulfilled all righteousness, obeyed the Law, and endured the penalty for the past transgression, being thus made perfect in one. And because in all this the people were in passivity, and Christ the active consciousness, and quickening spirit of the whole; therefore saith the Prophet, *Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us, for thou also hast wrought all our works in us.*[1]

The Human Race the Body of Christ.

The illustration which Relly and his followers used oftener, perhaps, than any other, to indicate their idea of the union of all men with Christ, was that of the oneness of the head and members in the human body. One of their favorite Scriptures was: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many are one body, so also is Christ." Upon this Scripture Relly remarks: —

The compleat Body here spoken of is similar to *Christ*, and the Members which fill up this Body to the people. Take away the members, and there will remain no body; take a *few*, yea *one only* away, and the body is not perfect; deny the proportionable perfection of any one of

[1] Union, pp. 29–33.

these members, and then the Symmetry of the Body is destroyed. So also is Christ; take away the people [all the members of the human race], or deny that they were united to their Head *Jesus* at some certain time, then was there at that time no *Christ:* Or, if all the Church [the entire race] were not united to Him, but some particular member, or members, stood at any time unrelated to him; then was he not a *perfect Christ* at that time: Or, if it is possible that a bone of that Body should be broken, or a member be cut off, then may he yet be rendered an imperfect *Christ:* and withall a deficiency in his power will appear. . . . Or, if this *Church* [the race], as united to *Christ*, is not perfect according to the perfection of beauty, in Righteousness, Holyness, Wisdom; &c. then is Christ deficient in those particulars: Which to affirm, will be agreed by all his worshipers, to be blasphemy. From hence we may infer, that whatever Jesus was, whatever he *did*, *suffered*, or *now is*, under the Character *Christ*, the people, as the *fullness of him who filleth all in all*, are not excluded; but to be considered *with him*, and *in him*, in the same circumstances, and condition, through every dispensation. . . . This leads us to the consideration of the human Body, as the intelligible figure of this sublimity, our *Union* with Christ. The Head and Members are one in conception: This represents the people's *oneness* with *Christ*, as the object of the Father's love. *Thou hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.* As the Head and the Members are born at once: so *Christ* and his *Church* [the race] were united in his Birth; as pure, and free from the original Taint. And also in his glorious resurrection, as born from the Dead. . . . As the *Head* and *Members* in one Body have but one Life; so *Christ* and his *Church* [the race] have but one eternal Life, one Life unto God; our eternal life is in *Christ.*[1]

He [Christ], as having the People in Himself, had the right of redemption, and *as* them stood engaged to fulfill every requisite, to the glory of God, and their eternal salvation: which requisites were *first* a holy principle, a privation of original guilt, fulfilled in his Birth; a just observance of the Law, and conformity to the Divine nature, fulfilled in his Life; and a full propitiation for the sin that was past, accomplished in his sufferings and Death. The whole of which He did; as containing the People in Himself, who are upon that account, not only represented as being *in Him*, in his Birth, as above; but also in the whole of his life, death, and resurrection. In him were they circumcised, and the body of the sins of their flesh put off by the circumcision of *Christ.* In him fulfilling the Law, and walking in all the ordinances of God blameless. Crucified with him; and that the resurrection of *Christ* was the resurrection of the people from Death, as the wages of sin, the Holy Ghost testifies by the prophets. . . . From hence it is evident, that the *union* between *Christ*, and the *People*, was such (as Head and Members in one Body) that they were *with Him*, and *in Him*, in his Birth, his Life, his Death, Resurrection and Glory. Therefore *his* Sufferings,

[1] Union, pp. 34, 35.

Wars, and Triumphs, all are *theirs:* And they have a right from this, to rejoice in Him; in what *He has done*, in *what He is;* and in the acceptance *He* hath found with the Father; and that, over all the weakness, and vanity, they perceive in themselves.[1]

This Vital Union of all Men with Christ Precedes Personal Holiness.

Relly taught that all men are vitally united to Christ irrespective of any act on their part and *before* they repent of their sins or believe on Christ. He says: —

But if what I have already offered to the consideration of the publick shall be allowed to have any weight, or argumentative force; it will appear, that our Union with *Christ* is not only antecedent to our Faith and believing, but also to all that *he* did, and suffered for us men and for our salvation.[2]

But to be brief, what hath already been urged to prove the necessity of *Union*, proves it to be also before faith; it being necessary unto the Father's loving *us*, as he loved the *Son*, yea unto his choice of us in his son; necessary unto the engagements of *Christ* on man's behalf, otherwise he had not the right of redemption; necessary unto his suffering the Death of the Cross for us, as hath been largely shown in the former part of this work.[3]

The Race in Christ from All Eternity.

Therefore if it is true, that *Jesus* was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification, and that before our Faith; that which was necessary unto this transaction, namely our *Union* with him, is true also before faith. If it is not our faith, or believing, that makes this *Union*, then it is an act of eternal Love, the *purpose*, *and grace*, *which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began;* The Antiquity of which is obvious, nor may its Date be fixed, because exceeding the Limits of Time. And what hath been from everlasting, will be unto everlasting, the eternal sameness of the person of *Jesus* being an undeniable proof of the unchangeableness of this *Union*. . . . If the *Union* of *Christ* and the *Church*, is dependent on *her* faith, and knowledge of him, then it is proportioned unto her faith; and admits of degrees, is also subject to change, yea may possibly be dissolved: . . . From all which it appears, that the *Union* of *Christ* and his Church [the race] hath been of *old*, before Faith, before Time: and remains to be indissolvable, and unchangeable.[4]

All Impenitent Sinners are What Christ is.

Our right and priviledge is to Judge of ourselves and our state towards God, by Union with Christ: By the Father's choice of *him*, *His* choice of

[1] Union, pp. 41, 42. [2] Ibid. p. 51. [3] Ibid. pp. 54, 55. [4] Ibid. pp. 58, 59, 60.

us; by his love to *him*, his love unto *us;* by his acceptance of *him*, his acceptance of *us;* by *his* eternal life and glory, *our* eternal life and glory: and all this without considering the work of our hands, or the desires, yearnings, or meditations of our Hearts. . . . But unto all the Gentiles, the outcasts, the destitute, the Sinners amongst Mankind; with all who know themselves, and groan beneath the miscries of man; Here are tidings of great Joy: there is a Saviour born unto you, a Saviour who is *Christ* the Lord; and what is more, tho' *you* are worthless, He is worthy; though you are lost, He is found; though you are unrighteous, unholy, unwise, yet He is Righteous, Holy, Wise; and withall, so nearly related, so closely united unto you, that you may Reckon yourselves to be what *he* is, and viewing *him* as *yourselves* through all He did, and suffered, have your conscience purged from Dead works; stand washed, and acquitted in his Bloody Death, and have the answer of a good conscience towards God, by his resurrection.[1]

Personal Repentance, Faith, and Holiness of No Account.

It is the Scripture testimony of *Jesus*, what *he* is, and what *He* hath done, and suffered, that is the ground of our confidence; and not the reflection that *we* repent, believe, or obey; and it is most certain that this ground remaineth, that This foundation is unshaken, For *Jesus Christ is the same Yesterday, To-day, and forever;* and that *our* unbelief, or any change passing over *us* in ourselves, cannot alter him who is unchangeable, and always Righteous and accepted. In him we are always as he is, according to which similitude God always beholds us, and accepts us; therefore, our change of frame or disposition cannot change His views of us; For, as he only beholds us *in Jesus*, He can always say, that he *beholds no iniquity in* Jacob, *nor perverseness in* Israel. . . . Salvation and Perfection in *Jesus Christ* our Lord, by Union with Him, is that glorious Truth, which first authorizes, encourages, and influences to believe, and that which preserves us spotless and acceptable unto God, when we fail to believe and credit his testimony.[2]

Man of Himself cannot do what God Requires of Him.

Relly held that man of himself has no power to obey the commands of either the law or the gospel. The exhortations of Christ and the apostles, urging men to repent of their sins and believe on Christ for forgiveness, justification, and salvation, were regarded by Relly as parts of the divine law, and he taught that man is utterly incapable of conforming to such exhortations. To the question, Why, then, is obedience to the law and the gospel required of men? Relly answers: —

[1] Union, pp. 90, 91. [2] Ibid. pp. 96, 97.

The Scriptures do not require this of man, as supposing him capable of it; for the coming of Jesus Christ into the world to save sinners proves the contrary: the law was given that the offence might abound, and the commandment took place that man might die. It was to distinguish to man, between good and evil, and to make him sensible that he could not perform the good; to prepare the way of the Lord, by proving the necessity and utility of the Saviour's appearance, as the fulfiller of all righteousness, that the law took place: but Christ being come in the flesh, and having fulfilled all, In us and For us, his virtue and glory is ours, and we are taught to reckon by him, and not by the work of our own hands.[1]

Speaking of our relation to the law given in the Old Testament, Relly affirms that we

cannot personally fulfil its precepts, forasmuch as we are not under it.

And he adds: —

The law, in the New Testament, is made to detect, expose, and censure all human righteousness; and that it doth continually, lest at any time the Christian man, forgetting the hole of the pit from whence he was digged, and the rock from whence he was hewn, should grow wise in his own eyes, and holy in his own conceit.[2]

Style of Writing.

Relly's antique and uncouth style of writing, his abundant use of italics and capital letters, with his bad grammar and spelling, and his frequent use of words and phrases in other than their usual and true sense, are at first quite confusing to the reader. But after a careful examination of a few pages of any of his writings his meaning is much less obscure. If his purpose was to abate the odiousness of some of his doctrines by attaching to certain familiar words a new meaning, he was not successful. His pantheistic Universalism is poorly concealed by his using the word "church" to designate the human race, the word "people" to designate all men, and the scriptural phrase, "in Christ," to designate, not a voluntary union to Christ in quenchless love and sympathy, in undying faith and service, but an involuntary and necessary union, and even *identity* of every man with Christ *in essence of being*. However, of this vicious and dishonest practice of using familiar religious terms and phrases after one has

[1] True Christian Baptism, p. 74. [2] Ibid. p. 75.

emptied them of all the meaning they have had, Relly was not more guilty than are the new-departure men of to-day. Indeed, the obscurity in the Rellyan writings of a century and more ago, so far as it arose from this unscholarly and indefensible practice, is not so great as is that arising from the same source in the writings of the modern progressives at Andover. The old Rellyan progressives, like their lineal descendants of our time, never defined a theological term, phrase, or doctrine. Still no candid person at all versed in the science of theology can read the theological writings of James Relly and carefully compare them with those of the progressive divines at Andover, and not admit that the two theologies, though bearing different names, are at their very centre and core and in nearly all their development absolutely the same.

"Progressive Orthodoxy" is Rellyan Universalism.

1. The above quotations from James Relly abundantly show that, in his belief, Christ is not simply *present* with all men, nor is He united to all men through their faith in Him, but He exists in organic and vital union with every member of the human race. This is the one radical and regnant principle in Rellyanism. But it is also, according to the confession of the Andover progressives, the radical and regnant principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy."

Christ the Life of All Men.

2. Relly teaches that Christ exists in union with the entire human race by being the *life* of every man. But this is a central and indispensable dogma in "Progressive Orthodoxy," which affirms that Christ's "universe is not attached to him externally, but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere." Of course, then, he is the life of every man.

The Race-union with Christ Involuntary.

3. Rellyanism holds that all men are united to Christ, not *voluntarily*, or of their own choice through faith, but in the very constitution and essence of their being, and therefore *involuntarily* and of absolute necessity, so far as their own wills are concerned. But this too is one of the fundamental beliefs set forth

by "Progressive Orthodoxy," which declares that "the race" — not some men, but "the race is reconstituted in Christ," and that consequently it now contains powers for repentance and holiness, which — without its being "reconstituted in Christ" — "it would be hopelessly destitute of."

Christ and the Race One Person.

4. It is a primary doctrine of Rellyanism that Christ is *in all men*, and that all men are *in Christ* in such a way that together they constitute a single personality, "one person." Relly says:

> We are taught in the scriptures that our Lord Jesus Christ is not only our friend, our benefactor, our kinsman, our brother, *but ourselves* [the italics ours]: one flesh, one blood, one spirit with us: the people, as many, make one Christ; as the members, being many, make one body. Christ and the church are considered in the scriptures, throughout the whole of his undertakings and attainments, as but *one person* [italics ours]; in the articles of his sufferings and death as the guilty sinner, whose soul was doomed to die; and in his resurrection, as the righteous, the sanctified, made perfect through sufferings. Jesus being thus made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; He being the New-Creature, the perfect Man, not only for Himself, but for the people: . . . from hence we have an undoubted right, to consider him as our New-Man; and to deny every self, in our appeal to the Highest, but Him who is our perfect self.[1]

But this oneness in personality of Christ and the human race is likewise a central and vital doctrine in "Progressive Orthodoxy," which dwells much upon Christ's person as *vitally* attached to, and containing in itself, the entire human race, and which declares of Christ that He is "the universal man," "the universal Person."[2] The doctrine of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is that Christ, wherever He is and whatever He does, even when lifted upon the cross, includes in his personality all men who ever did or ever will exist. Its language is: —

> No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself.[3]

What Christ Is and Does, the Race Is and Does.

5. It is the repeated affirmation of James Relly that Christ and all men are so united and included in one person that his condition and acts are theirs, and that their condition and acts are

[1] The True Christian Baptism, p. 98. [2] Prog. Orth. pp. 53, 63. [3] Ibid. p. 66.

his, and that this is true irrespective of their character as sinful or holy. According to this teaching, the most wicked men in the race, even when persisting in their wickedness, are so vitally united to Christ that all his holy experiences and works are theirs.

But this is also the teaching of "Progressive Orthodoxy." We are told that "When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful the race is sorrowful"; that the *race* can signify *its* penitence "by pointing to Christ, and by giving expression *in Him* to *repentance* which no words could utter." (Italics ours.) That is, when Christ is sorrowful in view of the sins of the human race, the race is sorrowful in Christ's sorrow. Christ in sorrowing for all the sins of the race is repenting of them. But what Christ does the race does. When Christ repents, the race repents. How a *sinless* being can repent of sins, we are not told. But all the same, this is "Progressive Orthodoxy." And "Progressive Orthodoxy" is Rellyanism. And Rellyanism is Universalism as well as Pantheism — the very kind of Universalism which the Founders of Andover Seminary had in mind when they wrote their Statute requiring that every professor on their Foundation, to the end of time, should solemnly promise to oppose Universalism.

Personal Obedience and Holiness not Conditions of Vital Union with Christ.

6. According to Rellyanism, this organic and vital union of Christ with all men *precedes* the repentance and faith of men. Indeed it exists, as already shown, irrespective of their own moral and religious character. The most wicked, as well as the most righteous, men are *in Christ*, as a constituent part of his Person, *before* they repent of their sins, or believe on him, or even know of his existence. This is a cardinal Rellyan doctrine.

But it is also a cardinal doctrine of "Progressive Orthodoxy." The belief of the Andover progressives is that repentance and faith are impossible without this union, and that the union itself is a oneness of all men with Christ, not in character but in essence of being, and of course precedes all personal obedience and holiness. But they are slow to reason from this belief as a premise. They have not yet told us how old this union is. It exists before repentance; but how long before? The progressiveness

of these professors is their standing boast. They are nothing if they are not progressive. Yet, in truth, they are at least a century and a half behind the times. The unlearned Relly, in the middle of the last century, taking this same principle of the organic and vital union of all men with Christ as a premise, reasoned from it with a vigor and boldness, and reached legitimate conclusions with a swiftness which should put to shame the drowsy and tardy progressives at Andover. He argued that if the very essence and life of Christ's being are constituent parts of every man's being, then every man's union with Christ was not simply before repentance and faith, but also before time; indeed, was "from everlasting," and "will be unto everlasting," "indissolvable and unchangeable." Every man, therefore, has been a constituent part of the being of Christ through all past eternity, and will be such through all the eternity that is to come. We repeat, the progressives at Andover have for years accepted the identical premise from which Relly deduced the truth of every man's existence in Christ from all eternity, and it is not to the credit of their scholarship that an unlettered man one hundred and fifty years ago reached such a legitimate and grand conclusion, while they, with their superior scholastic advantages have not reached it yet. It should be remembered, however, that the men of advanced thought at Andover are, by force of circumstances, lingering long in a transition state. If they retain their comfortable positions in a well-endowed Seminary, they must keep themselves in some kind of connection with the Seminary Creed. So they are attempting the impossible feat of standing with one foot on the permanent Andover Creed, and the other foot on their own ever-changing Orthodoxy. But the exhibition they are making of themselves in this attempted theological straddle is as ridiculous as it is unscholarly. If they would only found a Seminary of their own, for the express and sublime purpose of recovering the old pagan Pantheism of ancient Greece and India, and of adjusting Christianity to that Pantheism after the manner adopted by James Relly, they would make much swifter progress than they have yet made, and although it would be backward towards heathenism, they would be guilty of no perversion of trust funds, and in this particular at least would stand before God and the world as honest men.

Man Repents only in Union with Christ.

7. Rellyanism teaches, as has been clearly set forth in one of the quotations made above from James Relly, that while man of himself cannot repent, nor obey any of the commands of the gospel, yet in organic and vital union with Christ, and as a constituent part of his very person, he can and does repent. As every man is literally and constitutionally "*in Christ*," when Christ is sorrowful for the sins of the world every man is sorrowful, though Christ is active in and conscious of this sorrow, and man is passive in and unconscious of it. When Christ, in the days of his flesh, offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, He repented of the sins of the whole race; and when He thus repented, the race, which was passively and unconsciously *in Him*, repented also. Such is the teaching of Rellyanism.

Such also is the teaching of "Progressive Orthodoxy." The latter affirms that "man of himself cannot repent," but "when Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful." The Andover progressives refer approvingly to McLeod Campbell's wild theory of race-repentance in Christ's repentance, and they boldly declare that "The entire race . . . renders in Him [Christ] a complete repentance." It hardly needs to be again repeated that this belief and this teaching of James Relly and of the Andover professors are in outright antagonism to the Andover Creed, which affirms, "that man has understanding and corporeal strength [full mental and bodily ability] to do all that God requires of him; so that nothing, but the sinner's aversion to holiness, prevents his salvation." Never, within the range of our knowledge, has there been a more glaring and undeniable violation of sacred engagements than that of which those Andover professors are guilty, who have maintained and inculcated, on Andover Foundations, the pantheistic Universalism which is inseparable from their own and James Relly's theory of repentance.

John Murray's Rellyanism.

We now call the attention of the Board of Visitors to the fact that John Murray, "the father of Universalism in America," who, as we have shown, was well known to the Founders of Andover Seminary, and with whose singular and divisive theological

beliefs the Founders were perfectly familiar, was himself a thoroughgoing Rellyanist. He accepted and preached the Universalistic and pantheistic beliefs of James Relly without abatement, and also without addition, save as he may have exceeded his teacher in the violent wresting of Scripture and in the adroit concealment of his Universalism when his personal interests or success required it. The central and essential principle in his theology, as in that of Relly and in "Progressive Orthodoxy," is the organic and vital union of the entire human race with Christ. All his development and applications of this principle were thoroughly Rellyan, and in full accord with recent progressive teachings at Andover. A few citations from the writings of John Murray will make the truth of these statements evident.

The Life of Christ and of Man One Life.

Speaking of the one life that is common to Christ and to all men, Murray passionately exclaims: —

> Yea, were every man in the world to unite in their testimony against this truth, viz. that God hath given *me*, and *every man*, *life*, *and that this life is in his son*, I would still say, *Let God be true and every man a liar*.[1]

"Again," Murray remarks, "if the people had not been *in him* [Christ], in all he wrought, they could not be the righteousness of God *in him*, nor could he, according to justice, be the *life* of the *world;* for neither the world in general, nor any individual of the world, can be the subject of life, according to the rule of divine truth and justice, without that righteousness which alone gives a legal title thereto. If, saith divine truth, thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments; this is according to the Law, — and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of the Law shall pass unfulfilled. . . . Hence then, *he* [Christ] *is the life of the world* in *consequence* of the *union subsisting between him and the people*, as exemplified under the figure of the *head* and the *members* of which the Spirit spake, when by the Apostle he said, *I would not have you ignorant that the head of every man is Christ.* Now, as in nature what is done by the head is with spirit, justice and propriety said to be done by the *whole man*, so what was done by *Jesus* as *every man's head*, made under the Law, is according to strict justice in God's sight considered as *done by every man.* The revelation of this is indeed glad tidings to *every* creature."[2]

This fanciful doctrine, that whatever Christ does or suffers as the Head, the race, as the body of Christ, also does and suffers,

[1] Letters and Sketches of Sermons, by John Murray, vol. 1, p. 46. [2] Universalism in America, by Richard Eddy, D.D., vol. 1, p. 487.

it will be observed, is the exact doctrine set forth by James Relly and by "Progressive Orthodoxy." This dogma is grounded upon the belief that Christ and the race constitute one person, and *this* belief is grounded upon the pantheistic notion that the *life* of Christ and the world, and of all men, is *one and the same life*. Hence Murray held that Christ is "the *only* life of the world," and "of every individual in it." In his view there is but one Life. Its source is in the Lord Jesus, but it pervades *the world*. It is, however, the oneness of this Life in *Christ and in all men* upon which he chiefly and most exultingly dwells. In his belief, Christ and the human race, in some real sense, constitute one person, having one life. Christ in his personality is not complete without the race, and the race is not complete without Christ. Hence Christ is "the fulness" or completion of the race; and the race is "the fulness" or completion of Christ. He often designates the entire human race as "the human nature," and sometimes as "the nature." His idea of this vital union of all men with Christ he often sets forth by the illustration of the living union of the human body with its head, as in the following language: —

> I would not, said the Apostle Paul, have you ignorant of this: Of what? that the head of every man is Christ, lest you should be wise in your own conceit. Now if Jesus be the head and the fulness of the nature he assumed, and we are his body, then the body is safe; for although the waters of the adversary ascended *to the neck*, they could reach no farther. It is notorious that if the whole man be immersed in water, even to the neck, if the head be held above water, life is preserved. But reverse the figure, let the head be enveloped in water, and death is the certain consequence. Thus, blessed be God, Jesus is the life, is the head of every man, the life of the whole body. Your life is hid with Christ in God.[1]
>
> God is manifested in the flesh, and, thus manifested, he is, in deed and in truth, the life of the world, so that it is impossible to know God, and not to know my life. Moreover, I have life precisely in the way that the blinded children of this world would find it if they could, that is, by *keeping the law;* for, said the great Master, I come not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. Now he did, or he did not fulfil the law. If he did, *I also have fulfilled the law*, for the head of every man is Christ: and whatever is done by my head is assuredly done by my whole body.[2]

[1] Letters and Sketches of Sermons, vol. ii, p. 187. [2] Ibid. vol. ii, pp. 368, 369.

Man of Himself Cannot Repent.

In this last citation Murray intimates that the blinded children of this world would obtain life by personally keeping the law "*if they could.*" This implies, that, in his view, man of himself cannot obey God. Upon the question of man's personal ability to do what God requires of him, his teaching is in perfect accord with that of Relly and that of "Progressive Orthodoxy." He held that man of himself has no power of any kind to obey the commands either of the divine law or of the gospel, but that Christ's union with every man is such that when Christ keeps the decalogue, every man keeps it; when Christ repents, every man repents; and when Christ believes, every man believes.

The Union of Every Man with Christ is from Everlasting.

Murray also accords with Relly in believing that every man was united to Christ, or to God in Christ, not only before repentance and faith, but before time, even from everlasting. The following is believed to be a correct statement of Murray's belief upon this point, and in several other particulars: —

He believed that the creation of human beings made a part of the divine purpose; in which sacred, uncontrollable, and irreversible purpose, the *whole family of man* were originally and intimately united to their august Creator, in a manner MYSTERIOUS, and as much beyond our limited conception, as the Creator is superior to the creature whom He hath formed.

Adam the first was a figure of Adam the second. Adam the first, the prototype; Adam the second, the substance of the prototype, the Creator of all Worlds, the Lord from Heaven. The sacred Scriptures abound with figures of this mysterious, this ennobling, this soul-satisfying *Union;* among which, perhaps, none is more expressive than that of the *Head* and *Members* constituting one body, of which Jesus Christ was the immaculate Head. . . . We are members of the body of Christ, *who is the head of every man.* Should a single member of this mystical body be finally lost, the Redeemer must, through eternity, remain IMPERFECT.

A Law was given, to the complete obedience of which, everlasting life was annexed; but no *individual member* was ever able to fulfil this Law; it was only the head and members *collectively in their glorious head,* that was furnished with abilities adequate to a performance of such vast magnitude. Yea, verily, *we* do indeed break the Divine Law, in thought, in word, and in deed, and the lip of truth declares, he who offends in one point is guilty of all.

Why then was the commandment so exceeding broad? To convince mankind of imbecility; and that the rectitude they had forfeited, could never, in their own individual characters be regained. But the plan of Deity was without an error, the revolution of time ushered in the great Representative, or more properly speaking, the *Head* of the body; and the forfeit was paid, full atonement was presented, the ransom given, and, in this hour of NATURE'S JUBILEE, the prodigal family restored to their original possessions.[1]

THE IDENTITY OF CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE WITH THAT OF EVERY MAN.

Moreover, Murray taught that Christ's human nature was not simply that of his own single and distinct personality, but was the human nature of every man, and that consequently every child of Adam has a right to regard Christ's human nature as identically his own, and his own as identically that of Christ. In proof of his view, he cites the Scripture so often repeated by him, "The head of every man is Christ." (1 Cor. 11:3.) But beyond question, the Apostle means by "every man," not every member of the human race, but simply *every Christian man.* Yet Murray presumes to set forth and establish, on the authority of this Scripture thus wrested, his pantheistic scheme of the absolute numerical oneness of Christ's human nature with the human nature of every child of Adam. His language is as follows: —

That human nature, in which the Divine Nature condescended to be clothed, was not distinct from the rest as one body is from another. No, assuredly no; the clothing of the Redeemer in this body, was the giving him a part of that flesh in which the children, all the children were clothed. Hence the character bestowed upon, and received by Emmanuel. The head of every man is Christ. . . . Now my head is as much a part of one part of my body as the other; and it is in as perfect union with my feet as my hands; it is as much the life of one member as of another. . . . The human nature of Emmanuel is part of every child's flesh; and every human soul inhabiting a tenement of flesh has as much right to lift his adoring eye to Jesus Christ, as a part of himself, as any member of my body might, if it had sense in itself, claim, my head as a part of itself. Jesus is not flesh and bone, distinct from our flesh and bone, but he is flesh *of* our flesh, and bone *of* our bone. For both he who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified *are all of one.* And this is at all times the comprehensive character of the Redeemer,

[1] The Life of Rev. John Murray, edited by Rev. L. S. Everett, p. 265.

insomuch that when he was born without sin, we were in that eventful moment created anew in Christ Jesus; when he was crucified, we were crucified with Christ Jesus; when he died we were buried by baptism into his death; and when he arose [were] raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so that we also should walk in newness of life. . . . And we ascended with Christ, being heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.[1]

We Ourselves are Christ.

Murray also says: —

When we behold Christ Jesus, we behold ourselves, for he is the head of every man. In him dwelleth all fulness. In Christ Jesus, both Jew and Gentile constitute one new man. In one word, it is in Christ Jesus, that all things are made new.[2]

Every Man a Son of God in the Sense that Christ is.

Murray taught that all men are sons of God, not because they have been born of God, or have been renewed in the spirit of their minds, but because they are all so vitally united to the Son of God that they partake, in the very essence of their being, of his divine sonship. He says: —

The *christian* is not to consider himself *alone* when he addresses the throne of grace. He is not to say *my* Father, but, as we have the adoption of sons by Christ Jesus, we should ever keep in devout and grateful recollections this mighty blessing, this mysterious union, especially when addressing the divine Nature, the Sire of angels and of men, the creating God. . . . God doth not become our Father consequent upon our supplications. Certainly not; he was our Father before a single cry of distress passed our supplicating lips; and why? because he *was* and *is* the *Father of Christ Jesus;* and as the head of *every man is Christ*, and the head of Christ *is God*, so *every man* is allowed to view himself as a member of his glorious body. . . . Hence although as descended from the first Adam, we are from *beneath*, yet as *allied* to the second Adam we are from *above*.[3]

Man's Supreme Need is to "Know Christ as He is."

Murray eschewed evangelical repentance and faith. He never called on men to repent of their sins or to believe on Christ as a condition of their forgiveness, justification, and salvation from sin and eternal death. In his view men are utterly powerless to

[1] Murray's Letters and Sketches, vol. i, p. 255. [2] Ibid. vol. iii, p. 120. [3] Ibid. vol. iii, pp. 203, 204.

conform to such requirements. Moreover, they have already repented in Christ's perfect repentance, and believed in Christ's perfect faith, and therefore are already forgiven and redeemed from sin and death. But the great mass of men do not *know* this. They do not *believe* it. They are living in utter ignorance and unbelief respecting the true gospel and the true Christ. Consequently Murray continually insisted upon the indispensableness of *knowing* Christ, of hearing of Him, of learning of Him, and of being taught of God respecting Him. But what is this "knowledge of Christ" which is so indispensable? It is the knowledge of Him in the constitution of his person, as vitally united to the human race and to every member of it, as including all men in himself. In other words it is the knowledge of *Rellyanism* that is of such infinite moment. To know Christ *as He is* in the constitution of his person, as including the entire human race in his being — *this* is the true knowledge of Christ without which there is no blessedness. All men, with or without this knowledge, are redeemed and can no more be lost than Christ can be lost; for they exist in the very constitution of his person. But when they are ignorant of all this they often live in remorse and terror. What they supremely need, therefore, is not personal sorrow for their sins, nor personal faith, nor personal righteousness, but a certain kind of *knowledge*. When they hear and learn of their identity with Christ and with God in Christ, and *know* that Christ is their life, that He is so in them and they so in Him that what He is they are, and what He does they do, irrespective of their own moral character and lives — when they *know* and *believe* all this, then they are delivered from all their fears and forebodings and are filled with peace and the larger hope. Murray taught that it is of the utmost moment that men should *believe;* — but believe what? Believe *Rellyanism;* believe that all men are *in Christ*, that He is their life, and that they can no more perish than Christ can perish, do what they will. Believing this men are saved from all present anxiety and torment, whatever may be their moral character and lives. Murray made a distinction between redemption and salvation. All men are *redeemed* from the death eternal by their vital and deathless union with Christ. But only those are *saved* from "a certain fearful looking for of judgment" to come, who have "knowledge of Christ," who know him as *He*

is, as vitally and eternally united to every human being and as including all men in himself. This knowledge does not save from sin, but only from the fear of punishment. It was also held by Murray, as by Relly and the Andover progressives, that all men will have this saving knowledge *in due time*, if not in this life, then in the next life. In proof of these statements we present a few quotations from Murray's writings. He says: —

Jesus Christ is now, and forever will be, the life of the world, which divine truth will, *in due time* be testified, for it is written, They shall all be taught of God; and when they are all taught of God, they shall know him; and when they know him, they shall believe in him; and when they believe in him, they shall be saved from the misery which is consequent upon unbelief.[1]

As many as have the light of the knowledge of the glorious gospel shining into their hearts are wise; they have the knowledge of those things which make for their peace, and they enter in, and find rest and peace to their souls; and as many as have not this light are foolish, they know not the things which make for their peace, and therefore cannot enter in either to rest or peace. But it is written, they shall be all taught of God, and they shall know him from the least of them unto the greatest of them.[2]

Is the sinner miserable, from the knowledge of his unrighteousness, when he is told, the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven? He is saved from this misery the moment he hears and *believes* that the name whereby the Redeemer shall be called, is "*the Lord our righteousness.*" Is he convinced that without holiness no man can see the Lord, and that if he regards iniquity in his heart, the Lord will not hear him? Is his soul distressed in consequence thereof? . . . When the gospel is preached to him, assuring him that *Jesus is made unto him sanctification*, that this great High Priest wears on his head for us *holiness to the Lord*, and that we are authorized to view that head, thus adorned, as our head, hearing that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God; — when these divine gospel truths are heard and believed, he is completely saved from condemnation or damnation.[3]

It is a blessed thing to know God. We are told it is life eternal to know God, but certainly it is not life eternal to know God, except we know God as *he is*, the life of the world. It is a blessed thing to know God in this character, for in knowing him to be the life of the world, each individual of the world, who thus knows him, knows him to be his life, and each individual thus taught can say of himself, God is my life, and he whom God gives by his Spirit's teaching thus to know him, is an individual of that little remnant, who is saved *in consequence of believing;*

[1] Letters and Sketches, vol. i, p. 52. [2] Ibid. vol. i, p. 270. [3] Ibid. vol. i, p. 374.

but this not to the *exclusion* of the rest, for when *every eye shall see*, *then every heart will consequently believe.*[1]

Yet it is an established truth, that every *believer* was once an *unbeliever;* every believer, then, was *once damned*, and it was only when he became a believer, that he was *saved* from the countless agonies, which erst times pierced him through with many sorrows. But he was *redeemed*, the price was paid ere ever he was called into existence. Thus, in his view, redemption and salvation are *distinct considerations.* The preacher unhesitatingly believed, *all* who learned of the Father would come to Jesus, and that *all* would *finally be taught of God.*[2]

Growth in Grace.

In harmony with his view of the indispensableness of knowing Christ, *as He is*, in the constitution of his person and in his vital relation to the human race, Murray held that "growth in grace" is not advancement in personal holiness and goodness, or in personal likeness to our Lord, but is growth in *this unique knowledge* of Christ. This is indicated in the following extract: —

Ye are not, says the apostle, *under the law*, *but under grace.* By grace are ye saved; and, he adds, in this grace ye stand. Doubtless, then, to know more and more of *this salvation* is to grow in grace. We first learn we are saved from damnation due to our *past sins* by his death, and immediately look for holiness in *ourselves;* but, being *in grace*, we soon grow strong enough to know that He who was our *death*, is also our *life*, *by being our holiness.* Thus by little and little, we grow into him, in all things, until we are enabled to believe that we are *wise* in his *wisdom*, *righteous* in *his righteousness*, *holy* in his *holiness*, *strong in his strength*, suffering all things in his sufferings, doing all things commanded in the law, in his doings; and from hence we proceed to believe, that he who is *our* head, is the head of *every man*, that He, who by the grace of God tasted death *for us*, by the same grace tasted death for *every man;* that he who is *our* wisdom, is every man's wisdom; that he who is our righteousness, is *every man's righteousness;* that he who is *our sanctification* or holiness, is *every man's* sanctification or holiness; that he who hath *accepted* us, hath accepted *every man*, *in the beloved*, and that if we have a legal title to that kingdom, which the unrighteous cannot inherit, in consequence of our being righteous in the Lord our righteousness, every man hath the same title: and that as he who gave himself a ransom for all, must be testified in due time, every one in due time shall know him as well as we know him, shall believe in him, and believing in him, shall be saved from all that misery, which is consequent upon a disbelief of these God honoring, man restoring truths.[3]

[1] Letters and Sketches, vol. iii, p. 322. [2] The Life of John Murray, edited by Rev. L. S. Everett, p. 266. [3] Letters and Sketches, vol. i, pp. 98, 99.

The extracts now presented from the writings and biography of John Murray set forth explicitly the nature of his theological beliefs. In view of these statemeuts of his theology, we offer the following remarks: —

Rellyanism is Universalism.

1. John Murray was a Universalist. He was a Universalist of the most pronounced type. The particular form of his Universalism was that which since the middle of the last century has been known under the name of Rellyanism. It cannot be questioned that he was a thoroughgoing Rellyan Universalist. It is true — and a pity it is that it is true — that, during the early years of his preaching in this country, he concealed the fact that he was a Universalist. He went from place to place, after the manner of an evangelist or missionary, addressing the people whenever and wherever an opportunity was given him; but usually he at first made the impression that he was an orthodox preacher, and as such he was cordially received into the pulpits of many evangelical, orthodox churches. He also received his support from orthodox or evangelical Christian people; some of whom were ardent friends of George Whitefield, and at first looked upon Murray as quite likely to become a second Whitefield. After this manner he preached for several years. At last the impositiou he was practising upon the people was exposed in Boston. He was publicly charged with the sin of "*hiding*," as it was termed; of sailing under false colors; of playing the rôle of an impostor by pretending to be an orthodox preacher, only somewhat progressive, when in fact he was a Rellyan Universalist. Great excitement followed the exposure. Some of the friends he had made in Boston stood by him. But many of the people denounced him. He could not, however, refute the charge, aud thenceforth he was knowu as a Rellyan Universalist. He became a uotable character in the country, and he is called iu history "The Father of Universalism in America." This last fact is conclusive evidence, even if there were no other, that he was a Universalist.

The Founders of Andover Seminary had Knowledge of Murray.

2. John Murray, as has already been shown, was well known to the Founders of Andover Seminary. Some of them had been

brought into unwelcome acquaintance with Rellyanism, had made a study of it, and certainly were well informed respecting its divisive and perversive influence in many of the orthodox churches in New England. The authors of the Andover Creed, we repeat, were "Hopkinsians," or, as they preferred to be called, "Consistent Calvinists." Men belonging to this school of theology appear to have taken the lead in opposing the Rellyan Universalism of John Murray, believing it to be antagonistic to the gospel of Christ and hazardous to the souls of men. In view of facts already given (pages 160, 161) it is as certain as almost any historical fact can be, that when the authors of the Andover Creed, and all the Founders, determined that every professor in their Seminary should be solemnly pledged to oppose Universalism, they had chiefly in mind the Rellyanism of John Murray.

Moreover, there can be no question that, in at least two other instances, they used language in writing the Creed which was designed to make it forever impossible for any professor, if an honest man, to believe in and teach Rellyanism in their Seminary. One of these instances we shall refer to later, the other we desire to notice now.

Rellyanism and the Andover Creed.

3. Every professor in Andover Seminary, in taking the Creed, makes this declaration among others: —

> I believe, . . . that repentance, faith and holiness are personal requisites in the Gospel scheme of salvation.

What is the meaning of that word "*personal*," and what was the intent of the Founders in placing it in their Creed, as descriptive of those conditions of salvation which the gospel requires every sinful man to fulfil? This word in such connection is not found in the Westminster Confession or Catechism, nor in any other confession of faith, so far as we can learn. It is new in the Andover Creed. How came it there? The author of that Creed, his advisers, and all the Founders of the Seminary, were painfully aware that for some thirty-seven years it had been loudly proclaimed far and wide in New England, not only that man of him-

self, or *personally*, cannot repent, or believe, or be holy, but also that "*in Christ*," "*in union with Christ*," in *Christ's* repentance, faith, and holiness all men can, and actually do, repent, believe, and become holy. They knew to their sorrow that for years Murray and his followers had been publicly inculcating the delusive doctrine that when Christ suffers, the race suffers; that when Christ sorrows in view of human sins and guilt, the race sorrows; that when Christ repents, the race repents; and that whatever Christ does, the race, as included in his person, does. This doctrine the Founders believed to be false, deceptive, and hazardous to the souls of men. Consequently they determined that every professor in their Seminary should be solemnly pledged to hold and teach, in absolute opposition to the Rellyan error, that every man who would be saved must himself *personally* repent, *personally* believe on Christ, and be *personally* righteous; that "repentance, faith, and holiness are *personal* requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation," in the sense that, according to the gospel of Christ, no man, who does not *personally*, in himself and not in another, fulfil these conditions of salvation, can ever enter the kingdom of God. In other words, that peculiar phrase, "*personal* requisites" was aimed directly at the Rellyan Universalism of that time, and of our time, and was designed to make it forever impossible for any honest man to teach the pantheistic doctrine of race-repentance in Union with Christ, in Andover Seminary.

The Defendant Teaching Rellyanism in Andover Seminary.

4. Now we complain that, in spite of all these strong barriers, so carefully erected by the Founders for the special purpose of keeping this universalistic and pantheistic doctrine of race-repentance through union with Christ forever out of the Seminary, the defendant, in violation of his own solemn promise, and of the Constitution and Statutes of this sacred Institution, and in opposition to the known intent of its Founders, is now maintaining and inculcating, in Andover Seminary, and by means of the funds of the Founders, this same pestilential and corrupting error of race-repentance and race-salvation. This is our complaint. We charge before the Board of Visitors, who have supreme authority to remedy this grievous wrong, that under cover of this new and pretentious name, "*Progressive Orthodoxy*," the old,

defunct, and long-buried error of Rellyan Universalism has been raised from its grave, and in all its offensiveness paraded and commended in Andover Seminary as a "*new theology*," just discovered, of which the benighted Founders knew nothing, and which therefore may properly be promulgated from *their* Seminary and by means of *their* funds, in the place of, and to the utter exclusion of, the doctrines of *personal* evangelical repentance and faith which the Seminary was founded to maintain and inculcate. We submit to the Visitors, and also to that august tribunal of intelligent, honest Christian people the world over, that we have maintained our charge. We claim to have shown conclusively, by quotations from James Relly and John Murray compared with quotations from the writings of the progressive divines at Andover, that "Progressive Orthodoxy," in its "central and vital principle," is identically the old Rellyan Universalism so well known to the Founders, and is one of the specified errors which the Seminary was founded to oppose.

Conclusion.

If anything can be made clear, the citations now presented do make it clear that Rellyan Universalism and "Progressive Orthodoxy" *alike* maintain and teach that Christ is the *life* of the world and of every individual in it; that all men are united to Christ, not of their own volition or choice, but involuntarily, and in the very constitution of their own and of Christ's personality; that Christ is *so in* all men, and all men are *so in* Christ, that, in some mystical yet real sense, they together constitute one *Man*, one "universal *Person*," and that, consequently, when Christ suffers, the race suffers; when Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful; when Christ repents, the race repents; whatever Christ does, the race does, and whatever Christ is, the race is, in spite of all its wickedness.

As we claim, it has been proved that Rellyan Universalism and "Progressive Orthodoxy" both, and with equal earnestness, maintain and teach that this organic and vital union of Christ with all men *precedes* all repentance and faith on the part of men; that this union itself is not at all the product of man's repentance and faith, Christian love, sympathy, and devotion, but that every man, irrespective of his own moral and religious character, is,

and has been from the first moment of his existence, included in the personality of Christ, and in the very essence of his being.

It has been made abundantly evident that Rellyan Universalism and "Progressive Orthodoxy" are *agreed* in maintaining that man of himself, or *personally*, cannot repent, or believe on Christ, or obey any of the commands of the gospel; that repentance, faith, and holiness are *not personal* requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation. These two theologies are perfectly *at one* in accepting the anti-Scriptural notion that the entire race renders in Christ a complete repentance, so that God sees in every man, from Adam to the last-born member of the race, a penitent man, not because each man *personally* repents (for *personally* he does not and can not repent), but because God sees Christ in every man. It may be said of these two theologies, the one now taught in Andover Seminary and that preached by John Murray for forty years in eastern Massachusetts, that they both alike call for a most preposterous faith. They demand that we shall be able to believe in the perfect repentance of all impenitent sinners, in the perfect faith of all unbelieving souls, in the perfect righteousness of all wicked men, and in the perfect divinity of all depraved humanity. They alike call upon us to believe that the supreme need of fallen man is simply to know Christ *as he is* in the constitution of his person, as including in himself the entire human race, and that having *that* "knowledge of Christ," he will be forever free, even in his sins, from all remorse of conscience and fearful forebodings; and also to believe that every man, as sure as God is just, will "sooner or later" have that "knowledge of Christ," if not in this world, then in the next. Thus accordant are these two systems of belief. "Rellyan Universalism" and "Progressive Orthodoxy" are essentially one and the same theology. Hence we claim to have shown that the defendant is maintaining and inculcating in Andover Seminary the very Universalism which he has solemnly and religiously promised to oppose. Not only has our third particular charge, namely, that Professor Smyth holds and teaches "that no man has power or capacity to repent," been proved, but, in proving this, it has also been shown that this peculiar doctrine of man's impotence to repent, save as he is *vitally* united to Christ, is an essential part of,

and carries with it, that whole scheme of pantheistic error, which was well known to the Founders under the name of Rellyan Universalism, and against the teaching of which they supposed they had, by statute, forever protected their Seminary.

V.

FIFTH PARTICULAR COMPLAINT.

We have now presented evidence and arguments in proof of the first, second, and third particular complaints under our fourth general charge. For lack of time we pass the fourth particular complaint without argument. Our fifth specific charge is, that Professor Egbert C. Smyth maintains and inculcates, contrary to the declarations of the Creed and to the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary, "*that no man can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ.*"

In proof of this charge we present a concise statement from "Progressive Orthodoxy" (p. 250), the language of which is almost identical with that of the charge itself. The statement is this: —

> But we have endeavored to show that no one can be *lost* without having had knowledge of Christ.

The statement is, it should be noted, that "*no one*," that is, no member of the human race, "*can be lost*," or is in the least possible danger of being lost, "without having had knowledge of Christ."

The Creed Statement.

But in subscribing to the Creed of the Seminary this same defendant professor has repeatedly declared, without qualification, that he accepts the following statement of faith, and has explicitly promised that he will maintain and inculcate the same, namely: —

> that by nature every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God; and that, previously to the renewing agency of the Divine Spirit, all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God; that, being morally incapable of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam, *every man* is justly exposed to eternal damnation; so that, except a man be born again, he *cannot see the kingdom of God.* [Italics ours.]

The substance of this creed-statement is this: that *every man* is such in his personal, moral character and actions, in his personal relations to God, and in his personal, *moral* incapacity to recover the image of his Maker, that he is justly exposed to eternal condemnation, which certainly implies that he is in imminent danger of being forever *lost*, — "so that except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," which also clearly implies that he is in danger of being *forever* excluded from the kingdom of heaven.

The Defendant Contradicts Himself.

Now will the Board of Visitors please notice that Professor Smyth, in taking the Creed, explicitly asserts that, in his belief, *every unregenerate man* — every such man, then, with or without knowledge of Christ — is such in his personal character and relation to God that he is justly in extreme peril of being lost. Moreover, he promises to teach that belief. But in his actual teaching in "Progressive Orthodoxy," he asserts with equal explicitness that as the result of his investigations he is compelled to believe and to show that *no man*, without having had knowledge of Christ, is in the least possible danger of being lost. Now no professor can make both of these assertions without self-stultification. Each of these beliefs avowed by the defendant is an absolute contradiction of the other.

An Astonishing Statement.

Again, this statement of "Progressive Orthodoxy," that "no one can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ," is not only repugnant to the Andover Creed, but is itself a most astonishing statement. It offers a bribe to men to live and to die in ignorance of Christ. If men having no knowledge of Christ cannot be lost, it is perfectly safe for such men to die in their sins. They are sinners, indeed, but the maintenance of their ignorance of the Lord Jesus is the price at which they are insured against the loss of their souls. If a more monstrous doctrine than this was ever taught professedly in the name of Christ on this globe, we have never heard of it. Yet this doctrine is now taught on Andover Hill, and from that once sacred height is proclaimed to the world.

The Reply of the Defendant.

What has Professor Smyth to say in refutation of this fifth charge? Next to nothing. His first answer to the charge contained only three sentences, and in his long and elaborate defence made at his public trial before the Visitors, upon reaching this fifth charge, he simply referred to his first answer. We do not blame the professor for feeling — to use an Hibernianism — that such a charge, sustained by such evidence of its truth, is best handled by not touching it. Still, such a quick dropping of a charge so momentous and crushing awakens the suspicion that, in the defendant's view, it cannot be refuted. His answer of three sentences is as follows: —

> I repeat that I hold that all men being sinners are lost without Christ. The language cited refers to what we may infer from our knowledge of the revelation which God has made of himself in Jesus Christ the Redeemer of mankind. I deny that the citations when interpreted by the context and the book teach any thing contrary to the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary.

Such is the only answer that has been made in refutation of one of the gravest charges that could be brought against a Christian professor pledged to teach evangelical faith. In the first sentence of this answer the defendant says: "I hold that all men, being sinners, are lost without Christ." But what does he mean by the phrase "without Christ"? Does he mean without Christ in existence? Is his statement this, that all men, being sinners, are lost if there be no Saviour? If so, the statement is quite obviously true, but is not at all pertinent as a reply to the fifth charge, or as an explanation of his own declaration, that "no one can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ." Indeed, it makes that declaration absolutely needless and absurd.

The third sentence in the professor's answer is simply a denial that the citations made by the complainants, "when interpreted by the context and the book, teach any thing contrary to the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary." But if the astounding declaration that "no one can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ" can possibly be *so* interpreted by the context, or by the book, or in any other way, as to show that it is not in absolute antagonism to that part of the Creed which we have

quoted, why did not the professor give that interpretation, and so explain and justify, to the dismay of the complainants, his seemingly monstrous statement? In the circumstances, the fact that he did not give any such interpretation awakens the conviction that he could not do it.

A Declaration without Meaning.

In the second sentence of the professor's brief answer, he says, referring to the complainant's citations from "Progressive Orthodoxy": —

> The language cited refers to what we may infer from our knowledge of the revelation which God has made of himself in Jesus Christ the Redeemer of mankind.

This is a high-sounding sentence. On the face of it, it gives evidence of being the result of a desperate struggle of the writer to appear to be saying something vast and deep, while saying nothing. He represents that "the language cited" from "Progressive Orthodoxy" is a *reference* to an *inference*, which we *may* draw from *some sort* of knowledge of our own respecting *some kind* of a revelation "which God has made of himself in Jesus Christ the Redeemer of mankind." But what does a progressive divine mean by the phrase "Redeemer of mankind"? What "revelation" does he refer to? God has made many revelations of himself in Jesus Christ; but what is "*the* revelation" of himself to which the professor refers? What *is* "our knowledge" of that undesignated revelation? What is the *inference* which we *may* draw from an *undefined* knowledge of an *undesignated* revelation? What is the purpose and the value of a reference to an unknown inference, which we *may* draw from an undefined knowledge of some undesignated revelation which God has made of himself in Jesus Christ? Until answers to these questions are given or guessed, that high-sounding sentence which we have quoted conveys no intelligible idea to even the most intelligent minds.

We as complainants wish to be perfectly just in our dealings with these progressive professors. If the Board of Visitors, in fidelity to the great financial and religious trust which they are bound to protect, shall be obliged to inflict any penalty upon

these professors, we would have them err, if err they must, on the side of patience and leniency. We would at least have the severity of the punishment carefully adjusted to the magnitude of the offence. But we say deliberately, that when any professor in Andover Seminary is found capable of committing the crime of writing such a sentence as this second sentence upon which we are commenting, he should forthwith be removed from office in accordance with the imperative Associate Statute (Art. XX) for such cases made and provided, which requires that the *Visitors* shall

take care that the duties of *every* Professor on this Foundation be *intelligibly* . . . discharged.

"Knowledge of Christ" a Mystical Phrase.

Returning now to the assertion of the defendent, that "no one can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ," and remembering its inevitable implication, that it is safe for all men, *who have had no knowledge of Christ*, to die in their sins, we raise again the question, What is meant by the phrase, "*having knowledge of Christ*"? This phrase is very familiar to all readers of the writings of James Relly and John Murray, and of "Progressive Orthodoxy." It appears, on the face of it, to be a very simple and innocent phrase. It gives no suggestion of the use which is made of it by pantheistic or Rellyan Universalists. Still no one who has even a casual acquaintance with the writings of that class of progressives, who are progressing backward toward old pagan beliefs and philosophies, can possibly mistake the unusual and covert meaning which such progressives attach to this familiar clause. They mean by the phrase "having knowledge of Christ," having, not a general knowledge of Him as He is set forth in the Scriptures, nor having that saving knowledge of Him which comes through the revelation of Him to the soul by the Holy Spirit, and through a grateful trust in Him for the forgiveness of sins, but a certain special and peculiar knowledge of Him, which they sometimes vaguely define by the words "a knowledge of Him *as He is*"; that is, a knowledge of Him as *He is in the constitution of his being*, in his *organic* and *vital union* with the entire human race, and in his oneness with the entire world or universe which contains the human race. It is especially

a knowledge of Him as including in his *person all men*, the wicked and the righteous, the living and the dead, and all who are yet to be born.

If we now keep in mind this meaning of the clause, "having knowledge of Christ," the dark saying of the defendant, that "no one can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ," becomes luminous. If Christ is an essential part of every man's being, and if every man is an essential part of Christ's very person, no man *can* be lost — it is not *possible* that any man will be lost — before he has knowledge of Christ as a constituent part of his own being. *That* knowledge is his supreme need. God will see that he has it. Every man will have this knowledge "in due time," if not in this life, then in the next. There is not the least danger that any man will be lost without this knowledge, because, as every man is a part of the divine essence, and therefore imperishable, no man *can* be lost in any event, and God will see that every man for his own comfort shall know this. As Relly and Murray used to say, perverting Scripture: —

> All thy children *shall* be taught of the Lord. . . . They *shall all* know me, . . . saith the Lord;

that is, know the Lord as a constituent part of themselves. And then great will be their peace, for in this knowledge of the Lord they will have an assurance that, irrespective of their character as sinful or holy, they never *can* be lost, any more than the Lord Jesus can be lost, for of his person they are a constituent part. When a man knows Christ *as He is* in the constitution of his person, or as including in his person all men, he is at once convinced that he is in no danger of being lost. It would be greatly to his comfort to have this knowledge in this life, for then he would be troubled with no dread forebodings. But if he does not have this knowledge in the present world, he is sure to have it in the next world, for no man *can* be lost without having had knowledge of Christ.

Safe for Men to Die in Their Sins.

According to this interpretation of the professor's strange statement, he is simply stating what he believes *will become fact.* He is uttering a prophecy, namely, that no man *will* be lost before

he knows the fact of his own vital and indestructible union with Jesus Christ; and every man, knowing that marvelous fact, will also know that he is not, never has been, and never will be, in the least possible danger of being lost. This interpretation, which we believe to be the true one, does not make the defendant's statement less, but rather more, "hazardous to the souls of men." For if he teaches that every man is certainly to *know* — to know in knowing Christ *as He is*, to know in due time, in this life or in the next — that there is not, never has been, and never will be, the least possible danger that he, or any other man, will be lost, he surely *does* teach that it is perfectly safe, not for *some* men merely, but for *all* men, not only to *die* in their sins, but also to *live on* through all eternity in their sins; inasmuch as they are all organically, vitally, and inseparably united to the Lord of glory who can never perish.

Timidity of the Andover Progressives.

This unscriptural doctrine, which is itself the very root and essence of the whole system of pantheistic Universalism, James Relly and John Murray, as we have shown, preached with a vigor, fulness, and freedom which do not yet characterize the preaching and teaching of the progressive divines at Andover. The latter by implication *do teach* this doctrine — they teach it in teaching that all men are organically and vitally united to Christ Jesus. But they teach it timidly and haltingly, using much blind and enigmatical language. It has been their policy to "let out their new theology little by little." The reason of this is perfectly obvious to all who know anything of the theological revolution which has been inaugurated at Andover. Relly and Murray were unschooled men, but usually they had the courage of their convictions, and having accepted the fundamental principle of the vital union and real identity of all men with Christ, they reasoned from it with a resistless logic, and manfully accepted and preached all its legitimate implications. The progressives at Andover have made public announcement that they have unalterably committed themselves to the germinant principle of Rellyanism (though never designating it by that name), and they propose to "follow its guidance faithfully and loyally," and whithersoever it may lead. But they have not the courage of their convictions. They do not

follow fearlessly their guiding principle, nor do they allow any bold and vigorous logic to carry them whither it will. They back and fill. They start swiftly out upon a course, but quickly return upon it. Their action is that of men who are tethered. Their tether is not long and they have been struggling with but poor success to lengthen it. If they had the vigor and manliness to break their tether and separate themselves entirely from the Seminary and the funds which they are now perverting, and could they attain the courage of their convictions, and reason with a bold, scholarly, and manly logic, they could and would soon be openly preaching and honestly teaching pantheistic Universalism with all the fulness, clearness, and freedom with which Relly and Murray preached it. But so long as they remain tethered by a promise which they can rightfully withdraw, and by a contract which they are free to surrender at any moment, they will continue to make the sorry spectacle of themselves which they are now making in promising to teach one theology and yet timidly and haltingly teaching an opposing theology.

Moral and Religious Results.

If permitted to do so, these professors will doubtless in the future maintain and inculcate, as they are now doing, the germinant and dominating principle of Rellyanism with a few of its implications, while leaving the more extreme and inevitable development of them in charge of their students. What that inevitable development in morals and in faith will be is not doubtful. In morals it will be what it has been in the past, and what any one acquainted with human nature might expect would come from teaching, that it is safe for at least some men to die in their sins. In religious faith the development can hardly fail to be in the near future, what may have already occurred in individual cases, an utter abandonment of all evangelical faith, and ultimately of all belief in a personal God, or in any supreme Being other than that of the old pagan pantheists of Greece and India. As to the morality of the personal act of teaching such principles in Andover Seminary, the visitors and the world will judge. The influence of an example like this upon students cannot fail to be more or less disastrous. Some pupils, having accepted such views, may have enough conscience and honesty left to pay back

all funds which they have received in charity from orthodox sources, and openly and promptly connect themselves with Universalist or Unitarian churches, or perhaps abandon their purpose to enter the Christian ministry. Others, however, will doubtless follow the example of their teachers, and continue to receive support from orthodox people and institutions, while they hold and teach unorthodox and pantheistic beliefs. People of ordinary discernment must see that all these results in a greater or less degree are sure and imminent. Indeed, even now the moral development is not tarrying. The religious development, also, in the confessed beliefs and in the preaching of students, is already ominous. In the meantime the excited and impatient religious public must be content to listen wonderingly to many a blind hint and dark saying like that sonorous, but enigmatical sentence of the defendant to which, as an example, we have called special attention.

VI.

SIXTH PARTICULAR COMPLAINT.

Our sixth particular complaint is, that Professor Smyth holds, maintains, and inculcates, in opposition to the Creed and the Statutes of the Seminary, *That the atonement of Christ consists essentially and chiefly in his becoming identified with the human race through his Incarnation, in order that, by his union with men He might endow them with power to repent, and thus impart to them an augmented value in the view of God, and so render God propitious towards them.*

The evidence and arguments by which this charge was supported at the first trial of the defendant are in print, and are before your honorable Board. May we ask your careful consideration of them, and especially of the citations from "*Progressive Orthodoxy*"? The latter will show better than any words of ours can, how, in this progressive theology, all conceptions of the atonement of Christ are colored, modified, and controlled by the pantheistic notion of the organic and vital union of the entire human race with Christ.

"Progressive Orthodoxy" says: —

> The substitution is not of Christ standing on this side for the race standing on that side, but the race with Christ in it is substituted for the race without Christ in it. This Christ in with the race is regarded by God as one who has those powers of instruction, sympathy, purity which can be imparted to his brethren. Likewise the individual in Christ takes the place of the individual without Christ, is looked on as one whom Christ can bring to repentance and obedience, and so is justified even before faith develops into character. . . .
>
> The race is reconstituted in Christ, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing powers for repentance and holiness which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of.[1]

The New Theory of Atonement.

Such is the atonement according to "Progressive Orthodoxy." This theory allows of no substitution of Christ *alone* for the race

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 56.

alone, but only a substitution of an alleged *union* of Christ with the race for the *non-union* of Christ with the race. Christ did not take the place of a sinning, guilty, condemned, and lost race, and suffer and die *in its stead*, but a certain mysterious, organic, and *vital union* of Christ with the race — a union nowhere mentioned, still less described, in the Scriptures — takes the place of Christ himself and the race *not vitally united* the one with the other. God looks favorably upon both Christ and the race *thus united*, in other words is propitiated, not on the ground that Christ has suffered and died in the place of a guilty and condemned race, but on the ground that Christ has "powers of instruction, sympathy, purity which can be imparted to his brethren," that is, to all members of the human race. What these powers of instruction, sympathy, purity are, that they can be imparted to, or poured into all men, from Adam to the last member of the race, through the channel of their vital union with Christ, without and previous to any repentance or faith on their own part, and why all members of the race, as they are all thus united to Christ, do not give full and grand exhibitions of these Christ-given and Christlike powers of instruction, sympathy, and purity, we are not told. This silence is remarkable.

We are further instructed, that "the individual in Christ," — that is, every human being who ever has lived, or ever will live, — as he "takes the place of the individual without Christ," is regarded by God "as one whom Christ can bring to repentance and obedience, and so is justified even before faith develops into character." But if Christ is united to every individual member of the race, and in that union *can* bring every individual to repentance, faith, and obedience, then surely Christ is to blame if every member of the race is not penitent, believing, and obedient, and is not justified and saved. In other words, if this theory of the atonement be true, Christ himself can be justified only by the universal righteousness and salvation of men. If Christ exists in such a personal, vital, and power-imparting relation to every man, then every man ought to be at this moment, and from his birth, and forever, a righteous, justified, and saved man. If every man is not a saint, then "Progressive Orthodoxy," by fair implication, defames our Lord.

This theory of the *atoning union* of Christ with all men is finally set forth in these words: —

THE RACE IN CHRIST ON THE CROSS.

In the atonement Christ the Son of man brings all humanity to God. No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself.[1]

But if Christ brings all humanity to God, how can any part of humanity be lost? What can be meant by bringing all men to God, if it be not meant that all men are brought into eternal peace with God? If no member of the human race was *separate* from Christ when He offered himself up in atonement, then every man was with Christ and in Him when He suffered upon the cross; and with and in Him took part in making a complete and acceptable atonement for his own sins. Indeed, these progressive divines affirm that: —

When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful.[2]

UNIVERSALISM.

But if all men have sorrowed in Christ's great sorrow for the sins of the world, they have offered to God, according to this theory of atonement, a perfect repentance. And when all men have offered to God a perfect repentance in Christ's sorrows, and, having been with and in Christ on the cross, have made a full and acceptable atonement for their own sins, how can any man be lost? Thus "Progressive Orthodoxy," as set forth in its doctrines of repentance and atonement, is thoroughgoing Universalism, which is one of the specified errors that the defendant has repeatedly promised to oppose.

THE "CENTRAL AND VITAL PRINCIPLE."

Yet the defendant may claim that he can turn over the leaves of "Progressive Orthodoxy," and quote here and there a passage which contradicts this theory of the atonement. But what of it? "Progressive Orthodoxy" abounds in inconsistencies and self-contradictions. We do not admit, however, that, from the book as a whole, it can be proved that we are mistaken in our charge

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 66. [2] Ibid. p. 53.

that its doctrine of atonement is rank Universalism. But if the professor *can* quote isolated passages, which plainly contradict those which we have cited, we reply with the question, What if he can? He only proves that he and his progressive associates are holding and teaching two conflicting theories of the atonement. The question then will be, Which of these two discordant theories do they intend to accept, maintain, and inculcate? It is certainly fair to accept their own answer to this question. They have already given us their answer in unmistakable language. In the Introduction to "Progressive Orthodoxy," pp. 3, 4, they inform us that their decision is made beyond recall; that in writing this book they have been "under the guidance of a central and vital principle of Christianity, namely, the reality of Christ's personal relation to the human race as a whole, and to every member of it," which central and vital principle further on in the book proves to be the organic and vital union of Christ with every member of the human race. To the maintenance of this principle they have once for all committed themselves. In proof of the truth of this speculation, which they have made the fundamental doctrine of their whole system, or rather jumble, of theological beliefs, they have not given one particle of evidence. They do, indeed, dogmatically assert that their speculative notion of the vital union of Christ with the race is "a central and vital principle of Christianity"; but dogmatism is not evidence. They also dogmatically assert that "this principle," as they call it, "is involved in the church doctrine of the constitution of Christ's person," and that "it is a necessary implication of our fathers' faith in the extent and intent of the Atonement." But again we reply, that dogmatic assertion is not evidence. These progressive divines also assert that this pantheistic principle, as we call it, of the organic and vital union of the entire human race with Christ our Lord "is an indisputable teaching of Scripture"; but they do not cite a single passage of Scripture in proof of this astounding statement. It behooved them, at the very opening of their book, to establish beyond all question the truth of this vital and all-pervading principle of their "*new* theology," unless they were willing that their book should be a laughing-stock in the world of scholars. But they did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, at the opening of their volume, referring

to this mere speculation, the truth of which they had not established by the least particle of evidence, they unblushingly declare:

> We have sought to apply this principle to the solution of questions which are now more than ever before engaging the attention of serious and devout minds. We have endeavored to follow its guidance faithfully and loyally, and whithersoever it might lead. We have trusted it wholly and practically.[1]

Now this language of the defendant and of his progressive associates — whatever we may think of the morality or the scholarship manifested in committing themselves wholly and irrevocably to the guidance of an utterly unestablished principle — shows that they *have* thus committed themselves to the acceptance, maintenance, and inculcation of an unproved dogmatic principle, under the guidance of which they are compelled to hold and teach a theory of the atonement which is itself outright Universalism. The more passages they can find in "Progressive Orthodoxy" which contradict this theory, the worse for them. They will thus simply show that for some reason they are not able to stand faithfully and loyally by their own avowed "*principle*." It is right for *us*, however, to hold them responsible for the fundamental and dominating "principle" which they last avowed, and for all doctrines which they themselves have deduced from it, whether they have contradicted that principle or not. If, however, they *have* contradicted their own avowed, fundamental, and guiding principle, it is an ominous reflection upon their scholarship, or if not upon that, then upon their courage.

We have already shown conclusively, we submit to the Board of Visitors, that the defendant is holding and teaching, not only a monstrous and unproved theory of atonement, but also a theory which is itself with its unavoidable implications real Universalism. To teach that all members of the human race are in such vital and indestructible union with Christ, that they were all — from Adam to the last man who shall ever be born — with and in Him when He hung upon the cross, and thus actually made full and adequate atonement for all their own sins — to teach this monstrous notion is to teach absolute Universalism. But the teaching of Universalism is most clearly and emphatically forbidden by the Statutes of the Seminary.

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 3.

We might here close our argument in proof of our sixth particular charge. But the defendant in the first exceedingly brief reply which he made to this grave charge, referring to our citations, and to the Article in "Progressive Orthodoxy" from which they were made, said: —

I deny that the citations or the Article contain, either by negation or affirmation, any thing contrary to the Creed or the Statutes.

We cannot allow this categorical denial to pass unnoticed.

We propose, therefore, to present in the next place, in contrast with the *theory* of atonement defended in "Progressive Orthodoxy," that *doctrine* of the atonement which the Statutes of the Seminary require should be taught on the Andover Foundations.

The Doctrine of Atonement Required by Statute.

Every professor in Andover Seminary, in taking the Creed, has made this confession of faith respecting the atonement: —

I believe, . . . that God, of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, and that he entered into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of this state of misery by a Redeemer; that the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God, who for this purpose became man, and continues to be *God* and man in two distinct natures and one person forever; that Christ, as our Redeemer, executeth the office of Prophet, Priest and King; that, agreeably to the covenant of redemption, the Son of God, and he alone, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men; that repentance, faith and holiness are the personal requisites in the Gospel scheme of salvation; that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner's justification, that this righteousness is received through faith; and that this faith is the gift of God; so that our salvation is wholly of grace.

This passage, quoted from the Seminary Creed, contains a statement of that doctrine of atonement which every professor in Andover Seminary has promised, over his own signature, and on his honor as a gentleman and a Christian, to "maintain and inculcate." The Creed is a Statute of the Seminary. It is Article I of the "*Additional Statutes*," so called. It is also contained in Article II of "*The Statutes of The Associate Foundation in The Theological Institution in Andover.*" But the Creed is not the whole of this Article II. The same Article contains also this positive requirement: —

Every Professor on the Associate Foundation . . . shall sustain the character of a discreet, honest, learned and devout Christian; an orthodox and consistent Calvinist.

The defendant, Professor Egbert C. Smyth, is on the "Associate Foundation."

What now are the contents of that doctrine of Atonement which every professor in Andover Seminary is under the most imperative obligations to maintain and inculcate (so far as may appertain to his office), and which he cannot even fail to maintain and inculcate (so far as may appertain to his office) — to say nothing of his contradicting and opposing it — without breaking his own promise made voluntarily, and with prayer to God for his aid and blessing, and thus forfeiting the character of an "honest Christian" and of "an orthodox, consistent Calvinist"?

Moreover, what, in contrast with this Andover *doctrine of* Atonement, are the contents of that *theory* of Atonement which is set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy," and which is now held and taught by the defendant and his progressive associates on the Andover Foundations?

The Creed-Doctrine, and the New Theory of Atonement, Contrasted.

1. According to the Seminary Creed and Consistent Calvinism, "the Son of God, and He *alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men." The Creed also declares, "that the *only* Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God."

Now if these Creed statements mean anything, they mean what they say. Their plain import is, that the Son of God *alone* made the atonement. He was the *sole* being who hung upon the cross in sacrifice for the sins of the world. The distinct avowal of the fact of the *solitariness* of Christ while accomplishing his atoning work cannot be gotten out of these Creed statements. No honest interpretation of them, which contradicts their positive assertion of the absolute *aloneness* of the Son of God in making the atonement, is possible. If there *is* any such interpretation, we challenge the defendant and all his progressive associates to state what it is.

But this doctrine of the Creed "Progressive Orthodoxy" contradicts. Its language is: —

> When Christ suffers, the race suffers. . . . Thus we can regard Him as our substitute, not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another, but because He is so identified with us. . . .[1]
>
> No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself.[2]

These statements, and many others like them, we submit, are in absolute and irreconcilable conflict with the Seminary Creed and the belief of all Consistent Calvinists. They are so many positive assertions that the Son of God was *not alone* in making the atonement. If no man was separate from Christ when he was offered in sacrifice on the cross for the sins of the world, then all men were with Him and in Him on the cross, and took part with Him in making atonement for their own sins and in redeeming themselves from the curse of the law. Christ, therefore, is not the "*only* Redeemer." Every man is as truly a redeemer of at least one condemned and lost soul as is the Son of God himself.

Such teaching, though utterly irreconcilable with the Creed and with Consistent Calvinism, is yet in perfect accord with "the central and vital principle" of "Progressive Orthodoxy." Indeed, it is the inevitable outcome of that principle. The pantheistic notion that the constitution of Christ's Person is such that He is in organic and vital union with the race as a whole and with every member of it leads inevitably to the absurd belief that all men, from Adam to the last man who shall be born, actually suffered and died on Calvary, and so with and in Christ made full and acceptable atonement for all their sins. Thus this "principle," as the Andover progressives term it, paganizes and corrupts the Christian doctrine of atonement as it does every other Scriptural revelation to which it is applied.

The Creed-Doctrine of Vicarious Atonement.

2. It is the doctrine of both the Andover Creed and of Consistent Calvinism, that Christ, in his sufferings and death, became our substitute, and our *only* substitute, in the sense that He took our place before the holy law of God which we have broken, and

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 53. [2] Ibid. p. 66.

there alone suffered and died *for us* and *in our stead.* The atonement which the Son of God, and He alone, made was a vicarious atonement. The Creed says that "the Son of God, and He alone, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement *for* the sins of all men." All men are sinners and as such are guilty, condemned, and exposed to eternal death *for* their own sins. Christ in suffering and dying *for their* sins took their place, became their substitute, and freely offered his own sufferings and death in the place of the death eternal which God threatens and which all sinners deserve. All this our Redeemer did in order to make it possible for God, in perfect consistency with his own righteousness and his holy law, to save all men who should repent of their sins, and believe in God, or in God as revealed in the Lord Jesus Christ. This is not simply *our* interpretation of the Creed. It is the *doctrine* of the Creed as interpreted by the known belief of its authors. It is an established legal principle that the known belief of the writer or writers of such a document furnishes the true and legal interpretation of it. The writers of the Andover Creed, we repeat, were Hopkinsians, and called themselves "*Consistent Calvinists.*" Theirs was the most definite, positive, and clean-cut system of theology then in existence. Every theologian knows, or may know, just what it is. Dr. Samuel Hopkins himself defined the vicarious atonement of Christ in these words: —

> When it is said, "Christ died for our sins," the meaning must be that his death is the atonement and propitiation for sin; and that by it he suffered the evil with which sin is threatened in the law, or the penalty and curse of the law, or that which is equivalent. To suffer for sin, and for the sinner, is so far to take the place of the sinner, as to suffer the evil which he deserves, and which otherwise the sinner must have suffered. Or, which is the same, the sufferings of Christ answer the same end with respect to the law and divine government, that otherwise must be answered by the eternal destruction of the sinner.[1]

Such was the belief not only of Dr. Hopkins, but of all Consistent Calvinists, and in particular of Drs. Spring, Woods, and Emmons, who were the writers in chief of the Andover Creed. Professors Moses Stuart and Edwards A. Park held and taught

[1] Hopkins's Works, vol. i, pp. 327, 328.

the same belief respecting the atonement. Professor Stuart wrote: —

> When I say *Christ in his sufferings was our* SUBSTITUTE, or, *by them he made* an EXPIATORY OFFERING *for us*, I mean that GOD DID APPOINT AND ACCEPT THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST, INSTEAD OF INFLICTING THE PUNISHMENT DUE TO US AS SINNERS AGAINST HIS LAW; and that *in consequence of this appointment and of these sufferings, he does forgive our sins and receive us to his favor.*[1]

Dr. Park, referring specifically to the Andover Creed, writes:

> In the *most moderate interpretation* of its words, as explained by its framers, it requires a belief in the following principles: "The God-man is our priest, our royal priest, our royal prophet-priest. In this royal priestly office he offers the sacrifice for sin. This sacrifice, in its very nature, involves the idea of his death and sufferings, all of which represent the legal penalty for sin, and are, for the purposes of moral government, of equal avail with that penalty. The pains and death of the Lamb of God were designed to vindicate the honor of God's law, and of his retributive justice, as much as it would have been vindicated by inflicting the legal penalty on the penitent: this is the *nature* of his sacrifice. Our High Priest's righteousness, *i. e.*, 'his obedience unto death,' is the only *ground* on which sinners can be justified; and their faith which receives and rests upon this 'obedience unto death,' is the only *condition* on which they can be justified; and these two facts explain the very nature of the atoning sacrifice. . . . Agreeably to the arrangement called the covenant of redemption, the Redeemer made the atonement for all men: agreeably to the arrangement called the covenant of grace, the Sovereign of the Universe determined from all eternity, on the ground of this atonement, to regenerate and pardon some men: accordingly, Christ suffered and died for the whole race, but is the actual and the only Redeemer of a part of the race."[2]

The defendant, Professor E. C. Smyth, in his defence before the Visitors, asked the complainants, in the tone of a jeer, if they would "please to point out what is the theory of the Atonement made binding in the Creed as a condition of a trust? Where is it found, and how it is expressed?"[3] If the Professor does not know what the *doctrine* of the Atonement is, which is required by the Statutes and Creed of Andover Seminary, to be maintained and taught on the Andover Foundations, why has he so many times subscribed to the Creed? If he did not know

[1] Stuart's Miscellanies, pp. 222, 223. [2] The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary, by Edwards A. Park, p. 35. [3] The Andover Defence, p. 120.

what he was required by the Statutes to teach respecting the chief doctrine of Christianity, why has he so many times said in solemn promise before the Trustees: "I will religiously conform to the Constitution and Laws of this Seminary, and to the Statutes of this Foundation"? Did he, or did he not, in addressing those requests for information to the complainants, publicly confess that he is the kind of man who can subscribe to such a declaration of faith, not knowing what the faith is which he declares he accepts and will teach; and that he is the kind of man who can religiously make a solemn promise to conform to certain Statutes, not knowing what he promises to do?

However the Professor may answer these questions, we have no objection to respond to his request for information by saying that *the doctrine* — not "*the theory*" — of atonement, the maintaining and inculcating of which is "made binding in the Creed as a condition of a trust," and a condition of *his* holding his chair on the Associate Foundation, he will find, first, in the Creed itself; secondly, in that part of Article II of the Associate Statutes which requires every professor to be "an orthodox and consistent Calvinist"; and thirdly, in the exhaustive and incomparable Treatise on "The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary. By Edwards A. Park." If now the defendant, in reply, affirms that this requirement of the Statute, that every professor shall be a "consistent Calvinist," is indefinite, and points to no particular doctrine of atonement, we deny his statement. Every intelligent theologian who has made even a cursory examination of what the Founders called "Consistent Calvinism," knows that this statutory requirement does point to a most definite and clearly defined doctrine of atonement; a doctrine, too, which is, as we shall show, in irreconcilable antagonism to the *theory* of atonement which is now held and taught by the defendant and his progressive associates in Andover Seminary, in violation of a most sacred trust and promise.

The Opposing Theory of Vicarious Atonement.

3. "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that the vicariousness of the atonement consists in this, that "the *individual in Christ* takes the place of the *individual without Christ.*" The statement in this quotation is not, that *Christ* takes the place of the *individual,*

but that the *individual in Christ* takes the place of the *individual;* for "the individual without Christ" is simply the individual. It is the doctrine of the *Creed* that *Christ* takes the place of, and dies for, the individual. It is the teaching of "Progressive Orthodoxy" that Christ alone does *not* do this, but that the *individual* sinner *in Christ* takes the place of *himself* and suffers and dies as a substitute for *himself.* Can such an absurdity be reconciled with the sublime doctrine of Christ's vicarious atonement as set forth in the Andover Creed and in Consistent Calvinism?

It should also be noticed that, according to this view of the vicariousness of the atonement, it was absolutely necessary that "the individual" — that is, every human being — should have been "*in Christ*" *before* our Lord suffered on the cross, else how could every individual have suffered and died with Him in atonement for himself? Adam and his every descendant, to the last person who shall be born, including the most wicked men who ever have, or ever will, live, all must have been "*in Christ*" *previous* to his death; for if a single individual member of the race was not "in Christ" *previous* to his death, that person, according to the theory, did not have, and never can have, any share in the vicarious atonement made on Calvary. According to this marvelous theology, termed by its advocates "Advanced Thought," "Progressive Orthodoxy," and so on, no man's sins have been, or ever can be, atoned for, save as he was individually "in Christ" previous to his sacrifice on the cross, took part in Christ's sufferings and death, and so became a substitute for himself, and made atonement for his own sins. But if each and every member of the race was "in Christ" *previous* to his sacrifice on Calvary, how long had they been in Him? Was each man from the date of his birth only "in Christ"? If so, how about those who were born *after* Christ's atoning death? Was each man "in Christ" only from the date of the Incarnation? If so, how about all the people who lived in the ages preceding the Incarnation? Were they saved, if saved at all, without union with Christ, and so without repentance? Were all members of the race "in Christ" from all eternity? If so, how can they be in any need of atonement? If the human race is a constituent part of the very being of the Son of God, the race is in the Son from everlasting to

everlasting, and no member of the race can be lost any more than the Son of God can be lost.

Again, according to the theory, "the individual in Christ takes the place of the individual without Christ." But we repeat the question, when *was* "the individual without Christ"? "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that Christ's "universe is not attached to Him externally, but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere." Of course, then, He is the life of every man. He is not the Creator of life as something other than Himself, He *is* the life of every man. The constitution of Christ's person is such that all men are organically and vitally united to Him, if not from all eternity, yet at least from the first moment of their existence. Then no man was ever *out of Christ*, and that "the individual *in Christ*" should take the place of "the individual *without Christ*" is an utter impossibility. The "individual without Christ" is a nonentity, and no man in Christ *can* be substituted — in the theological sense of substitution — for a nonentity, to say nothing of the absurdity of a man substituting himself for himself. Thus this sonorous and pretentious theory of an atonement made by the substitution of the race and the individual *in Christ* for the race and the individual *without Christ* vanishes into nothing. According to "Progressive Orthodoxy" itself, there is not now, and never has been, any such thing in existence as a human race or an individual *without Christ*. This theory of vicarious atonement is self-destructive. It has in it the seed of its own death.

God Not Reconciled to Impenitent Sinners.

4. It is a cardinal doctrine of Consistent Calvinism and of the Andover Creed, as well as of the Holy Scriptures, that God is never, by any mediation or atonement, or by any other means, propitiated or reconciled to impenitent and unbelieving sinners, but that "repentance, faith, and holiness are personal requisites in the Gospel scheme of salvation"; that is, there is nothing in the vicarious atonement of Christ that *reconciles* God to, and actually *saves*, any sinner *before* he personally fulfils certain conditions. When one man becomes reconciled to another who has become his enemy and has wronged him, he *forgives* him. It is inconceivable that any man should be reconciled to an enemy who

has wronged him, and at the same time not forgive him, saying to him, "I am perfectly reconciled to you; it is all right between us; but I have not forgiven you, and never will forgive you." In such a case the wronged man is not reconciled. Forgiveness is the very heart of reconciliation. If there is no forgiveness, there is no reconciliation. So when God has become reconciled to a sinner He has forgiven him. If He has not forgiven him, He is unreconciled to him. The divine reconciliation and forgiveness go together. But a sinner forgiven of God is a sinner saved. Yet God cannot righteously become reconciled to, forgive, and save impenitent and persistent sinners. He cannot forgive and save the wicked *in their wickedness.* If he becomes reconciled to sinners *in their sins*, He becomes reconciled to sin, and ceases to be holy Himself. According to the Andover Creed, the atonement is *not* a means of propitiating and reconciling God to impenitent and unbelieving sinners, but "repentance, faith and holiness are personal requisites" which must be personally fulfilled by the sinner *before* God is reconciled to him, forgives, and saves him; and the atonement of Christ makes it possible for God, in perfect consistency with his own righteousness, with his own stainless justice and holy law, to be reconciled to, and to forgive and save, *penitent* and *trusting* sinners.

Now we do not present this view as *our* opinion, or *our* belief, even though it is our belief; but we submit to the Visitors that this is exactly the doctrine of the Andover Creed, and the well-known doctrine of Consistent Calvinism, which Creed and Calvinism the defendant and all his progressive compeers have solemnly declared that they believe, and have religiously promised to teach.

The Progressives' Theory of Divine Reconciliation.

Now what is the doctrine which they are actually maintaining and teaching in their "Progressive Orthodoxy"? It is this: that God *is* reconciled to impenitent and unbelieving and persistent sinners; that He *does* forgive and save sinners *in their sins*, before ever they repent, trust in and obey God. "Progressive Orthodoxy" says: —

> Because God is reconciled in Jesus Christ man repents and begins a new life. The gospel never reverses this order of dependence.[1]

[1] pp. 46, 47.

Professor George Harris, — who ought to know what "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches, — in his defence at his trial before the Visitors, made this remarkable affirmation: —

> The fundamental position is that because God is reconciled to man, therefore man is forgiven, rather than that God forgives by reason of any thing that man does. First God is reconciled, then man repents. Not first man repents, and then God is reconciled.[1]

"Progressive Orthodoxy" is Universalism.

The positive assertion in this language is, that God is reconciled to sinners *before* they repent; that is, is reconciled to impenitent sinners. But we repeat, if God *is reconciled* to impenitent sinners, He *forgives* impenitent sinners. And an impenitent sinner forgiven of God is a sinner saved *in his sins*. In this case, there are no "personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation." "Personal repentance, faith and holiness" are not necessary to the salvation of any sinner. Moreover, if there are no conditions to be fulfilled personally by sinners precedent to their forgiveness and salvation, and if God is reconciled to all impenitent sinners persisting in their sins, then He forgives and saves all sinners. Thus we again establish the charge which we have so often proved, that "Progressive Orthodoxy" is absolute Universalism — a Universalism, moreover, according to which all men are saved, not *from* their sins, but *in* their sins.

Justification by Faith.

5. The great doctrine of *justification by faith* is a fundamental doctrine of the Andover Creed and of Consistent Calvinism. The Creed affirms, in connection with its statement of the doctrine of atonement,

> that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner's justification; that this righteousness is received through faith; and that this faith is the gift of God.

According to this creed-statement, the righteousness of Christ is of no avail to a sinner until he receives it "through faith." That is, faith in Christ, or believing on Christ, is a condition to be fulfilled by the sinner himself, precedent to his justification.

[1] The Andover Defence, p. 294.

The teaching of the Creed is not that God first justifies the sinner, and then the sinner believes on Christ, and that this order is never reversed in the gospel; but that first the sinner believes on Christ, and then is justified of God, and that *this* order in the gospel is never reversed. When a sinner believes on Christ he not only trusts in Him for that remission of sins which is graciously offered him through Christ's atoning sacrifice, but he also trusts in Christ's perfect righteousness, that is, in his obedience unto death, approves of and pleads that righteousness before God, and so is brought into moral and spiritual sympathy with Christ, and is personally united to Him in character, in righteousness. All this would be impossible without Christ's perfect and glorious righteousness; and therefore, on the ground of that righteousness, the condemned and lost sinner, *through his faith in Christ, and in his righteousness*, is accepted and justified of God. He now dwells in Christ by faith, and Christ dwells in his heart. He is now "*in Christ*" and Christ is "*in him*," not by any organic and vital union, but *by faith*. He is now one with Christ, not one in essence of being — that is a pagan notion, it is Pantheism — but one with Christ through love, sympathy, and trust, one with Him in purpose and righteousness. Thus the sinner *through faith* puts on Christ, receives, and is clothed in Christ's righteousness, and on the ground of that righteousness is justified of God. Such is the doctrine of the Creed.

Justification without Faith.

But "Progressive Orthodoxy" antagonizes this great Protestant and evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, by setting forth somewhat cautiously a theory of justification without faith, or previous to faith — of justification grounded, not upon Christ's righteousness, but upon the pantheistic notion that the entire human race was with and in Christ when He was offered up on the cross. Because of that imagined union of all men with Christ in his atoning sacrifice, all men are justified of God *before faith*. The progressive divines boldly affirm that God is *reconciled* to all sinners before they repent, or believe, or obey; but, seemingly for prudential reasons, they are wary in setting forth their theory of *justification* without faith. Yet this theory is involved in their notion that God is reconciled to sinners before they repent. If

God is reconciled to impenitent, unbelieving, and persistent sinners, He is no longer opposed to them, but is at peace with them, is satisfied with them, forgives and *justifies* them. It is impossible that God should be reconciled to a man whom He does not justify. Such a reconciliation would be immoral.

Impenitent Sinners Justified on the Ground of Their Eminent Value.

The actual representation of the Andover progressives is, that all men are "in Christ," not by faith, but by an organic and vital union with Him; and that on the ground of this union with Christ they have eminent value in the sight of God, are essentially different in fact from what they would have been without this union, are looked upon by God as being other than they would have been, as having had imparted to them, through this union, powers and capacities of which they would otherwise have been wholly destitute, and so on the ground of these betterments in the *condition* and *relations* of all sinners, entirely apart from any change in their moral character, they are more highly esteemed by God, and so He becomes propitious toward them, in other words becomes reconciled to them and justifies them in their sins; not, we repeat, because they have repented, believed, and become obedient, for all this is beyond their power; but because by their union with Christ they have attained augmented value in the sight of God, and have become *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting.[1]

Such is the notion of God's justification of sinners as set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy." It is a justification previous to faith, and therefore without faith. It is the justification of all sinners through their vital union with Christ. Such a notion can never be reconciled with the great Scriptural doctrine of justification *by faith* as stated in the Creed and as held by all Consistent Calvinists. The antagonism between the two beliefs is uncompromising.

"Personal Requisites."

6. While the Andover Creed and Consistent Calvinism set forth the atonement of Christ as absolutely indispensable to the salvation of sinners, they also place marked emphasis upon the divine

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 52, 53, 56.

revelation that, "repentance, faith and holiness are personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation." All Consistent Calvinists make conspicuous in their faith and in their preaching the great gospel truth, that while the atonement of Christ is *sufficient* for the salvation of all men, it yet never becomes *efficient* in the salvation of any man, until he repents of his sins, believes on Christ, and begins to be in character and life a holy man. They believe and preach, that God from all eternity was a loving, merciful, and gracious God, that He "so loved the world" that He gave his Son to die for it; that it was always in his disposition to become actually propitiated and reconciled to penitent and believing sinners, and thus to forgive and save them, in case He *could* do this *righteously*, or without bringing shame upon his own character and breaking down the authority of his holy Law. They also believe and preach that the atonement made in the sacrifice of the Incarnate Son of God, and of Him alone, did open a way for God, or make it possible for Him, without dishonor to his own character and throne, to become propitiated and reconciled to sinners, in other words, to forgive and save them, upon the condition, and *only* upon the condition, that they repent of their sins, believe on Christ, and become obedient to God. Hence Consistent Calvinists have always been evangelistic Christians, praying, preaching, and laboring for the immediate conversion of their fellow-men, and doing this in fulfilment of the express command of the Lord Jesus, "that *repentance* and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," and doing this also in the spirit of the great missionary Apostle, who could say to the elders of the church at Ephesus, I "have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying to both Jews and Greeks *repentance* toward God and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

But "Progressive Orthodoxy," on the contrary, places no emphasis upon "repentance, faith and holiness" as "personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation." The progressive divines are giving no noticeable exhibitions of evangelistic fervor. Indeed, they cannot, in consistency with their pantheistic beliefs, go everywhere preaching "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," and laboring in season and out for the conversion and salvation of lost sinners. Why should

they do anything for the redemption of men who are already in organic and vital union with Christ? What more *can* be done for them? Even if a progressive professor should, under the influence of his old but now abandoned evangelical faith, or from sheer force of habit, or for the purpose of holding on to a desirable official position, continue to speak and teach in favor of immediate conversions, Pentecostal revivals, and evangelistic missions, yet how long would he do so? These Andover progressives are properly called "liberal Christians"; but "liberal Christians" have never been marvelously famous for their evangelistic and missionary labors. No honorable man will for any length of time teach and preach what is utterly discordant with his own beliefs. Already there is evidence that it is the chief purpose of the new-departure professors to train young men for philanthropic, socialistic, and educational work, to the neglect, if not exclusion, of all evangelistic labors. If the advocates of "Progressive Orthodoxy" preach and work in harmony with their opinions and beliefs, as sooner or later they certainly will do if they preach and labor at all, they must place all emphasis, not upon repentance and faith, nor upon any other voluntary obedience to God and to the gospel of his Son, but upon their own regnant theological principle of the organic and vital union of the entire race with Christ, proclaiming everywhere that all men are "*in Christ*" before, and of course without, repentance, faith, and holiness, and even before and without atonement. What they are bound to make as conspicuous in their preaching as it is in their belief, is this, that for all practical ends the supreme need of every man is, not to repent of his sins and believe on Christ, but *to know* that he himself is *in Christ*, and that Christ is *in* him; *to know* that he himself *was* in Christ, not only before repentance, faith, and obedience, but even before Christ was offered in sacrifice upon the cross. This "knowledge of Christ" is of supreme concern to every man. Personal repentance, faith, and obedience are of comparatively little moment. The phrases, "knowledge of Christ," "having knowledge of Christ," "to know Christ," abound in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and in nearly all the religious writings and speech of the Andover progressives. We have not space for quotations, nor are they necessary. No one can read "Progressive Orthodoxy" without noting the frequent asser-

tion, in one form or another, of the absolute indispensableness of "the knowledge of Christ." Just what this knowledge is, or what degree of it is so necessary, we are not clearly informed. Evidently, however, it is not that knowledge of God and of his Son Jesus Christ of which our Lord and his Apostles spoke. It is, as has already been shown, simply a knowledge of Christ in his union with men. In this view, what every man supremely needs is "*to know*" Christ in the alleged constitution of his person, in his alleged vital relation to every member of the human race; to *know* that he himself, irrespective of his own character as righteous or wicked, or of any act of his own, is united to the Lord Jesus by an organic and vital union, and that he *was* thus united to Him before the crucifixion, and while Christ was suffering and dying upon the cross, and that he *will* be thus united to Him forever. This knowledge of Christ, it is claimed, may lead to repentance, faith, and holiness. It is also claimed that no man will or can repent without this knowledge. Consequently all members of the race who do not *know* Christ in this life *must* have opportunity to know Him, and *will* know Him, in the life to come. But what evidence is there that *this knowledge* will bring any man to repentance either in this life or in the next? Where is the man who will testify that by his knowledge of Christ as vitally united to every human being he was brought to repentance, faith, and obedience? This dogma of the organic union of Christ with the entire human race has been accepted and loudly proclaimed in the last and the present centuries by Rellyan Universalists, and by other men holding pantheistic beliefs; but how many persons are there who have been made penitent, believing, and holy by Rellyan Universalism and Pantheism? Unregenerate human nature being what it is described to be in God's Word, and what we know it to be, one would suppose that if an impenitent and persistent sinner *could know assuredly* that he is vitally and eternally united to Christ, he would break loose from all restraint, give full liberty to his lusts and passions, and plunge deeper than ever into wickedness. The moral fruit of Rellyanism, as can easily be shown, has thus far been anything but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. At all events, this emphasizing and magnifying "the knowledge of Christ," as He is set forth by "Progressive Orthodoxy," in his pantheistic union with the entire human race, is in

irreconcilable conflict with the Andover Creed, which attaches supreme practical importance, not to any speculative knowledge concerning the constitution and relations of Christ's being, but to personal "repentance, faith and holiness," as the indispensable conditions of our salvation. "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches, without proof, that men are brought to repentance, faith, and holiness by their organic and vital union with Christ, and to salvation by their knowledge of that union. But the Andover Creed declares "that by *convincing us of our sin* and *misery*, enlightening our minds, *working faith* in us, and renewing our wills, the HOLY SPIRIT makes us partakers of the benefits of redemption." The antagonism between these two beliefs, upon the supreme question of the way of salvation, is unqualified and irrepressible.

THE ATONEMENT MADE BY THE GOD-MAN.

7. The defendant antagonizes the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary by denying that Christ, at the time when He made the atonement, was *God* as well as man. Who was the being who was offered in atoning sacrifice on Calvary? The statement of the Andover Creed is, that "the Son of God, and He alone, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men." But who is "the Son of God"? The Andover Creed represents that He is the Second Person in the Trinity, "the same in substance, equal in power and glory" with the Father and the Holy Ghost, that *He*, "the eternal Son of God," "became man, and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever"; and that *while* He was continuing to be God and man, in two distinct natures and one Person, He "the Son of God, and He alone, by his sufferings and death, made atonement for the sins of all men." No mere creature, then, according to this Creed, was the author of the atonement.

THE ATONEMENT MADE BY A BEING WHO WAS NOT GOD AND MAN.

But the defendant denies that our Lord, while He was in the flesh and when He was offered in atoning sacrifice, was "God and man in two distinct natures." His belief is, as has already been shown under our Second Particular Charge,

that Christ in the days of his humiliation was a finite being, limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments; in other words was not *God and Man;*

that He was not omniscient nor omnipresent, nor possessed of any other infinite perfection; that He did not at that time have any divine nature distinct from his human nature; that it was his human nature that was divine, yet only as the human nature of every other man is divine. Christ while in the flesh was simply and wholly human, and his divinity was simply the divineness of all humanity. He had only a human nature, yet this was "created capacious of Deity," and it is immediately added, "This is true also of other men according to their measure."[1] The defendant affirms that

it is the belief that God was in Christ *so far* as God can manifest his life in a human personality at a given period in history.[2]

But the same may be said of every other man. Yet did not Christ, while in the flesh, work mighty miracles of mercy, which required something more than human power? No. He wrought veritable works of healing, yet wrought them by human means and forces, as, for instance, by the power which a man with a healthy body has over a sick man, and "by hypnotic and mesmeric influence."[3]

Such is the teaching of the defendant. In his view, Christ in his earthly life, and when he made the atonement for the race of condemned and lost sinners, was as merely and wholly human as any other man is.

Now was such a merely human creature "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"? Did a *mesmerizer*, by his sufferings and death on Calvary, make atonement for the sins of all men? It is safe to say that no representation respecting the divine Author of the atonement could have been more shocking or abhorrent than this to the Consistent Calvinists who founded Andover Seminary. It was a cardinal doctrine with them that no man or angel was equal to the task of consummating the stupendous atoning work needful for the salvation of sinners; that only the eternal Son of God incarnated, only He who was both "*God* and man," could possibly have become "the propitiation

[1] Prog. Orth. p. 21. [2] Andover Review, October, 1892, p. 398. [3] Ibid.

for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Consistent Calvinists have always been strenuously opposed to the unscriptural notion, that when the eternal Son of God became flesh and made the atonement He ceased to be God and became only a creature. We have already alluded to the fact that Dr. Emmons, who aided in writing the Andover Creed, believed that the eternal Son of God, when He was tabernacled in the flesh and dwelt with men, at the same time filled all heaven with his presence. Dr. Samuel Hopkins, whose followers called themselves Consistent Calvinists, speaking of the transcendent and ineffable work of redemption, says: —

Dr. Hopkins's View.

A mere creature would be infinitely unequal to this. It is necessary that this should be believed; that his infinitely high and glorious person and character, as the true God, should be kept in view, in order to trust in him as the Redeemer of man from the infinite evil which he deserves, from a state of total moral depravity to the favor of God, to perfect holiness and eternal life, by his suffering and obedience, and by his power, wisdom, and goodness.

It is necessary that he should be a person of infinite dignity, excellence and worthiness, in order to make atonement for sin by suffering the penalty of the law, as has been explained above from the Scriptures. The sufferings of a mere creature could do nothing towards this; and had such an one offered to undertake this, it would have been so far from pleasing the Governor of the world, that it must be considered as an affront offered to him, most dishonorable to his character, law and government; and the obedience of a mere creature or of all creatures, could not so honor the law, and the divine authority expressed by it, which sinners had reproached and trampled under foot by their rebellion, as to obtain favor, recovery from a state of sin, and eternal life for them, out of respect to the merit and worthiness of such obedience. This could be done by none but a person of infinite greatness and worth, and one who was under no obligation to obey antecedent to his voluntarily taking upon him the form of a servant. And it requires infinite power, skill, and wisdom, to recover a rebel from total depravity and enmity against God and his law, to obedience and holiness, and infinite condescension and goodness. All this is ascribed to the Redeemer in the Holy Scriptures, as has been shown. And surely none can believe all this, and rely with confidence on the Redeemer for such redemption, who does not believe him to be truly God, infinitely great, honorable, powerful, wise and good.[1]

[1] Hopkins's Works, vol. 1, pp. 358, 359.

These views of Dr. Hopkins respecting the deity of Christ while He dwelt in human form on the earth, and made atonement for the sins of all men, are the views of all Consistent Calvinists. These theologians hold, that, according to the Scriptures, an adequate atonement for all human sins could not have been made by any mere creature, not even by the highest archangel, but only by Him who was the eternal Son of God incarnated, the one and only God-man. Their lofty views of the Incarnate Son of God were in full accord with those of the great church-father, Athanasius, who, speaking of the Redeemer as manifested in the flesh, glorifies Him in such language as the following: —

ATHANASIUS' VIEW.

For He was not circumscribed in the body; nor was so in the body as not to be elsewhere too. Nor, while He moved that, had He emptied the universe of His effectual working and providence; but, what is most marvellous, being the Word, He was not contained by any thing, but rather contained all things Himself. And as, when present in the whole creation He is essentially distinct from it all, but in it all by His power, ordering all things, and unfolding His providence over all things in all, and quickening each and every thing at once, containing the universe, and not being contained, but existing wholly in His Father alone in every respect; — so also, existing in a human body and Himself quickening it, He was naturally quickening also the universe, and was present in every part, yet outside the whole. And being known from the body through His works, He was manifest too from His working of the universe. . . . And this is the marvel, that He was at once living the daily life of a man, and as the Word was quickening all things, and as Son was present with the Father. Whence, not even when born of the Virgin, did He undergo change.[1]

Now when these sublime words of Athanasius respecting the Deity of our Incarnate Lord and Redeemer are compared with the words of the Andover progressives upon the same theme, what a stupendous contrast is presented! No old pagan Pantheism glaring at us from out the language of this great church-father; no dethroning of Christ, and telling us that He ceased to be God when He came to redeem lost sinners; no deifying of ourselves and of all men, and telling us, what we know is false, that we are all God-men, as truly as Christ was a God-man; no tearing out of our faith and out of our Bible the glorious mystery of

[1] De Incarnatione Verbi Dei, chap. xvii.

the real incarnation of *God* in Christ; nothing of this; but our adorable Redeemer is presented to us as *God and man;* as human, yet at the same time as filling the universe with his quickening and sustaining presence; manifested in a human body, yet at the same time manifested also through all his own vast creation, from which He is essentially distinct, but which He ever fills and transcends. Such an One is, indeed, "very God and very man." And He it was, and He alone, who made atonement for the sins of all men. This is the sublime doctrine of the Andover Creed, and of all Consistent Calvinists, as well as of the great church-father, Athanasius.

The Defendant's View.

"Progressive Orthodoxy," on the other hand, degrades our infinite Redeemer by representing that in his earthly life He was merely and wholly a creature having only a created human nature with all its necessary limitations; that this created nature was divine only in the sense in which all men and beasts and things are divine; that our Redeemer's presence was limited to his body; that his knowledge and power and wisdom were limited as truly as were those of any other man in his country, and at his period in history; that it is simply ridiculous to believe,

> that God in all his absoluteness, omniscience, and omnipotence took on the form of a man and walked about among men in Galilee, so that Jesus knew all occurrences on earth and through the universe, and was conscious that he created the stars, and knew more not only than the ancients, but more than the moderns, of science and philosophy.[1]

The progressive professors hold that it is absolute nonsense to ascribe to the world's Incarnate Redeemer infinite knowledge. They doubtless regard those who believe that He was omniscient as men of no spirituality or mental ability, their minds being antiquated and benighted;[2] but are fully persuaded that those who live in the effulgent light that has recently broken upon the progressive minds at Andover, and are in possession of their superior spirituality and ability, are abundantly competent to decide what the Almighty can do among men in Galilee, and what He cannot do, and are abundantly able, out of their own knowledge and wisdom, to declare for the information of the world that the actual

[1] Andover Review, October, 1892, pp. 397, 398. [2] See The Andover Defence, p. 296.

Incarnation of the eternal Son of God was an absolute impossibility; that there never was such an incarnation; that the Lord Jesus Christ, who once appeared in Galilee, and offered Himself as the world's Redeemer, was simply and wholly human; that his divinity, so called, was nothing different in kind from their own; that He was simply the creature of his own time and country, weak, ignorant, and helpless, and that *by this man* the atonement was made for the sins of all men, if, indeed, any atonement, so called, was ever made. Yet the said atonement was not made by Him alone, but by Him in union with and aided by all other men who ever have lived or ever will live.

Now, Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, between these views respecting the world's Redeemer and those set forth by the Andover Creed, by Consistent Calvinists and Athanasius, there is a great gulf fixed. It is broad and deep. There is no passing from the one side of it to the other. Between these two classes of views, no union or compromise is possible. Their antagonism is absolute and eternal. Yet the defendant and his progressive associates have promised, upon their honor, that they would maintain and inculcate the sublime views set forth by the Creed and by Consistent Calvinism — views which exalt and glorify the Incarnate Son of God. But, in fact, as we have shown, they are maintaining and inculcating views which not only shockingly misrepresent our Incarnate Redeemer, but also defame Him.

The Founders of Andover Seminary were hospitable towards all new light, but it must *be* new light, and not old darkness. They avowed their own obligation to make progress in knowledge, and they expected to go on to know their adorable Lord and Redeemer forever and ever, and they expected all professors and students in their Seminary to do the same. The self-styled progressive divines, as their very name indicates, are in duty bound to make progress, and they loudly proclaim that they are doing so. But in what direction are they progressing, forward and upward, or backward and downward? Their last and most advanced thought — so far as we know — respecting our Incarnate Saviour, is, that He was a *mesmerizer!* Now does this, their last advance in knowledge respecting our Redeemer, indicate that their boasted progress is forward and upward, or backward

and downward? Compare also the littleness and the limitations of Christ's being and character as set forth by this last new name given Him, with the absolute infiniteness and the supreme majesty and glory of his being and character as set forth in the adoring language of Athanasius, and tell us, Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, which of these contrasted and eternally conflicting views respecting our Incarnate Lord and Redeemer shall be maintained and taught on these Andover Foundations?

8. This pantheistic theory of atonement advocated by the defendant, and held up in "Progressive Orthodoxy" as the latest and most advanced thought respecting atonement, was well known to the Founders of Andover Seminary as the theory maintained in their time by the so-called Rellyan Universalists.

Rellyanism.

We have already given, under our Third Particular Complaint, an outline of the history of Rellyanism in this country. It is not necessary to repeat that history here, but it is needful that it be distinctly recalled to mind. We did not give a full account of Rellyanism, as it lived and wrought in eastern Massachusetts for about forty years, from 1770 to 1810, — to do this would require a volume, — but we did give enough of that strange history to prove that, beyond question, the writers of the Andover Creed and Statutes, and all the Founders of Andover Seminary, were perfectly familiar with the pantheistic errors of Rellyan Universalism.

Andover Seminary was founded for the purpose of preparing young men for the Christian ministry, under the instruction of professors, who should be solemnly pledged to maintain and inculcate the doctrines of the Seminary Creed and all the other doctrines of Consistent Calvinism, "*in opposition* to" thirteen specified classes of errorists. Now it will not be denied, that of these thirteen classes of errorists, there were two which the Founders had chiefly in mind and whose unscriptural beliefs they wished especially to oppose, namely, Unitarians and Universalists. Universalism had been rampant in New England and in some other parts of the country for nearly two scores of years, under the energetic lead of John Murray, "the father of Universalism in America." Unitarianism had more recently asserted

itself by taking possession of Harvard College, which was founded by orthodox men for the service, not only of good learning, but of evangelical religion, and by electing a Unitarian to the Hollis Professorship, which was founded to maintain the orthodox faith. There was, therefore, in the judgment of large numbers of evangelical people, urgent need of a theological seminary whose teaching and influence should be opposed to these two systems of unevangelical belief. These errors were no longer indefinite, concealed, and unknown. They were now clearly defined, and the unscrupulous purpose of these errorists to get possession of the meeting-houses, vested funds, and other property of evangelical churches, as well as of evangelical institutions of learning, was beginning to be disclosed.

Unitarianism.

The generous Founders of Andover Seminary were not ignorant of Unitarianism. They had definite knowledge of what it was, and, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, they so framed their Creed and Statutes as to make it forever impossible for an honest man to teach Unitarianism on their foundations. The Seminary is now eighty-five years old, and during this long period no distinctive doctrine or even phase of Unitarianism has been taught by aid of the trust funds provided by the orthodox Founders, until within the last few years.

Rellyan Universalism.

Nor were the Founders ignorant of Universalism. They had definite knowledge of it and a decided opinion of its character and influence. Gloucester in this State is not far from Newburyport. In the latter town resided three of the chief Founders of Andover Seminary, namely, Dr. Samuel Spring, William Bartlet, and Moses Brown. At the time of the founding of the Seminary, the career of John Murray at Gloucester had become historic. His methods of procedure were such that officers of the town had ordered him to leave the community. A pamphlet had been published and widely distributed, giving a full account not only of his dishonorable and divisive attempts to get possession of the pulpit of the orthodox church during the sickness of its pastor, but also of some of the peculiar, Universalistic beliefs which he held and

preached. On account of these historic occurrences at Gloucester, and others like them in other places, all well-informed people in New England had come to have a definite knowledge of Murray, of his personality, of his methods, and of his beliefs. The man himself and his Rellyan Universalism had been publicly and privately discussed throughout the Eastern and Middle States. Moreover, at the time Andover Seminary was founded, several editions of Relly's "*Union*" had been published in this country and had been rapidly and widely distributed. Dr. Samuel Hopkins, Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger, Dr. Nathanael Emmons, and other Consistent Calvinists had publicly and severely criticized the doctrines of the book. Probably there was not, at that time, an intelligent Christian minister in any of the religious denominations in New England who did not know what Rellyanism was. Wherever Murray went there was a tempest. All the Founders of Andover Seminary had been, through the larger part of their lives, in the more central part of the battle between evangelical faith and Rellyan Universalism. Did they forget this strenuous and persistent error when they were laying the foundations of their theological seminary? Impossible. Murray, though an old man, was still preaching in Boston. The evidence is abundant that they had Rellyanism distinctly in mind when they were deciding what should and what should not be taught in their theological institution. Any man to-day who has only a general knowledge of Rellyanism can see, upon even a cursory examination of the language of the Founders, that they designedly so framed their Creed and Statutes as to make it forever impossible for any honest man to hold and teach any form of Universalism, and especially Rellyan Universalism, on their Foundations. And it is an historic fact, that no form or phase of Universalism ever has been held and taught by professors supported by the Andover trust-funds, until recently. Within the last few years, a so-called "new theology," named by the defendant and his associates "*Progressive Orthodoxy*," has been forced into the Seminary. This so-called "Progressive Orthodoxy," the complainants claim, is essentially Rellyan Universalism. Under our Third Particular Complaint we have shown conclusively, as we believe, that "Progressive Orthodoxy" is, in its vital and central principle and largely in its development, Rellyan Universalism.

We propose now to present still further evidence and argument in support of this position by showing that the theory of atonement set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy" is identical with the theory advocated by Rellyan Universalism.

The Rellyan Theory of Atonement the Theory of "Progressive Orthodoxy."

(*a*) According to Rellyanism, the very heart and life of the atonement is the asserted verity that the entire human race was *with Christ and in Him* when He was offered up in sacrifice upon the cross. He and the race constituted one person. The race was an essential part of the very being of Christ. It was the fulness of Christ. Christ would not have been complete without the race. If a single member of the race had not been vitally united to Him, Christ would have been an imperfect, defective Christ. Speaking of the members of the human body, Relly says: —

> Take away the members and there will remain no body; take a *few*, yea *one only* away, and the body is not perfect; deny the proportionable perfection of any one of these members, and then the symmetry of the body is destroyed. So also is Christ; take away the people [that is, the human race], or deny that they were united to their Head *Jesus* at some certain time, then was there at that time no *Christ*. Or if all the *Church* [all men] were not united to Him, but some particular member, or members, stood at any time unrelated to him; then was he not a *perfect Christ* at that time.[1]

Such, according to Rellyanism, was the vital union of Christ with every human being when Christ hung upon the cross. This union is the absolute, pantheistic oneness of Christ and the human race.

But this is also the teaching of the Andover progressives. "Progressive Orthodoxy," in all its discussion of the atonement, attaches supreme significance to the alleged verity that the entire human race was with and in Christ when He hung upon the cross, as has been abundantly shown.

(*b*) Rellyanism represents that this vital union of all men with Christ imparts to them great power, dignity, and honor, and that on account of this betterment of men God regards them as having

[1] Union, p. 34.

augmented importance and value, and, irrespective of their moral character, is propitiated and reconciled to them, and bestows upon them special love and favor. Rellyanists speak of the vital union of the human race with Christ as "this mysterious, this ennobling, this soul-satisfying *Union*," and often represent, that even the most wicked members of the race stand high in God's estimation, in spite of their wickedness, on account of their vital relation to Christ. Relly holds that all men alike are loved of the Father, because they and Christ constitute one person. He remarks: —

> Thus considering him [Christ] as the *Head* of his Body the *Church*, [which is the human race], we give Him the pre-eminence, as *immediately* receiving all Grace and Glory from the Father; which honour all the members, as *united* to him the *Head*, must necessarily partake of in Him.[1]

"All the members," then, all human beings, as united to Christ their Head, do now partake of all his honor and glory, and God must look upon them as having, irrespective of their moral character, a vastly augmented importance and value on account of their vital union with Christ. Such is the teaching of Rellyanism.

But "Progressive Orthodoxy" presents substantially the same view. Take the following statements: —

> One view of atonement is gained by considering the historical Christ in relation to humanity and as identified with it; in which view we see that the race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it. . . .
>
> Humanity may thus be thought of as offering something to God of eminent value.[2]

These statements of "Progressive Orthodoxy," and many others, represent, that the entire human race, by its organic and vital union with Christ, without any change whatever in its moral character, has received various kinds of powers and dignities, of which powers and dignities it was previously wholly destitute, and so has attained an importance, a respectability, and an eminent value in the sight of God which it did not have before, and on account of this eminent respectability and value thus imparted to the whole race, God is propitiated and reconciled to all men, and

[1] Union, p. 39. [2] Prog. Orth. pp. 52, 53.

consequently all men, fallen and sinful as they are, and previous to any repentance or faith on their part, are freely and fully forgiven and justified of God.

This is not the place, nor have we the time, to characterize adequately this kind of atonement. But the point we now make and emphasize is that this theory of atonement set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy," and now maintained and inculcated by the defendant and his progressive associates on the Andover Foundations, is identically that theory of atonement which constitutes an essential part of Rellyan Universalism. And it is for the Board of Visitors to decide, whether Rellyan Universalism can be defended and taught by any professor in Andover Seminary, even with the permission and aid of the Board of Trustees, without a criminal violation of most solemn promises and engagements, a gigantic breach of trust on the part of the Trustees, and also on the part of both Trustees and professors, a most extraordinary disregard, and an utter avoidance of the true intention of the Founders of the Seminary, as expressed in their Constitution and Statutes.

(*c*) But the identity of the Rellyan theory of atonement with that of "Progressive Orthodoxy" is further and clearly disclosed in the fact, that both of these theologies persistently maintain that Christ was *not* "*alone*" when He was offered in atoning sacrifice on the cross. All evangelical Christians from time immemorial have believed in and emphasized the *aloneness* of our Redeemer in his sufferings and death. In Isaiah 63 : 3, 5, Jehovah is represented as saying, "I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me. . . . And I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me." These graphic and pathetic words of Jehovah doubtless have no reference whatever to the passion of our Lord. Yet by way of accommodation they have often been used as vividly expressive of what has always been the belief of evangelical Christendom respecting the *aloneness* of the Redeemer, when with none to help Him He bore the world's burden of sin and guilt on the cross.

But both Rellyanism and "Progressive Orthodoxy" plainly contradict the general historic belief of the Christian Church upon this point, and dogmatically declare that our Lord was *not alone*

in his atoning sacrifice on Calvary, but that the entire human race was with Him and in Him as a constituent part of his person, when He suffered and died for the sins of all men.

Rellyanism, indeed, affirms that, without this vital union of the race with the atoning Saviour, his sufferings and death would have been unjust and cruel. Relly asserts that: —

it doth not appear how God from a principle of mercy and peace towards Mankind, could punish sin upon *Christ*, without the concurrence of Righteousness and Truth; nor can this concurrence or harmony be proved; without *Union* between *Christ* and those for whom he endured the *Cross*, and *dispised the shame.*

First. Because, contrary to Truth, which declareth, . . . that the sinner shall die for his own sin; and that the righteous shall not suffer. . . . This is the language of *Truth;* one jot or tittle of which shall not fail, though Heaven and Earth should pass away. Therefore, such an *Union* or relation between *Christ* and his *Church* [the human race], as gives *Him* the right of redemption, and brings *Him* under that Character which is obnoxious to punishment, is absolutely necessary, that His sufferings for sin might accord with the declarations and demands of truth.

Secondly. It is contrary to *Justice* to afflict the Innocent: to punish and destroy him is cruelty and injustice. Without the consideration of *Union*, where is the Justice of charging the black rebellion, and crying guilt of *Man*, upon the pure and spotless Head of *Jesus?* . . . Sin is not only a Debt, for which suretyship is sometimes admitted, but a *Transgression*, a *Crime*, capital in the highest sense, only atoned for by the shedding of Blood; by the *Death*, yea, by the *eternal Death* of the Sinner; which Justice must inflict before it can be properly satisfied; nor can it possibly admit of a *Surety* here, because it can only punish him whom it *first* finds guilty; and that not by reckoning him to *be* what he is *not*, according to human quibbles; but according to artless, reasonable, divine Equity, which can only declare such guilty, on whom the fault is found, and can only find the fault on such who have committed it. *We* only committed the fault, upon *Us* only can it be found. Therefore without such an *Union* between *Christ* and *us*, as exposes *us*, in *his* person, to Judgment and Condemnation, the harmony of the divine perfections doth not appear in the things which he suffered, because contrary to Truth and Justice.

Again, it is contrary to *Mercy*, as Mercy may not, consistent with its own nature, trespass the limits of Truth and Justice. But if *Jesus* suffered for sin, without such an Union to the Sinner as made his sufferings and Blood to be regarded as that of the offender, though there be an appearance of mercy towards *us*, there is a great lack of it towards *Him*, who suffered for sin unjustly charged upon him. Such is not the

nature of infinite Goodness, to show mercy to *one* through injustice to *another:* But if united to the Sinner there is a consistency, yea, a Divine Equity in His sufferings.[1]

Now all this explanation of what is alleged to have been accomplished by the union of all men with Christ on the cross shows how absolutely indispensable it is, in maintaining the Rellyan theory of atonement, to prove that Christ was *not alone* in his sufferings and death. For if, in fact, He *was* alone on the cross, and there suffered and died in the *room of*, or *instead of*, all men, and not *with* and *in* them, then all support of the Rellyan theory of atonement is destroyed, and the whole theory falls to the ground.

As Christ is in Condition, Act, and Character, so are all Men.

But again, while Rellyanism claims that this pantheistic union of the Incarnate Son of God with the entire human race made it perfectly just and equitable for the sins of all men, as members of his body, to be visited upon Him as their Head, it also claims, that by this same union all men are made to share involuntarily in all that Christ is or does; made to partake, without any volition of their own, in all Christ's condition and experiences, on the cross and everywhere else; made to repent, believe, and obey in his perfect repentance, faith, and obedience; and even while persisting in their sins, and before ever they have fulfilled one of those conditions of salvation prescribed in the gospel, made perfectly righteous in the righteousness of Christ their Head, and crowned with all his honors and glories. Rellyanism affirms that man of himself has no power of any kind to obey the commandments of the decalogue, or of the gospel of Christ. (Citations in proof of this statement may be found under our Third Particular Charge.) But Rellyanism also affirms that all men, through their organic and vital union with Christ their Head, do, in his perfect obedience, themselves render an absolutely perfect obedience to all the commandments of the law and the gospel, although at the same time they are fully conscious of continuing in the life and love of sin, and conscious too of their own helplessness to

[1] Union, pp. 4–8.

live a life of righteousness. These views are expressed in the following language of Relly: —

if this *Church* [that is, this human race], as united to *Christ*, is not perfect, according to the perfection of beauty, in Righteousness, Holyness, Wisdom, and so forth, then is *Christ* deficient in those particulars: which to affirm will be agreed upon by all his worshipers to be blasphemy. From hence we may infer, that whatever *Jesus was*, whatever He *did*, *suffered*, or *now is*, under the Character *Christ*, the people, as *the fullness of him who filleth all in all*, are not excluded; but to be considered *with him*, and *in him*, in the same circumstances, and condition, through every dispensation.[1]

Of similar import is the following statement: —

From hence it is evident, that the *Union* between *Christ* and the *People* was such (as Head and Members in one Body) that they were *with Him*, and *in Him*, in his Birth, his Life, his Death, Resurrection and Glory. Therefore *his* Sufferings, Wars, and Triumphs, all are *theirs*. And they have a right from this, to rejoice in Him; in what *He has done*, in what *He is*, and in the acceptance *He* hath found with the Father; and that, over all the weakness, and vanity they perceive in themselves.[2]

On another page Relly breaks out in such exultant language as the following: —

And O, what grace is this! that we helpless worms, whose every word, work and thought is unholy, yea in whom according to the strongest testimony of our senses and reason, there is yet found the motions, life and love of sin, should have a right to reckon ourselves dead unto sin; dead unto what we yet feel the *life* of, dead unto what we yet feel the *love* of, dead unto what is yet stronger than we, and against which our utmost efforts when compared with its strength are feebleness itself; it esteems all our Iron as straw, and our Brass as rotten wood; and yet to reckon ourselves dead unto this, what an amazing reckoning it is! Yea, not only dead unto sin, whereby we are exempt from its filth, guilt and condemnation; but we are to reckon ourselves positively Holy, Righteous and fruitful, *Alive unto God!* and that in Opposition to all we see, feel or understand of ourselves, according to sense. . . . Hence we have authority to conclude, if *he* is righteous, *we* are righteous; as He we are holy; as He we are wise; as He we have obtained redemption, and are accepted with Him. . . . We would always believe in *hope*, in hope of *his* being accepted, of God's being well pleased in *him*, and of our being accepted, and well-pleasing as him, by the Grace of *Union with* him. . . . Our right and priviledge is to judge of ourselves and of our state towards God, by Union with

[1] Union, pp. 34, 35. [2] Ibid. p. 42.

Christ: By the Father's choice of *him*, His choice of *us;* by his love to *him*, his love unto *us;* by his acceptance of *him*, his acceptance of *us;* by *his* eternal life and glory, *our* eternal life aud glory; and all this, without once considering the work of our own hands, or the desires, yearnings, or meditations of our Hearts. . . . But unto all the Gentiles, the outcasts, the destitute, the Sinners amongst Mankind, with all who know themselves, and groan beneath the miseries of man, here are tidings of great Joy. There is a Saviour born unto you, a Saviour who *is Christ* the Lord; and what is more, tho' *you* are worthless, He is worthy. Though you are lost, He is found; though you are unrighteous, unholy, unwise, yet He is Righteous, Holy, Wise, and withall so nearly related, so closely united unto you, that *you* may Reckon yourselves to be what *he is*, and viewing *him* as *yourselves* through all He did and suffered, have your conscience purged from Dead works, stand washed, and acquitted in his Bloody Death, and have the answer of a good conscience towards God, by his resurrection.[1]

Immorality of Rellyanism.

This is saying to all men, even to the most wicked and abandoned of men, "You need not be troubled on account of your sins. You may be profoundly conscious that you are plunging deeper and deeper into wickedness, and are waxing worse and worse. But what of it? Fear not. You have no occasion to be troubled, or to tremble in dread of the things that are coming. Throw off all conviction of sin. You have no need to bear any burden of guilt on your soul, still less of remorse and despair. For even while you are sinning, you are in Christ and Christ is in you. The entire human race is the body of Christ, and each one of you is a member of that body, and can no more perish than Christ can perish. Moreover, you were with and in Christ Jesus in his sufferings and death on the cross, and there with Him made full atonement for all your sins. And what is more and better still, in your vital union with Christ you have a right to regard Him as your very self, and yourself as being what He is, and as doing what He does, and as experiencing what He experiences, in all his conditions, acts, sufferings, joys, and honors. You of yourself have no power to repent, or believe, or obey; but in union with Christ you have already offered to God a perfect repentance, faith, and obedience. Sin as much as you may, conscious as you may be of having in you 'the motions, life, and

[1] Union, pp. 88-91.

love of sin,' yet, 'so *nearly related* to Christ, so *closely united*' and *identified* with Him are you, that you may view Him as yourself, and reckon yourself to be perfectly righteous in his righteousness."

Now most men, however wicked they may be, if addressed in this manner would naturally ask: "Is this doctrine you are preaching true? Is it the very word of God? Can we trust in it as the veritable revelation and gospel of Christ?" "Yes," Relly would answer. But we would reply, "Everything depends upon the answer that must be given to another question." That question is this: Was Christ Jesus *alone* in his sufferings and death on the cross, or did He have "with Him and in Him" the entire human race? If He *was alone* in his great atoning sacrifice, and no member of the race was "with Him and in Him" in his passion and death, then the whole system of Rellyan beliefs breaks down, and the whole Rellyan gospel, like so much mist or smoke, vanishes into nothing. Now, that there ever was such a union of the eternal Son of God with the entire human race as makes all men with Him one person, all having only one common life, we venture to affirm, has never yet been proved from Revelation or from reason. But it has been and is the common belief of the Christian Church that, according to the Scriptures, Jesus Christ is the "*only* Redeemer" of men, and that He, "and *He alone*, by his sufferings and death," has procured redemption for all men who repent of their sins and believe on Him.

John Murray.

The Rellyan views presented in the citations which we have just made from James Relly were also heartily accepted by John Murray, and were the staple of his preaching. This will be indicated by a few passages from his writings. Murray remarks: —

> The soul that sinneth it shall die, says the prophet, . . . and as God declared *he would by no means clear the guilty*, this sentence of death has been fully executed on every man. . . . Jesus came to fulfil this law, yea, every jot, and tittle thereof; therefore he died once for all. . . . Thus God, instead of clearing the guilty, exacted the uttermost farthing; hence he is a *just* God, and a Saviour: hence he is just in justifying the ungodly; and hence also appears the justice of God in the sufferings and death of him, who, in himself, detached from the race of Adam, was pure and undefiled, perfectly *sinless*. But, it should be remembered,

Christ is the *head* of *every man;* the individuals of the lost nature constitute the aggregate of our Lord's mystical body; the comprehensive term union is the key by which we unlock this mystery, the head and members are united, and the iniquity of the members is visited upon the head. In any other view that law, which is holy, just and good, could not have condemned to death an immaculate being; there would be as much *injustice* in punishing the *innocent*, as in clearing the guilty; but I repeat, our Almighty Saviour was the head of the lost nature, and he became accountable for the sins committed by the members of his body. . . . Thus then, in this stupendous connection, bearing the sins of his body, it became divinely just that he should suffer the death, that the punishment should follow the offence; but if it were just to inflict the penalty of death upon Jesus Christ for our sins, then it becomes *just* that we should *live through him;* hence, as he died for us that whether we wake or sleep we should be the Lord's, so he is *now our life*, and when he who is *our life* shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory. Now, therefore, may every soul that hath sinned, say with the Apostle Paul, who *styled himself the chief of sinners*, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? *The sting of death is sin*," but we behold the Lamb of God who *taketh away the sin of the world.*[1]

Nor was it simply in his life, sufferings, and death, but also in every other condition of his, that Christ Jesus was in vital union with the entire human race. Murray teaches that

The human nature of Emmanuel is part of every child's flesh; and every human soul inhabiting a tenement of flesh has as much right to left his adoring eye to Jesus Christ, as a part of himself, as any member of my body might, if it had sense in itself, claim my head as a part of itself. Jesus is not flesh and bone, distinct from our flesh and bone, but he is flesh *of* our flesh, and bone *of* our bone. For both he who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are *all of one*. And this is at all times the comprehensive character of the Redeemer, insomuch that when he was born without sin, we were in that eventful moment created anew in Christ Jesus; when he was crucified, we were crucified with Christ Jesus; when he died we were buried by baptism into his death; and when he arose, raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so that we also should walk in newness of life. . . . And we ascended with Christ, being heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.[2]

Murray, as well as Relly, held that Christ and the entire human race constitute "one Son of Man," one "life or soul," one universal person, so that every human being's life is one with the life of Christ, and his righteousness one with the perfect righteousness

[1] Letters and Sketches of Sermons, by John Murray, vol. i, pp. 44–46. [2] Ibid. p. 255.

of Christ. The communion bread, as composed of many grains of wheat, Murray uses as an illustration. The grains of wheat, he says,

being all collected together, are together ground, together leavened with one leaven, together baked in one oven, and being brought forth in *one* piece of bread, "This," says the Redeemer, "is my body." My body is not a *single grain*, but it is all the harvest collected. *It pleased the Father, that in him all fulness should dwell.* Thus the fulness of the human nature was in the God-man, and as the many grains of wheat constituted one piece of bread, so the many children of men made one Son of man, the many bodies one body; and as all the grains of wheat, whatever their appearance while growing in their natural state, partake in this bread the same condition; so the whole lump in the second Adam, partakes of one life, one righteousness. . . .

As the many grapes being pressed together, after they are all gathered into one vat, make one cup of wine, so the many lives, or souls of all the ruined race, all gathered into one, is what Jesus calls his soul. . . . As these grapes grew on the vines in their natural state, there was a very visible difference, some large and some small, some filled with refreshing juice and some nearly dry; but looking with a single eye to this cup, or to the substance of this figure, the life or soul of Jesus Christ, we find all distinctions completely swallowed up, precisely as in the bread or body. . .

Now what is a communion, but a gathering together? the Apostle therefore teaches us, that as the bread we break is the gathering together of the multitude of grains, and the cup of wine the gathering together of the multitude of grapes; so the body and blood of Jesus Christ is the gathering together of the many who *were lost* by the transgression of the first, and by this wonderful method *recovered* in the second Adam.[1]

Every Man a "Legal Heir" of the Life Everlasting.

Murray went so far as to claim, that every sinner, irrespective of his own character, or of any obedience of his own, has a *legal right* to Christ's righteousness, and to everlasting life as the reward of that righteousness, and that this legal right of every sinner is grounded solely on his organic and vital union with Christ. In a letter to a friend he says · —

In the fulness of time the second Adam made his appearance: when the law spoke to him, and to us also *in him*, had he failed, we should have been totally ruined; but he having suffered the punishment due to

[1] Letters and Sketches of Sermons, by John Murray, vol. i, pp. 235-237

our transgressions, delivered us from death, and having fulfilled all righteousness for us, we became *legal heirs* of everlasting life. . . .

Yes, truly, mankind are as much entitled to eternal life, through what Jesus Christ has performed and suffered, as if every individual had thus in his own proper person performed and suffered.[1]

We are thus "*entitled*," however consciously sinful we may be, to look upon ourselves as perfectly righteous, because, according to Murray,

When we behold Christ Jesus, we behold ourselves, for he is the head of every man. In him dwelleth all fulness. In Christ Jesus both Jew and Gentile constitute one new man.[2]

All this is thoroughgoing Rellyanism.

Knowledge of Christ, Man's Supreme Need.

Murray also, as well as Relly, held and taught, that the supreme present need of every man is *to know* of this alleged verity of his own vital and imperishable union with Christ.

All men, according to Murray, are redeemed from the curse of the law and are saved from the wrath of God by their union with Christ. But they do not *know* or *believe* this, and therefore live in mental fear and torment. He says: —

I endeavor to prove that the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ have taken away the *sting of death*, and rendered it a blessing to mankind; But that they will never see it so until they believe the gospel, which bringeth life and immortality to light; and that although Jesus, by his death, redeemed them from that death which is called the curse of the law, yet nevertheless, so long as they are ignorant of this, so long they are children of wrath, vessels of wrath fitted for destructions, and the wrath of God apparently abideth on them; but yet they are saved from wrath through their Redeemer, and *sooner* or *later* they shall be made acquainted with this truth.[3]

Murray usually speaks of the condemnation of sinners as merely their own self-condemnation, their remorse of conscience; and he teaches that they can be saved from this inward torment only by a *knowledge* of the Rellyan theory of salvation, or of the inclusion of all men in the person of Christ. Speaking of the sinner who is "miserable from the knowledge of his unrighteousness," and because he is "convinced that without

[1] Letters and Sketches, vol. ii, p. 312. [2] Ibid. vol. iii, p. 120. [3] Ibid. vol. i, p. 313.

holiness no man shall see the Lord," he points out the following method of giving him consolation: —

> When the gospel is preached to him, assuring him that *Jesus is made unto him sanctification*, that this great High Priest wears on his head, *for us, holiness to the Lord*, and that we are authorized to view that head, thus adorned, as our head, hearing that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God, — when these divine gospel truths are heard and believed, he is completely saved from condemnation or damnation.[1]

This preacher of Rellyanism taught, that if men die without knowledge of the Rellyan gospel, they will experience nothing but misery in the next world, until they have *knowledge* of and belief in that gospel. In his view the unbeliever is not simply the man who does not trust in Christ for forgiveness and the life everlasting, but he is the man who does not believe the Rellyan gospel with its pantheistic doctrine of the inclusion of the entire human race in the person of Christ. The following are his words: —

> Yes, undoubtedly, the unbeliever at his death bids adieu to every source of consolation; and not informed that he has redemption in the Beloved, and that God can be a *just God* and a Saviour, he feels ten thousand deaths in fearing one; and this misery shall continue until the people are all taught of God, until the face of the covering shall be removed, and the veil taken from all nations, and death swallowed up in victory.[2]

All men, according to the Rellyan view, are saved, but they do not all *know* that they are saved. Their *ignorance* of their own salvation is their misery. In this view, the sinner's probation is not opportunity to *repent* of his sins and to *trust* in God's mercy for forgiveness and life eternal, but it is opportunity to *know* that he has already been forgiven and saved without having fulfilled any conditions of salvation whatever — saved *in* his sins, but not *from* them. There are no conditions of salvation in the Rellyan gospel. Men have no power to repent, believe, and obey; and all their attempts to do these things are miserable failures and useless. The gospel is an announcement of salvation and glory already obtained in Christ, and not a call to salvation and glory to be obtained in Christ through repentance, faith, and obedience.

[1] Letters and Sketches, vol. i, p. 374. [2] Ibid. vol. ii, p. 252

Murray makes use of the following illustration: —

When the glory of the Lord shone round about those shepherds, their fears were excited by their *ignorance of God;* and so, just so, when the sinful world shall behold their Saviour in the clouds of heaven, with power and *great glory*, they will be sorely afraid: not apprehending him to be their *Saviour*, they will call upon the rocks and mountains to hide them from the wrath of that *Lamb of God*, *who hath taken away the sin of the world*. Yet in the Lamb, there is certainly no wrath, but the *fearful* and *unbelieving* judge from their own *darkened* and *tormented minds*. . . .

Fear not; for behold I bring you *good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people*. What were these glad tidings of great joy which were to be to *all people?* That they may be *saved if they would?* That there was a Saviour born unto *believers?* Do you not, my beloved hearers, know that this was not the language of this celestial messenger?

But what were these glad tidings? *There is born unto you this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* This consideration was in truth, and indeed sufficient to banish, to annihilate their fears, for he could not be their *Saviour*, if they were never to be *saved;* he could not be the *Saviour* of any individual who was never *saved*. These tidings were indeed glad tidings of great joy.[1]

Murray, in the style of "Progressive Orthodoxy," emphasizes the importance of knowing God "*as He is*" — not as He is revealed in the Scriptures — but as He is conceived to be in pantheistic Rellyanism, as including in Himself the entire human race, and having with all men one common life. He says: —

It is a blessed thing to know God. We are told, it is life eternal to know God; but certainly it is not life eternal to know God, except we know God *as he is*, the life of the world. It is a blessed thing to know God in this character, for in knowing him to be the life of the world, each individual of the world who thus knows him knows him to be his life; and each individual thus taught can say for himself, God is my life; and he whom God gives by his Spirit's teaching thus to know him, is an individual in that little remnant, who is saved *in consequence* of *believing;* but this not to the *exclusion* of the rest, for when *every eye shall see, then every heart will consequently believe.*[2]

Christ Not Alone on the Cross.

These numerous citations have been made from the writings of James Relly and John Murray, partly for the purpose of setting forth fully, and in their own phraseology, the Rellyan theory of atonement, in order that the Visitors may be able, at their leisure, to compare this Rellyan theory of atonement with the theory pre-

[1] Letters and Sketches, vol. iii, p. 246. [2] Ibid. p. 322.

sented in "Progressive Orthodoxy," and thus to decide for themselves the question of the identity of these two theories. We have made these numerous citations *chiefly*, however, for the purpose of establishing, beyond all dispute, the truth of our assertion, that, according to Rellyanism, Christ was not *alone* on the cross, but that, in making atonement by his sufferings and death for the sins of the world, He had with Him and in Him the entire human race; that the *race*, from Adam to the last man who shall ever be born on the earth, was united to Christ by a vital union, a union like that which unites the body to the head in the human form, making of both one man. The entire race, according to Rellyanism, is the body of Christ, and every man is a member in particular of that body. Thus all men and Christ, gathered together and united in one, constitute one person — the head, the body, and all the members having one common life. It cannot be truthfully denied, that the citations we have presented abundantly prove that such is the Rellyan theory of the constitution of Christ's person, and that consequently our Lord was not *alone* in his sufferings and death on the cross.

"Progressive Orthodoxy" in Full Accord with Rellyanism.

But this Rellyan theory of the constitution of Christ's person is identically that presented in "Progressive Orthodoxy." The progressive professors, as we have repeatedly shown, represent over and over again, that Christ Jesus was *not alone* in his sufferings and death, but had with Him and in Him, by an organic and vital union with Himself, the entire human race; that every human being is "*in Christ*," and that Christ is in every human being, for He is the life of every man. They teach that "the historical Christ in relation to humanity" is to be considered "as identified with it," that "When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful." Of course, Christ and all men, if existing in such organic and vital union, have one common life, and constitute one all-comprehending person. "Progressive Orthodoxy" declares that

> The created universe and all rational beings are . . . in Christ. . . . his universe is not attached to him externally, but vitally. He is not a governor set over it, but is its life everywhere.[1]

[1] Prog. Orth. pp. 43, 44.

This is pure Rellyanism. Relly and Murray would have accepted these statements at once with thanksgiving and joy as defining accurately their own favorite doctrine. This is also Universalism — not the form of Universalism now accepted and preached by all Universalists, but the Universalism which was held and preached in New England in the latter part of the last century and in the early part of the present century. It is also Pantheism. If Rellyanism is a pantheistic theology, "Progressive Orthodoxy" is also, for they both have in them the very same central and dominating pantheistic principles, that of the organic and vital union of all men with Christ, and the identification of the life of all men with the life of God. If Rellyanism is Universalism, as its friends and foes alike have always declared it to be, then "Progressive Orthodoxy" is Universalism also, for they both alike maintain that all men have in them the very life of Christ, and are thus made constituent parts of Christ's being; and if these propositions are established, it must follow, that no man can ever perish unless a certain part of the very being of Christ perishes. It thus appears to be true, that "Progressive Orthodoxy," in its vital and controlling principle, is Rellyan, that is, pantheistic, Universalism.

The Question at Issue.

We come now to the vital question, to the practical issue before us. It is this: Can the Rellyan theory of atonement, as presented in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and in the writings of Relly and Murray, be legally and righteously taught by any professor on the Andover foundations? Certainly this theory cannot be taught on these foundations with honor and righteousness; and this for such reasons among others as the following: —

Pantheistic Universalism is not Consistent Calvinism.

1. The Statutes of the Associate Foundation require that every professor on that Foundation shall be a "Consistent Calvinist." We hardly need say in the presence of the Visitors that no two theologies are in more absolute antagonism each to the other than are Rellyan Universalism as advocated in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and in the writings of Relly and Murray, and Consistent Calvinism as held and advocated by Founders of Andover Sem-

inary; and no two views of the atonement are more absolutely contradictory each of the other than are the Rellyan theory and the doctrine of the Andover Creed. These two theologies can no more be brought into agreement than fire and water, or light and darkness, can be brought into agreement.

Opinion of an Andover Professor.

True, one of the defendant professors, in his trial before the Board of Visitors in 1886, expressed a decided conviction that these two systems of belief *are* in perfect accord, and that a man *can* be at one and the same time a pantheistic Universalist and a Consistent Calvinist. He frankly acknowledged that he himself heartily accepted, and was perfectly fascinated with, the notion, that the entire human race is in vital union with Christ, so that every human being is a member of the body of Christ. He rejoiced in the belief that Christ himself is in every man and that consequently all that any man needs to do is to build upon Christ already within him. Thus that defendant professor confessed himself a Rellyan Universalist. Yet in the same defence he disclosed his agility and astuteness as a theologian by declaring with some vehemence: "if I am not an 'orthodox and consistent Calvinist' according to the Creed, in my theological convictions and methods, I am nothing." Then (we are compelled to reply), he is nothing. For who does not know that a man can no more be, at once, a Rellyan Universalist and a Consistent Calvinist than he can go in two opposite directions at one and the same time; or than he can be at the same moment a benighted heathen and an educated Christian? The Statutes require that every professor on the Associate Foundation shall be "an orthodox and consistent Calvinist"; and a Rellyan Universalist, as everybody, save the said professor, knows, is not "an orthodox and consistent Calvinist," and therefore cannot with honor and righteousness hold a professorship on that Foundation.

Every Professor Pledged to Oppose Universalism.

2. Another reason why this Rellyan theory of atonement cannot be honorably taught in Andover Seminary is, that every professor has put himself under the most solemn obligations to teach the doctrines of the Creed "*in opposition to*" *Universalism*. But

this Rellyan theory of atonement is, as we have abundantly shown, Universalism.

The Teaching of Rellyanism Forbidden by Statute.

3. Then there is a third reason why this Rellyan theory of atonement cannot be lawfully taught in Andover Seminary. The Founders provided in their Statutes, that every professor should be religiously pledged to teach that Christ was absolutely "*alone*" in his sufferings and death on the cross. "Progressive Orthodoxy" teaches that he was *not* alone in his atoning sacrifice. We have already called attention to the irreconcilable conflict of the two theologies at this point. But this particular antagonism needs to be further explained, that its decisiveness in this argument may be fully understood.

Every professor in subscribing to the Creed declares: —

> I believe, . . . that . . . the Son of God, and *He alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men.

Why was that word "*alone*" introduced into this Creed-statement? It is not found in the catechism, nor, so far as we know, in the same connection in any other confession of faith. How came it to be in the Andover Creed? The writer of that Creed and those who advised with him were, as we have shown, perfectly familiar with the writings of James Relly and "the wild and confused mysticism" of John Murray. One at least of these framers of the Creed had publicly discussed and refuted "the horrid doctrine" of Rellyanism. There is evidence that they had a profound dread of this "doctrine" as "hazardous to the souls of men," and that they were determined that it should never be held and taught by any professor in their Seminary. Hence they put two words into their Creed, the word "*personal*" (to which we have already called attention under our Third Particular Charge) and the word "*alone*"; and they put them both in such positions as would, in their judgment, make it forever impossible for any professor to teach Rellyanism without breaking sacred promises and engagements, and perverting the trust-funds of the Seminary. Along the years immediately preceding the founding of Andover Seminary, repeated editions of two of Relly's works, usually bound

together, had been issued in this country, and industriously circulated through New England. The writers of the Andover Creed must have noted, in reading the pages of Relly, how persistently and with what numerous illustrations he teaches that the entire human race was "with and in Christ," on the cross and everywhere else; how repeatedly he declares, that man of himself cannot do what God requires of him, — cannot repent, or believe, or be holy, — but that in his vital union and real identification with Christ he can do all these things, indeed has already repented in Christ's repentance, believed in Christ's faith, and even while in his sins has been made absolutely holy in Christ's perfect holiness. Thoroughly familiar as the writers of the Creed were with this teaching of Relly and Murray, and personally acquainted as they were with its divisive and perversive influence, they naturally determined that every professor-elect, as a condition of taking his chair, should solemnly aud publicly declare: —

I believe, . . . that repentance, faith, and holiness are the *personal* requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation.

The meaning of this Creed-statement cannot be misunderstood. The professor, as a condition of taking and holding his chair, must say in substance: "According to the gospel scheme of salvation as I understand it, accept it, and will teach it, sinners are not saved through their repentance in Christ's repentance, through their believing in Christ's faith, and through their being made holy in Christ's holiness; but, as conditions of their being saved by Christ they must *personally* repent of their sins, *personally* believe on Christ, and be *personally* holy."

The Founders of the Seminary also, impelled by what they knew of Rellyanism and what they had seeu of its working, determined that never in their Seminary should any professor hold and teach that the entire human race was "*with* and *in* Christ" when, by his sufferings and death on the cross, He made atonement for the sins of men. Consequently they put into their Statutes the requirement, that every professor-elect, as a condition of taking his chair, and every professor once in every five years, as a condition of holding his chair, should solemnly declare: —

I believe, . . . that . . . the Son of God, and he *alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men.

That one word "*alone*" is fatal to the claim of the defendant, that he and his progressive associates can lawfully and honorably teach, on the Andover foundations, that all men, from Adam to the last child that shall ever be born on this earth, were "*with and in Christ*" when He hung upon the cross in atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world. The statement in the Creed, that "the Son of God, and He *alone*," made the atonement, makes it impossible for any honest professor to teach in Andover Seminary that the Son of God was *not alone* on the cross. No wonder the progressive professors wish to get rid of that word "*alone*"! But how can they? There it is in the Creed; and they cannot get it out of the Creed.

Objection of One of the Defendants.

At the trial of the accused professors before the Visitors in 1886, one of the complainants called attention to this word "*alone*," and to its decisive significance in the Creed. Professor George Harris, Abbot Professor of Christian Theology, and one of the defendants, appeared to be much disturbed, and in his "defence" made the following reply, uttering the last two or three sentences seemingly in considerable heat: —

> The fact that Christ in his incarnation became a real man in organic relation with the human race gives the most profound conception of his Atonement. It should also be observed, that in the statement concerning incarnation it is perfectly clear that something other is meant than the completed union of Christ with the believer. And this view of Christ's proper humanity is argued to be in opposition to the statement of the Creed that Jesus Christ and he *alone* made atonement for the sins of all men; as if "alone" means that he has no organic union with the men for whom he laid down his life. This is as complete a reversal of an author's meaning as it was ever my misfortune to hear.[1]

But if our interpretation of that word "*alone*," in its connection and purpose, is a "complete reversal" of the Founders' meaning, why did not the learned professor tell us just what the Founders did mean by that word? The fact that he did not state distinctly what *he* regards as the true meaning and purpose of that word in the Creed is reasonable evidence in the circumstances that he could not find in it any meaning or force other

[1] The Andover Defence, p. 295.

than that which we find in it. We do not blame the professor for being disturbed by the statement in the Creed, that "the Son of God, and *He alone*," made the atonement. That statement sweeps away in a flash all his assumed right to teach on the Andover foundations, that the Son of God was *not alone* in his atoning sufferings and death. It is a death-blow to all his hopes and assurances of being able to maintain and inculcate lawfully and righteously, in Andover Seminary, a theory of atonement, the central and essential principle of which is the *vital*, *living* union of the whole human race with Christ, when He was lifted up in atoning sacrifice upon the cross.

The professor may dislike that word "alone" as it stands in the Creed. He may dislike still more our interpretation of it. But neither the word nor its meaning can be changed. We challenge the professor to show that our statement of the history, the meaning, and the purpose of this Creed-word is false. We believe it to be established as an historical fact, that this decisive word was put into the Creed by its authors for the express purpose of making it utterly and forever impossible for any true and honest man to hold and teach, in Andover Seminary, the Rellyan theory of atonement, which is, that Christ was not *alone* on the cross, but that all human beings were "with and in Him" in his sufferings and death, and so took part with Him in making atonement for their own sins. This being the meaning and purpose of the word "alone," in the intent of the Founders, the teaching of this pantheistic theory of atonement by any Andover professor is debarred. This theory cannot be maintained and inculcated in this Seminary without a violation of compact and a criminal breach of trust.

The "Central and Vital Principle" Characterized.

A word more must be added as we take leave of this pantheistic theory of atonement. We have thus far refrained from characterizing properly the notion which is really the soul and life of this whole theory of atonement, and of all the other distinctive doctrines of Rellyanism and of "Progressive Orthodoxy"; namely, the notion of the *vital* union of all human beings with the person of Christ. We do not wish to speak with disrespect of any one's serious religious convictions. But the

questions we are discussing are not private or merely personal. The Church universal is interested in what is accepted and taught in Andover Theological Seminary, and ought to know the true character of that teaching.

The regnant idea which lies back of that theory of atonement set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and in Rellyism is not, as Professor Harris charges us with believing, that Christ in his Incarnation was "a real man." The professor knew perfectly well that we had made no complaint against him for holding that belief. The regnant error of which we speak is not that Christ was a member of the human race. It is not that He was omnipresent, and so *with* every human being. It is not, that while all other men have their imperfections and lackings, Christ was perfect at every point of his being and nature, and lacked nothing necessary to the absolute completeness of his manhood and character, and therefore was himself the complement of every other man, and so in that sense the ideal man.

The basal, erroneous, and all-pervading conception in the theory of atonement against which we enter complaint, is that all human beings who ever have lived or ever will live, were "*with and in*" Christ on the cross, united to Him by a "*vital*," *living* union, by an actual inclusion of themselves in his person. No member of the race was separate from Him. When He sorrowed in Gethsemane, the race *in Him* sorrowed. When He suffered on Calvary, the race suffered. This union is "*organic*," not like that of the several members of a family, of a tribe, of a race, but like that of the members of the human body with its head. In the head, in the body, and in the members there is but one life, one person. It has been the belief of some men, that the entire human race was literally in Adam, actually sinned in his sin, and fell with him. So, according to "Progressive Orthodoxy" and Rellyanism, the entire race was actually *in Christ* on the cross, and took part in his sufferings and death, and in making atonement for the sins of all men; and also has been and is *in Christ* in all his conditions and experiences, sharing in all that He is, and feels, and does.

Now it is difficult to find language to express what seems to us to be the grotesqueness and hideousness of this conception. Think of all the billions of human beings who lived on the earth before

our time; of all the millions now living; and of all the billions yet to live; all gathered together, and massed in one personality, falsely called Christ, and lifted upon the cross. Such a conception of our Lord and Redeemer is monstrous. Others may speak for themselves, but such is not our adorable Saviour and King, nor is such the Christ of the Andover Creed and of Consistent Calvinism. This whole idea of the vital union and actual inclusion of the entire human race in one divine being is essentially and grossly heathen. The conception in its germ came from heathenism, not from Christianity.

Pardon a personal reminiscence. Once in my childhood, I looked with a revulsion of feeling I have never forgotten upon a picture of a heathen god. The deity was represented as a huge monster, with a multiplicity of heads and faces and bodies, of arms and legs; with uncounted hands and feet, eyes and ears, mouths and nostrils; all massed together in a single huge and horrid personality. One would recoil from looking at it very much as he would recoil from looking at a mountain of live snakes. Something like this, to our view, only on an infinitely larger scale, is the representation that all human beings — the dead, the living, and all those yet to live — were massed in one personality, and then lifted upon a cross to suffer and die in atonement for all human sins. The whole conception is hideous and revolting in the extreme. As a theory of atonement it is a theological monstrosity. Had such a grotesque idea been cherished only by darkened, heathen minds, it would not have been so surprising. But how such a revolting conception of our personal, glorious Redeemer could ever have been entertained for one moment by intelligent, educated minds, in a Christian land, in the nineteenth century, passes our comprehension.

One thing is certain: the Christ of "Progressive Orthodoxy" and Rellyanism is not the Christ of the Andover Creed and of Consistent Calvinism. By no possible explanation can they be shown to be one and the same being.

Man in "Progressive Orthodoxy."

Nor is *man* as depicted in "Progressive Orthodoxy" and Rellyanism the *man* described in the Andover Creed and Consistent Calvinism. Man impotent to do what God requires of him, and

therefore committing no sin in not obeying God, — impotent to repent, to believe, to be holy; powerless to feel any sorrow for his transgressions, and able only to point to Christ and give expression to repentance in his repentance; — man who is of no account in himself, and can attain to no eminent value in the sight of God, save through an imaginary vital union with another being, — man thus depicted is not the regal being described as *man* in the Andover Creed and in Consistent Calvinism. There he appears, sinful indeed, fallen and lost, yet even in his ruin a being of magnificent capabilities and possibilities; abundantly competent to do all that God requires of him, and therefore immeasurably wicked because he *will* not obey his Maker; having in himself transcendent value, possessed of a soul worth more than the whole world, so that the eternal Son of God loved him even in his moral ruin, and gave Himself for him. *Man* being such, standing forth alone in his *personal* responsibility to God, and in his high *personal* obligations to his fellow-men, giving evidence even in his apostasy of his kingly endowments and of the supernal destiny for which he was created, and which may yet be his, and so attesting the measureless value there is in himself, — *man*, being such, is not the pitiable, impotent, irresponsible, and worthless creature *called* man in "Progressive Orthodoxy."

Now we submit that if Christ and man, as set forth in "Progressive Orthodoxy," are not the Christ and man of the Andover Creed and of Consistent Calvinism, then "Progressive Orthodoxy" has no more legal or moral right to use the name *Andover*, or the prestige of that name, or the funds, buildings, and grounds of *Andover*, as the means of its own maintenance and promulgation, than any other form of Universalism, or any form of Infidelity or of Atheism has to use the same, as the means of *its* support and of its dissemination through the world.

VII.

FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS

In the Replies of the Defence.

We now call special attention to two or three notable arguments made by the defence in answer to the charges presented by the complainants.

False Assumption of the Founders' Ignorance.

1. The defendant has taken the position, that the Founders of Andover Seminary were utterly ignorant of the question of "the personal relation of Christ to the entire race"; and his reasoning from this assumption appears to be that, as the Founders never heard of this question, and knew absolutely nothing about it, he and his progressive associates may rightfully give in their teaching as professors any answer they choose to such an inquiry — may accept and teach, for instance, the central and dominating principle of "Progressive Orthodoxy," which is that all men exist in organic and vital union with the Lord Jesus.

Professor Smyth's Remarkable Declaration.

Professor Smyth at the close of his long defence, in his trial before the Board of Visitors in December, 1886, made the following astonishing statements: —

It is idle to question that in all lands, in all evangelical churches today, the question of the personal relation of Christ to the entire race for which He died, is receiving an attention never before given to it. The Church at large has never yet passed upon it. It was not before the minds of the authors of the Catechism or of the Seminary Creed. It could not be. Providence shapes problems for the Church. It puts this one before us. It would be at least doubtful whether if the Creed contained some expressions which might be used to exclude the new doctrine, it would not be an unwarrantable use of an incidental phrase, to make it interdictive and decisive of a question out of the purview of the framers. Fortunately there is no such difficulty to be settled. The

Creed admits by its silence and by its principles, at least as a legitimate inquiry, all that has been contended for by me in the *Review* and in *Progressive Orthodoxy*.[1]

These are remarkable statements. As the professor read this passage before the Visitors there were some present who listened to him with a feeling of amazement. Dr. Smyth is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary. He has occupied that chair for about thirty years. The Statutes require that he should be "learned," — learned especially in his own department of instruction, accurate and trustworthy in his presentation of historical facts. During these thirty years he has had ample time and every facility needed to make himself familiar with the history of Christian doctrine and of its conflicts with religious error in many lands, including Old England and New England. We cannot help saying, partly in his own language,[2] "he knows, or is inexcusable if he does not know," that at the very time Andover Seminary was being founded and the Andover Creed was being written, John Murray was preaching Rellyanism in Boston, and had been preaching it for the most part in eastern Massachusetts for nearly forty years. Professor Smyth "knows or ought to know," that Rellyanism is one form of Universalism, and that in its germinal and organic principle it is pantheistic; that it is bitterly inimical to evangelical faith, and particularly to Consistent Calvinism; that it was strenuously opposed by evangelical clergymen under the lead of the Wesleys in England in the last century, and in this country in the last and in the early part of the present century was opposed with equal resoluteness by evangelical clergymen under the lead of such men as Dr. Samuel Hopkins, Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger, President Ezra Stiles, and Dr. Nathanael Emmons. Professor Smyth "knows full well, or is inexcusable if he does not know," that the supreme question raised by Rellyanism was exactly this "of the personal relation of Christ to the entire race for which He died"; that James Relly and his disciple, John Murray, held, that all men, believers and unbelievers, the penitent and the impenitent, the most godly and the most wicked, the most heathen and the most civilized, the living and the dead, — that all members of the human race alike are "*in Christ*," and that Christ is

[1] The Andover Defence, p. 179. [2] See The Andover Defence, pp. 102, 103.

in every human being, united to him by an organic and *vital* union, a union not like that by which one member of the race is united to every other member, but like that which, in the human form, unites the body and all its members to their head; and that the evangelical opponents of Relly and Murray held, that this notion of the *vital* union of all men with the Lord Jesus, or of the actual inclusion of the entire human race in the person of Christ, was absolutely unscriptural and false, a pestilent and most harmful religious error. Professor Smyth "knows, or ought to know," — and if he does not know, his competency in scholarship to fill his present chair may well be called in question, — that Dr. Samuel Hopkins spoke of this "notion" of the vital union of Christ with all mankind as "unreasonable" and "whimsical"; that Dr. Jonathan Edwards the younger characterized this same "vital union," and the Rellyan theories that are naturally evolved from it, as "wild and confused mysticism" and "horrid doctrine"; and that Dr. Nathanael Emmons, speaking of this same theory of the vital union of all mankind "with Christ through all the circumstances of his birth, life, death, resurrection and glory," declared that it "is repugnant to the plainest dictates of common sense," and that it "is as destitute of all support from divine revelation as from reason and common sense." Professor Smyth "knows, or ought to know," that the central and dominating principle of "Progressive Orthodoxy," namely, the vital union of all mankind with Christ, is the central and dominating principle of Rellyanism, and that if *that* principle makes Rellyanism outright Universalism, it makes "Progressive Orthodoxy" outright Universalism also. 'We are thankful,' Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, 'that it does not devolve upon us to occupy your time in trying to explain why the professor has deemed it necessary in the professed interest of an honest, truthful, and scholarly setting forth of history,' to make the extraordinary historical statements which we have cited, to wit, that "the question of the personal relation of Christ to the entire race" "was not before the minds of the authors . . . of the Seminary Creed," and that "It could not be"; that it was "a question out of the purview of the framers" of the Creed, — historical statements "which he knows full well, or is inexcusable if he does not know, are baseless and false."

The Question Well Known to the Founders.

It is well known, if any historical fact is well known, that "the question of the personal relation of Christ to the entire race" *was* before the minds of the Founders, and within "the purview of the framers" of the Creed. Indeed, they knew more about the "central and vital principle" of what is now called "Progressive Orthodoxy," but of what was then known as Rellyanism, than Professor Smyth himself appears to know; for they knew the history of this speculative, pantheistic scheme in England and in this country, while this Professor of Ecclesiastical History seems to be profoundly ignorant of that history of Rellyanism. The Founders had seen this principle of the vital union of all mankind with the Lord Jesus carried out, by unschooled men, to its legitimate results, with a vigor and boldness of logic which should put to shame these timid and faltering progressives at Andover. The Founders saw Rellyanism not simply in its germ and early development, but also in its ghastly maturity, when its fruit had ripened, and men and churches had tasted of its bitterness. The progressives at Andover seem to be stone-blind to the harvest of evil that is coming of their own seed-sowing. This whole speculative scheme of pantheistic thought, which is as yet only partially, and with much vagueness and many inconsistencies, disclosed in "Progressive Orthodoxy," and in other writings of the Andover progressives, the Founders saw developed to a completeness in which its true character could no longer be concealed. Nevertheless, the defendant, from his large knowledge as Professor of Ecclesiastical History, is fully persuaded that this notion of the vital relation of Christ to the entire human race is "new doctrine," and therefore was not before the minds of the authors of the Creed; and he reassures himself by the further dogmatic assertion, that "It could not be." Yet notwithstanding all this firm persuasion of his mind, "some expressions" in the Creed give him no little anxiety. What *do* these expressions mean? "Oh, nothing," the Professor seems to reply. "The Founders had no definite purpose in using these phrases. They could not possibly have intended to interdict our 'new doctrine,' for they never heard of it." "Providence," the Professor declares, "shapes problems for the Church. It puts this one before us. It would be at least doubtful whether if the Creed contained some expres-

sions which might be used to exclude the new doctrine it would not be an unwarrantable use of an incidental phrase to make it interdictive and decisive of a question out of the purview of the framers. Fortunately there is no such difficulty to be settled." Indeed! These are curious remarks, considered in view of the actual historical facts in the case.

We say in reply: Fortunately there *is* just "such difficulty to be settled." Fortunately for the present protection of the Seminary and its funds from perversion, this question of "the personal relation of Christ to the entire race" was *not* "out of the purview of the framers"; it was directly before them, and received their most thoughtful and solicitous attention. Note these words of the defendant: "It would be at least *doubtful* whether *if* the Creed contained some expressions which might be used to exclude the new doctrine," etc. Why, there is nothing "doubtful" about it, and there is no "if" about it! There *are* "some expressions" in the Creed — we have specified some of them and emphasized them — which were put in for the very purpose that they "*might* be used to exclude 'the new doctrine.'" They are not aimless expressions, having no definite intent. Not one of them is an "incidental phrase," resulting from the innocent ignorance of the Founders. That phrase, "the Son of God, and He *alone*"; the phrase, "*personal* requisites"; that other phrase, "do *in this life* partake of justification, adoption, and sanctification," — those phrases, every one, are in the Creed *for a purpose*. They are not arrows shot at random, with no intention of hitting anything in particular, as the defendant thinks they are. They were aimed at, and were intended to pierce, the very core and heart of Rellyanism, now called "Progressive Orthodoxy." And they *do* pierce its heart through and through. Those phrases "incidental"! Those phrases unintended, and not to "be used to exclude the new doctrine"! It might as well be said, that the patriotic shot fired at Concord and Lexington and heard round the world was unintended, merely incidental, and must not be regarded as designed to exclude British tyranny from the American colonies! The definite purpose of that shot was to effect the death of British tyranny in this land, and it *did* effect the death of that tyranny. The definite purpose of the phrases we have cited from the Andover Creed was to effect the death of Rellyanism in Andover

Seminary, if it should ever dare to enter and take possession of this Institution. If this high purpose just now is ineffective, it is because the criminal usurpation of Rellyanism, for the time being, is triumphant here, and the sacred liberty of the Founders to do what they would with their own for the good of mankind is manacled — manacled too by the intolerance and tyranny of what styles itself broad and progressive Orthodoxy, but which is only another name for that rationalistic and intolerant liberalism which has always been the bitterest and most unscrupulous foe of evangelical and evangelistic faith, and a frequent menace to freedom in churches and educational institutions founded by orthodox people.

Fallacious Argument of the Defendant.

The argument of the defendant, in the passage which we have just cited, appears to be this: The Creed is *silent* upon this question of the personal relation of Christ to the entire human race. The Founders never heard of such a question. Therefore any professor has a perfect right to accept and teach this "new doctrine" on the Andover Foundations.

To this we reply: First, even if it were true that the Creed is silent upon this question, it would not by any means follow that a professor could legally and righteously hold and teach this doctrine in Andover Seminary. The Creed is silent upon the Mormon Delusion. The Founders of the Seminary never heard of it. But does it follow from this, that any professor has full right and liberty, if he choose to do so, to teach and practise polygamy on the Andover Foundations? The Creed is silent upon the subject of modern Spiritism. But does the mere fact of that silence make it lawful and right for a professor to hold and expound in this Seminary the doctrines of Spiritism? But, secondly, the Creed is *not* silent upon this question of the personal relation of Christ to the human race. In several expressions, as even the defendant half-admits, the Creed has special reference to this pernicious error. We have shown conclusively, as we believe, that the Founders made provision in their Statutes and Creed, abundantly adequate, as they supposed, to render it forever impossible for any man, who has accepted the principles of Rellyan Universalism, to occupy a chair in Andover Seminary, without

thereby becoming guilty of action which in the commercial world would be regarded as a crime, — a crime, too, for the commission of which a business man would at once be called to account in a court of justice.

Criticisms in Place of Direct Answers to Charges.

2. The defendant in his arguments has repeatedly represented that the complainants were unfair, and even dishonorable in their method of making citations in proof of the charges which they had preferred against himself and some of his associates. We do not now refer to the defendant's petty literary criticisms which we have already noticed, but to another kind of crimination. The complainants are repeatedly charged with wrenching quoted passages from their connections, and with not taking into account the preceding or the following context. Fault is found with the complainants because, in some instances, their citations were not more ample. Had they made more liberal quotations, it is claimed, they would have found statements which would relieve their distress, prove that their charge was groundless, and show that the defendant's belief is in accord with the Seminary Creed. The complainants are accused of grave delinquency in not quoting various passages which, in the judgment of the defendant, they ought to have quoted. More copious extracts from various parts of "Progressive Orthodoxy" would have counterbalanced the citations actually made, and have shown that the defendant is not at variance with the Creed. Such arguments as these are of frequent recurrence in the Professor's self-defence. In reply to them we would say: —

(*a*) We have been told that there is no need of drinking the whole Atlantic Ocean in order to prove that its water is salt. A single taste is sufficient. So there is no need of quoting the whole volume entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy," and all the editorials of The Andover Review, in order to prove that the "New Theology," now maintained and inculcated by the defendant, is repugnant to the Andover Creed and Statutes. A few sentences are sufficient.

(*b*) It has never been claimed by the complainants that there is no theological or Biblical truth in "Progressive Orthodoxy." Usually the chief power of religious error lies in its close alliance

with more or less of admitted religious truth. But what occasion had the complainants to call attention to the wholly unobjectionable statements in "Progressive Orthodoxy"? Their sole purpose was to bring to the knowledge of the Visitors such portions of the writings of the defendant and of his progressive associates as were evidently in sharp conflict with the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary, and would serve as proof of a great perversion of trust-funds. Such portions of their writings, therefore, were carefully selected, and their irreconcilable antagonism to the intention of the Founders, as expressed in their Statutes and Creed, was pointed out. If the passages selected do not demonstrate that the defendant is holding and teaching beliefs which are opposed to the doctrines set forth in the Seminary Creed, it is perfectly legitimate for the accused professor to show that they do not demonstrate this. But to upbraid the complainants for omitting to cite sentences and passages which do not antagonize the Creed and Statutes is on a par with the action of the criminal in court who, when the prosecuting attorney was depicting with startling vividness the revolting details of his crime, cried out, "Why don't you tell some of the *good* things I've done?" The defendant in this case, sorely pressed by the passages which we *have* cited against him, and utterly unable to explain them away, not knowing what else to do, cries out: "Why do you not cite some of the good passages which I have published, which contain no reference whatever to 'the new theology,' and which are in harmony with the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary?" Such replies do not refute the charges.

In Transitu.

(*c*) It is difficult to understand some of the replies given and some of the arguments presented by the defendant in self-defence, without taking into account the fact, that the Andover progressives, in their theological beliefs, are confessedly *in transitu*. They are developing a "new theology," and at the same time, as they claim, are not relaxing their hold upon an old one. They have heartily accepted the central and regnant principle of Rellyanism, which is the vital union of the entire human race with Christ — a principle in *their* view "new," "central and vital," and utterly unknown to the Founders of the Seminary.

They propose to follow the guidance of this principle whithersoever it may lead them. It is their intention apparently to devote themselves to the maintenance and propagation of this principle, to live for it, and, if need be, to die for it. But they are supported by the trust-funds of an institution which was founded for the express purpose of maintaining and inculcating the evangelical faith as expressed in the doctrines of Consistent Calvinism. These progressive professors, therefore, progress or retrograde as much as they will, are bound to keep their faith in some sort of connection with the Seminary Creed, to which, as a condition of holding their professorships, they have pledged their undeviating loyalty. Such is their present position. They are on their way to another theology, one confessedly "new" to them, though it was certainly well known to the Founders. Yet at the same time they are also vainly attempting to hold on, in their belief, to Christian doctrines, with which they can no longer in consistency have any sympathy, as these doctrines can no more be made to mingle and coalesce with their new beliefs than water and oil can be made to mingle and coalesce.

Timidity of the Andover Progressives.

Now one of the results of their being in this state of transition in their theological beliefs, while holding professorships in Andover Seminary, is a certain very natural, and probably unavoidable timidity. They seem to be living in mortal fear of some kind of exposure. They proclaim themselves great lovers of "new light," yet, strange to say, to walk in the light appears to them no desirable thing to do. Apparently they dread all investigation of their present theological position. They eschew examinations of all kinds. After long and persistent effort, they have at last succeeded in procuring the abolition of the public spring examination in the Seminary, which heretofore has been the chief of the two examinations held each year. They dread, however, as they dread nothing else, all *official* investigation of their religious beliefs, especially if that investigation is to be conducted by the Board of Visitors. At the thought of such a trial, their usual timidity appears to change instantly into "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" which will surely devour them; and upon the least apprehension of such a trial

they set themselves at once and with all vigor to the work of resisting and preventing the investigation at any cost of time, toil, and treasure.

Dread of Definitions.

Another result of their being consciously in such a transition state in their religious faith is their extreme reluctance to give any definitions of the theological terms and phrases which they use, still less of the new doctrines which they hold and teach. In their view, apparently, to give a definition is to put their very lives in jeopardy. Ostensibly they propose to investigate and investigate, and to give definitions only at the end of their investigations. But it is looking more and more as if it were their intention never to reach the end of any investigation, and so never to be obliged to give any definitions. Their motto might well be: "Ever learning, but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." Perhaps these progressive professors would not object to this motto, as it might seem to them to be expressive of prodigious and tireless thoroughness in their investigations; but Paul applied these words to a class of men from whom he warned Timothy "to turn away."

Neglect of Definitions Evasive and Deceptive.

A third result of continuing in such a transition state in religious belief, as the progressive professors are in at present, is the vicious habit of using undefined theological terms and phrases now in one sense and then in another, without giving the least intimation that such terms and phrases are used in more than one sense. Familiar religious phraseology is thus employed, when occasion calls for it, to express such evangelical truth as it has always been understood to express; and the very same phraseology is also employed, when occasion calls for it, to express theological conceptions which are in irrepressible antagonism to evangelical faith.

Perversion of Language.

Consequently a fourth result of the present futile attempt of these progressive divines to accept and maintain the "new theology," and at the same time keep themselves in some sort of

connection with the evangelical faith of the Andover Creed, is not only a large amount of inconsistency and self-contradiction in their writings, but also a certain indefensible vacillation in their use of words.

For example, the word repentance is used by the progressive professors as designating now one thing, and now another thing. The word is usually understood as signifying what is called evangelical repentance, or the sinner's own personal turning from his sins with shame and sorrow for them. The Andover progressives at times use the word in this sense. But sometimes they use the word in a sense totally distinct from this, or as signifying a repenting of the sinner in Christ's repentance. The meaning is, that when Christ sorrows in view of human sin, the entire race, being vitally united to Him, and included in his personality, *sorrows also*, though without any volition in the matter, or any consciousness of repenting. In this way the progressive divines empty familiar religious words of the meaning which they have always had, and put them to a new use, and so abuse and pervert language. People listening to a progressive preacher are often deceived. He uses common evangelical phraseology, and they deem him very orthodox; when in fact he is discoursing about one thing and they are thinking about another thing. He may be preaching race-repentance, which is a doctrine of Rellyan Universalism, and they may suppose that he is speaking of the same kind of repentance which Christ and the apostles preached.

Notice now another peculiar manner in which the defendant conducts his defence.

Self-contradiction Practically Admitted by the Defendant.

The authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," in their discussion of the subject of repentance, declare in the most positive terms, that "man of himself cannot repent," but in union with Christ he can and does repent. In Him the race repents. These authors affirm, that "When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful." This is pure Rellyanism. It is outright Rellyan Universalism. Yet these same professors, in this same discussion, speak of men as being themselves, or *personally*, "stirred to penitence." And they declare of "man," that, "under the appropriate influences he is *capable* of repenting.' This is the theology of the Andover

Creed. This is Consistent Calvinism. But such language is an absolute contradiction of the Rellyan theory of repentance, which, those same professors declare, is their accepted belief.

Now how does the defendant in his elaborate defence explain this vacillation and self-contradiction? He does not explain it at all. He practically admits and intensifies his inconsistency. The complainants charge him with teaching, contrary to the Creed, that man of himself cannot repent, but can repent in his union with Christ; that when Christ repents every man repents. The defendant replies: 'Yes; but I also teach that man *of himself can* repent. Under appropriate influences, he *is capable* of repenting.' Such is his argument in defence. All we need to say about it is that it is a complete self-stultification. It is playing fast and loose. It is giving with one hand and taking back with the other.

"The Other View" of Atonement.

Similar inconsistency is found in other parts of the professor's defence, as well as in various discussions in "Progressive Orthodoxy." In treating of atonement, however, much self-contradiction is sagaciously avoided by presenting only "one view of atonement," and simply remarking that there is another view which is so familiar that it need not be given in detail. The view presented proves to be the Rellyan theory of atonement. Had the authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," and the defendant in his defence, made a full and honest statement of the "*other* view," that is, of the doctrine of atonement as defined and held by Consistent Calvinists, they would at once have involved themselves in a perfect tangle of self-contradictions. There was a certain kind of wisdom in omitting to present "in detail" the *other view*, as there is also in declining to define theological terms, and in using familiar evangelical phraseology to express religious conceptions which, if understood, would be abhorrent to all evangelical believers. But is this the wisdom "that is from above"? Is such wisdom worthy of an Andover professor? Such a method of introducing a "new theology" into Andover Seminary and of defending its introduction cannot be covered. From the first it has been unmasked to the eyes of all people of even ordinary theological information. The whole proceeding has awakened

astonishment in multitudes of minds, and has been condemned even by liberals as well as by conservatives. An apparently candid and judicial writer in The Universalist Quarterly (January, 1885) gives expression to the following plain judgment: —

> Already it is too evident that the New Orthodoxy is clinging to the words of the Old Orthodoxy after having cast aside all that these words meant and must mean to every veracious mind.

Rev. Frederic Palmer's Criticism on "Progressive Orthodoxy."

Even in The Andover Review (February, 1890) is found an Article designed to be a friendly criticism of "Progressive Orthodoxy," in which the writer, Rev. Frederic Palmer, exposes, with no little plainness of speech, the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of the Andover progressives. He is abundantly competent to make such criticism upon their present theological position. He knows all the way over which they have traveled, and all the way they must yet travel if they are to follow the lead of their avowed guiding principle, for he has traveled all this way himself, and is now somewhat in advance of these progressive professors. He arraigns them for their inconsistency, in teaching the doctrine of the divine immanence in humanity, or of the life of God in every man (which divine life must make every human soul as safe from being lost as is God himself), and at the same time teaching, in absolute opposition to this doctrine, their other pet dogmas, that no man can be saved without knowledge of Christ, and that "no man can be lost without having had knowledge of Christ," and that every man "sooner or later," "sometime and somewhere," if not in this world, then in the next, will have opportunity to know Christ. Mr. Palmer was probably not aware that all this is of the very essence of that Rellyan Universalism which was perfectly familiar to the Founders, and against the teaching of which they supposed they had forever protected their Seminary. Had he known this, he might have found something else to criticize in these men besides their theological vacillations and self-contradictions.

Mr. Palmer also justly reproves these progressive theologians for their failure to define the theological terms which they use. After giving some statement of their much-emphasized doctrine

of the absolute necessity of "the knowledge of Christ" to the salvation of any man, and referring to their belief that God cannot be just unless He gives to every man "a chance to pass upon the claims of Jesus Christ," Mr. Palmer adds: —

> Now here is a plentiful lack of definitions. Apart from those we have mentioned, — what is meant by Christ? and what is meant by salvation? — Here are others: What constitutes a sufficient "knowledge of Christ"? What determines whether the opportunity for getting that knowledge was sufficient? What is "passing upon the claims of Christ"?[1]

Mr. Palmer had already charged, that in "Progressive Orthodoxy" there is "a lack of definition of fundamental terms," and then had said, in words to which we now call special attention: —

> One would suppose that if nowhere else, yet in the discussion of eschatology, a definition would have been given, or would have been privately arrived at, of salvation. But in the chapter on this subject one looks in vain, not only for such a definition, but for any clear conception of it. . . .
>
> The same confusion hides in other phrases covering fundamental needs of thought: "The gospel," "accepting Christ," "faith," "nature," — it is assumed that these have no need of definition. And as two meanings are possible in each of these cases, confusion is inevitable, especially since the real root of the difficulty is that Andover is dissatisfied with one meaning, and has abandoned it in feeling while still holding to it in thought. *She has jumped off the boat without having reached the wharf.*[2] [Italics ours.]

Have Abandoned the Andover Creed.

These professors are under stress of local conditions. They are undertaking to introduce a pantheistic theology into a Seminary founded to teach Consistent Calvinism. It is hazardous business. They have subscribed to a Calvinistic Creed, and have promised to be loyal to it and to maintain and inculcate its doctrines. How about keeping that pledge? Such has been and is their predicament. In Mr. Palmer's graphic words, they are "dissatisfied with one meaning" of certain "fundamental terms" and "have abandoned it in feeling while still holding to it in thought." They have "jumped off the boat without having reached the wharf." They have leaped clear of the Andover Creed and Consistent Calvinism, yet, as he thinks, they have

[1] Andover Review, Feb. 1890, p. 193. [2] Ibid, Feb. 1890, pp. 187, 188.

not landed upon the doctrines of pantheistic Universalism. But if they have leaped from the boat, and yet have not reached the wharf, where are they? It has been some ten or a dozen years since they began the leap. Have they gone up into the skies, or are they floundering and drowning in the water? Mr. Palmer's language is highly figurative, yet is clearly expressive of his conviction that the Andover progressives have abandoned utterly and forever all evangelical faith. He does not know just where they are, but he knows where they are not. They are not on the Andover Creed.

The Reply of the Andover Progressives.

We come now to the significant fact, that the accused professors do not deny the truthfulness of Mr. Palmer's graphic representation of their present plight. Indeed, they practically admit its truthfulness by attempting to account for and justify their course and their present predicament. In replying to the criticisms of Mr. Palmer they say: —

> These local conditions [referring to the strenuous opposition which had been manifested to the teaching of their "new theology" on the Andover Foundation and to their violent attacks upon the American Board], as we acknowledge without hesitancy, gave form and color, direction and spirit, to the movement. *Much of the phraseology* employed in discussion *was used to make immediate connection with existing doctrines*, which it was desired to supplement or to apply.[1] [Italics ours.]

Mr. Palmer had severely criticized these professors for continuing to use, without definition, evangelical phraseology, when they had abandoned the evangelical faith which that phraseology expressed. Their reply is, that under the stress of the conflict which they had raised, they found it necessary "to make immediate connection with existing doctrines," that is, with the doctrines "existing" in the Andover Creed; and that in order to make this "immediate connection," they must needs use freely evangelical phraseology which in other circumstances they would not employ. This is no denial of Mr. Palmer's charge that they had abandoned evangelical faith, but it is a confession, that under pressure of circumstances they adopted a policy in action, the moral nature of which does not need to be characterized.

[1] Andover Review, April, 1890, p. 437.

PRESENT THEOLOGICAL POSITION OF THE ANDOVER PROGRESSIVES.

It is evident, that the Andover progressives have leaped from the grand old ship of evangelical faith, which has braved the storms of all the Christian centuries and is now sounder and stancher than ever, but it is not so evident that they have failed to land upon the old, long-unused, decayed, and down-tumbling wharf of Rellyan Universalism. Apart from the critic's vivid imagery, the prosy fact seems to be, that these professors have not flown skyward, nor have they been struggling in the water, but during all these years they have been trying to stand with one foot on the stanch old ship of evangelical faith, and the other foot on the crazy and tottering old wharf of Rellyan Universalism. The exhibition they have made of themselves has not been creditable. Their posture has been that of a *straddle*, so called, which is not a savory word even when used in the sphere of low politics. Their attempt has been to be at one and the same time on both sides of the great religious questions at issue between evangelical faith and pantheistic Universalism. Moreover, they are not crossing over *from* unbelief *to* evangelical faith. Their "movement," of which they talk so much, is in the opposite direction. It is from evangelical faith to unevangelical beliefs and speculations. They are not supplementing the "existing doctrines" of the Andover Creed and Consistent Calvinism, but are opposing those doctrines. They are not 'applying' them to anything. They are applying the pantheistic principle of the *vital union* of all men with Christ to various evangelical truths, with the result that the faith of many in such truths is destroyed It is impossible to believe that they are unaware of this. They understand what they are doing.

They know, too, whither they are bound. But it is not wise to reach their goal at a single leap. In existing circumstances it is more prudent to keep up "*connections*" with the old faith. Doing this they will be able to spring quickly back and forth, from one side to the other of the vital questions in controversy. Self-defence is thus made easy. When conservatives, like the complainants, attack them, they can hold up sample after sample of their orthodox words, phrases, and sentences, and waving them exultingly in the air cry, 'See, how orthodox we are! Look at these repeated declarations of our faith, and know that we are

squarely on the Andover Creed!' When liberals like Mr. Palmer attack them and charge them with holding on to evangelical words and phrases when they have abandoned their only legitimate meaning, they can hold aloft sample after sample of Universalistic and pantheistic phraseology, and cry, 'See how liberal we are, and what prodigious advances we have made! We are not so far behind you as you seem to think. As to these old evangelical terms, we do, indeed, use them now and then, not, however, because we like to use them or accept the beliefs which they have always expressed, but simply because in present circumstances it is wise "to make connection with existing doctrines."'

These replies of the Andover progressives are virtually an admission of the truth and justness of our charge, that they are not only in a transition state, and are moving *from* the Andover Creed to pantheistic theories, but have also adopted the policy of playing fast and loose, of being now on one side and now on the other side of the great religious questions at issue, or, as Mr. Palmer expresses it, of taking "back with one hand what they give with the other." While we do not affirm that these progressive divines, in adopting such a course of action, are conscious of doing anything morally wrong, yet we are bound to say, that if they are not sensible of any admonitions of conscience, it is a "new departure" of a most extraordinary type in human experience. We also say, that this "taking back with one hand what is given with the other," considered either as a method of concealing the antagonism of "Progressive Orthodoxy" to the Andover Creed, or as a method of self-justification on the part of the defendant, is an absolute failure; and that the moral character of such a procedure is absolutely indefensible.

"According to the Best Light God Shall Give Me."

3. A third fallacious argument of the defence must now be noticed. Nothing in the Constitution, in the Statutes, or in the Creed of Andover Seminary has been made more prominent in the arguments of the defence in this Andover Case than that single clause, now so familiar to the public, "according to the best light God shall give me." The defendant has been more wary than some of his legal counsel in the use of this phrase. He so refers to it, however, as to make the impression that it

contains something of the greatest importance to the defence, yet he never makes the least allusion to its grammatical position in the Statute of which it is a part, nor to its actual force and meaning. He gives great emphasis to this clause, repeatedly quotes it, prints it in italics, once at least in capital letters, and thus indicates that *in some way* it has a most significant and decisive bearing upon his right to follow all "*new* light," and to introduce the "*new* theology" into Andover Seminary.

One of Professor Smyth's legal counsel, Theodore C. Dwight, Esq., made still larger use of this fragment of a sentence. He was also more frank and positive in declaring its meaning, and its bearing upon the question of the rights and liberties of the professors. He discussed the clause at considerable length and boldly took the ground, that it gives to every professor full liberty to use Andover Seminary and all its funds for the propagation of any new light, or new doctrine, which he may think he has discovered, irrespective of its accordance or discordance with the intention of the Founders as expressed in their Creed and Statutes. This learned New York lawyer quoted some of the grand and deservedly famous sentences of John Robinson respecting our liberty and duty to accept any *new* light or truth that may come to us from God's Word, and then interpreted the clause, "according to the *best* light God shall give me," as affirming the liberty of every professor in Andover Seminary to follow the teaching of John Robinson, and accept any *new* light, and teach, by aid of the Andover funds, any *new* doctrine, which, in his judgment, has come to him from the Scriptures. Ex-Governor Gaston likewise, in his argument for the defence, interpreted the phrase, "*best* light," as if it meant "*new* light," *new* doctrine, and interpreted the whole clause as if it gave to every professor "a certain degree of liberty" to decide for himself what doctrines he shall promulgate by aid of the Andover Seminary and funds.

By means of such interpretations and statements as these, which have been caught up and continually repeated by the secular papers, the impression has gone abroad, that there is one sentence or declaration in the Andover Constitution or Statutes which somehow secures to every professor full right and liberty to use his own judgment in deciding what doctrines he shall maintain and teach by aid of the Andover endowments; that it is, indeed,

a fundamental law of the Institution, that every professor *shall* first of all be loyal to all the "*new light*" that comes to *him*, and that consequently the new-departure professors are doing nothing inconsistent with the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary, or with their own promises and contracts, in introducing a "*new* theology" into the Seminary, even though it be in irrepressible conflict with some of the doctrines of the Andover Creed.

This famous clause, "according to the *best* light God shall give me," can be understood only as it is seen in its relations to its context. The passage in which it occurs contains the sacred promises which every professor makes, once in every five years, in connection with a solemn declaration of his belief in all the doctrines of the Creed. This passage immediately follows the Seminary Creed, and is as follows: —

THE DECLARATION.

And furthermore I do solemnly promise that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my Pupils with integrity and faithfulness; that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the Creed, by me now repeated, together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy Religion, so far, as may appertain to my office, according to the best light God shall give me, and in opposition, not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mohammedans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists; and to all heresies and errors, ancient or modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of CHRIST, or hazardous to the souls of men; that by my instruction, counsel, and example, I will endeavor to promote true Piety and Godliness; that I will consult the good of this INSTITUTION, and the peace of the Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ on all occasions; and that I will religiously conform to the Constitution and Laws of this SEMINARY, and to the Statutes of this Foundation.

This passage, which is a statutory statement of the promises which every professor must make once in every five years, was called by the Founders, in order to distinguish it from the Creed with which it is immediately connected, "*The Declaration*"; and the two were spoken of as "the Creed and Declaration." This paragraph was doubtless thus designated because it *is* a *declaration*, on the part of the Founders, of the promises which they require every professor to make; and also, when repeated by a professor, is a *declaration* on his part of the promises which he makes as a condition of his holding a professorship in Andover

Seminary. This Declaration, as found in the Statutes of the Associate Foundation, was taken for the most part from Article XII of the Constitution of the Seminary. The clause which we are considering and its immediate context are substantially the same in the Constitution and in the Associate Statute.

The Clause Interpreted.

In view of the "Declaration," now quoted in full, the truth of the following statements must be conceded: —

(*a*) In this notable clause, "according to the best light God shall give me," nothing whatever is said about "new light," or "new doctrine." Mention is made of "the best light," but "the best light" may be old light. It is not necessarily "new light." The easy coolness with which it has been assumed that the phrase "best light" is equivalent to the phrase "new light" is characteristic of the logic of the defence. It would be as legitimate to claim, that every Andover professor is authorized and required to accept and teach the *old light* or the *old doctrine*, and then to present, printed in capital letters, the statutory clause we are now considering, as in some mysterious manner *proving* such claim, as it is to claim that every Andover professor is authorized and required to accept and teach "the new light" or "new doctrine of to-day," and then present, printed in capitals, the same statutory clause as in some mysterious way proving that claim.

(*b*) Nothing is said in this statutory clause about "the *right*" or "the *liberty*" of the professors to maintain and inculcate any "new truth" or "new doctrine," which, as they may conceive, has come to them from the Holy Scriptures. It has been strangely assumed, that because John Robinson, John Milton, and other great advocates of religious liberty uttered some grand words about the right and duty of all Christians to accept such "new light" as may break upon their minds from the Word of God, it *must* be perfectly just and proper, that this famous clause in the Andover Statutes should be so interpreted as to give to the Andover professors full liberty to enter into solemn engagements to maintain and inculcate the doctrines of the Andover Creed, and then, at their own sweet will, to break their engagements and begin to teach "new doctrines" which are in absolute antagonism to those of the Seminary Creed; and this, when there is not one

word in that statutory clause having the remotest reference to "religious rights" and "liberties." Would John Robinson, or John Milton, or any other great defender of religious freedom, have advocated such infamous liberty as this — liberty to break solemn promises and to be false to a great trust voluntarily assumed?

(*c*) In this entire "*Declaration*" there is not a single sentence or clause which authorizes a professor to maintain and teach any doctrine or speculation, new or old, which antagonizes the Seminary Creed, or opposes the doctrines of Consistent Calvinism. It has been claimed, or at least implied, that there is a clause here which will allow a professor to do this. It is the clause, "together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion." Every professor in taking the Creed, and in making the promises included in the Declaration, says: —

> I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the Creed by me now repeated, *together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy Religion*, so far as may appertain to my office.

At a hasty and careless reading it may possibly seem that in one clause of this sentence a professor actually promises to teach doctrines which not only are not in the Creed, but also may be opposed to the Creed and to Consistent Calvinism. But does he make such a promise? Not at all. Notice the language. Every professor promises to "maintain and inculcate the Christian faith as expressed in the Creed," "together with all *the* other doctrines and duties" — not "together with *all other* doctrines," — but "together with all *the* other doctrines and duties of *our* holy Religion." Whose holy religion? "Of OUR holy Religion"; the holy religion of the Founders, and of those who were of the same faith with themselves; that is, the holy religion of Consistent Calvinists. That little word "OUR" should be printed large, so large that no Andover professor or Trustee can ever again fail to see it. When the Founders put into this Statute the phrase, "all *the* other doctrines of *our* holy religion," they did not mean all the doctrines of the holy religion of Mohammedans, or of Unitarians, or of Rellyan Universalists, or of semi-pagan pantheists. This phrase, "*our* holy religion," when written by the Associate Founders, meant the holy religion of Consistent Cal-

vinists. And when a professor to-day repeats that phrase in solemn promise, he has no legal or moral right to mean anything different from what the Founders meant. The Founders were not so near idiocy that they required every professor on their foundation to promise solemnly, first, that he would maintain and inculcate "the Christian faith as expressed" *in their own Creed;* and then to promise, secondly, that he would also maintain and inculcate all doctrines of any other creed which he might prefer, however opposed they might be to the Seminary Creed. That little word "*our*" brings the promissory clause in which it stands into perfect harmony with all the other promises, with the entire Creed, and with all the Statutes of the Seminary.

(*d*) The clause, "according to the best light God shall give me," is a qualifying clause. It has adverbial force. It tells *how* something is to be done. But it does not qualify the promissory declaration, "I do solemnly promise that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness." It has been claimed that this famous adverbial clause does qualify that promise. This claim has been put forth by one professor and by one trustee, both of whom have defended and aided to the extent of their ability the theological revolution now in progress in Andover Seminary. (See Andover Defence, p. 305, and "The Creed of Andover Theological Seminary. By Rev. D. T. Fiske, D.D.," p. 8.) But this claim is fallacious. The adverbial clause is not attached to this first promise. It is attached to the second promise, and the second promise comes between this clause and the first promise. (See the Declaration quoted above.) The plain rules of grammar forbid the interpretation which comes from making this clause added to the second promise qualify also the first promise. To urge this construction is to wrest language, to misrepresent the intention of the Founders, to ascribe to them such self-contradiction and folly as they were never guilty of, and to represent that they deliberately allowed, and even required, professors to make a promise, the faithful fulfilment of which *might* defeat all the grand and unmistakable purposes for which the Seminary was founded.

Why has this fallacious claim been urged? The motive has not been stated. But whatever the motive may have been, one thing is certain: if the promise to be made by professors is this, "I

will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness," "*according to the best light God shall give me*," then a professor may go into his lecture room and say, or may say in his publications: "I have promised to explain the Scriptures with integrity and faithfulness *according to the best light God shall give me*, and on my honor, explaining the Scriptures with integrity and faithfulness, I must affirm that, 'according to the best light *God now gives me*,' the most destructive criticism of the Scriptures of which I ever heard does not go too far. Accordingly, I believe and teach that the Bible is nothing but so much paper and ink; that there are no words, or teachings, or so-called revelations in the Bible which can truthfully be said to have any divine authority whatever. The Bible abounds in errors of all kinds, and therefore is untrustworthy as a rule of faith and practice. I myself, however, and others like me, in our superior and reverent scholarship, are abundantly competent to amend the Scriptures and correct all the blunders of ignorant prophets and unscholarly apostles. The man Jesus amended the Scriptures, therefore I can. If the apostle Paul had the mind of Christ, so have I. If apostles out of their own Christian consciousness evolved holy Scripture, I can evolve the same out of my Christian consciousness. As to the authority of the Bible, I have this to say: that all Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments must bring their credentials and submit them to the test of the truth that is in my heart and my mind. If the Scripture thus presented to me for authentication be truth, I shall decide that it is truth, and then it will have authority; not, however, because it came from prophets, or apostles, or even from Christ himself, but because I have said it is truth."

Any professor, we say, if so disposed, may lawfully proclaim and teach such radical and revolutionary infidelity as this in Andover Seminary, if he be allowed to make the proposed amended promise: "I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness, *according to the best light God shall give me*." And thus this sacred Seminary, which was founded to maintain the truth and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, "in opposition . . . to Infidels," may be used in the spirit of Voltaire to destroy their truth and divine authority, and to blot the Bible itself out of existence, under the plea that this is "*reverent and tolerant scholarship*."

To "open the Scriptures" is to give an exposition of them. To "explain" the Scriptures includes something more than exposition; it is to account for them, to tell what they are, and whence they came. The amendment recently introduced by a trustee and a professor into the Declaration of the Founders is to the effect, that every professor shall account for the Scriptures and decide the questions of their origin and divine authority "according to the best light God shall give him."

This amendment is of the nature of an addition to a Statute. It is adding to a statutory sentence a modifying clause which the Founders never annexed to that sentence. That the change thus proposed is radical and revolutionary cannot be denied. Whether this amendment be introduced by inadvertence or by deliberate intention, the effect will be the same. It opens a wide door to any amount of the most destructive criticism of the Bible, and prepares the way for the defeat of the chief purposes of the Founders in the establishment of their Seminary.

It may be said in reply by the defendant and his progressive supporters that the transposition of this modifying clause, and the annexation of it to the first promise in the Declaration of the Founders, were not intended to be an *amendment* of the Statute, but only an interpretation of the language of the Statute. To this we answer, that if such an "interpretation" be accepted and acted upon by the Trustees and Faculty of the Seminary, the radical and revolutionary effect will be precisely the same that it would have been if the Statute had been *amended* by the insertion of the modifying clause immediately after the first promise in the Declaration. The cardinal purposes of the Founders in the establishment of their Seminary may be as completely defeated by such an "interpretation" of the Statute as by such an "amendment" of it. This proposed change of the Statute, whether it be called an amendment or a new interpretation, would present an almost resistless temptation to some men, if they were professors in this Seminary, to revolutionize the instruction and character of the Institution. Especially would this temptation be powerful at a time like this, when the pride of rationalistic and speculative scholarship and the spirit of destructive criticism are rampant. But the statutory Declaration, *as framed by the Founders*, offers no such temptation to any professor, not even to one

who might have the frenzied and bitterly destructive spirit of Robert Ingersoll.

Again it may be said, in reply, by the defendant and his supporters, that no Andover professor will ever put himself into such a position of extreme antagonism to the Bible as "the Word of God," for the reason that he has solemnly affirmed his belief in the divine and supreme authority of the Scriptures, by saying in the language of the Seminary Creed, —

> I believe . . . that the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.

To this we answer, that a professor's assent to the said statement of the Creed will not necessarily be any safeguard against his antagonism to the divine origin and supreme authority of the Scriptures; for he may take the position, that in this case we have one of the "inconsistencies" alleged by the defence to be found in the Creed and Declaration; that the first promise in the Declaration, as he reads it, and the statement in the Creed respecting the perfection of the Scriptures, are in irreconcilable conflict each with the other; that no man can consistently at one and the same time assent to the said Creed-statement and make the said promise of the Declaration; that consequently he has a right to choose which he will discard; and that he prefers to discard the Creed-statement of the divine authority of the Scriptures, and make the promise required of him; for then he will be able, in all good conscience, to explain the Scriptures 'according to the best light God gives *him*,' and in square opposition "to the best light God gave" the Founders when they wrote their Creed. Such a professor will be greatly encouraged to make this choice, and so put himself into conflict with the Creed, by the fact that the President of the Board of Trustees has publicly instructed him:

> That the Original Founders desired above all things that the Scriptures should be faithfully opened and explained by the Professors "according to the best light God should give them. [1]

This extraordinary explanation and instruction respecting the supreme desire of the Original Founders has already been cited by defendant professors as an authoritative interpretation of the Statute, and as fully justifying their present attempt to revolu-

[1] The Creed of Andover Theological Seminary, p. 8.

tionize the theological instruction of the Seminary. Such an official statement of the desire and intent of the Founders would naturally be regarded by a reckless liberal professor as giving him full warrant to teach his pupils, if he should be disposed to do so, that 'according to the best light God gives him,' the Creed-statement of the Founders concerning the divine origin and authority of the Scriptures is absolutely false, that the Bible is not "The Word of God," and is not "the only perfect rule of faith and practice."

But fortunately the President of the Board of Trustees is not the "constitutional interpreter" of the Statutes of Andover Seminary. His opinion respecting the desires and intention of the Founders has no more legal authority than that of any other man. The Visitors, and they alone, are the "constitutional interpreters" of the Andover Statutes. The Founders never entrusted this high function to the President of the Board of Trustees, nor to any other trustee, nor to all the trustees; but, by Statute, authority is given to the Board of Visitors, and only to that Board, "to determine, interpret and explain the Statutes." It is more than fortunate, also, it is a matter for devout thanksgiving to God in the present emergency, that no professor, no trustee, not even the Board of Trustees, has any authority, legal or moral, to change, by addition or diminution, by *transposition* or substitution, or in any other way, a single word, clause, or sentence in the Creed or Declaration, in the Constitution or in any Statute of the Seminary. It is made the special duty of the Board of Visitors to deal summarily with any attempt, by whomsoever made, to bring about any such change or amendment as has been recently proposed in the "Creed and Declaration." The Board of Visitors was established and endowed with great powers, for the very purpose of preventing any "perversion" or "the smallest avoidance of the true design" of the Founders as expressed in the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary. Special Visitorial fidelity is enjoined in guarding the Creed from all mutilation or alteration, by whomsoever attempted. Article XXVII of the Associate Statutes declares: —

It is strictly and solemnly enjoined, and left in sacred charge, that every article of the above said Creed shall forever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, addition or diminution.

But the recent transposition of the clause, "according to the best light God shall give me," from the place assigned to it by the Founders, and the attachment of it to another sentence to which the Founders did not attach it, is undeniably an "alteration" of the "Declaration," — an "alteration," too, which, if accepted by a professor of the higher, destructive criticism, will encourage him to claim the right to subscribe to the Creed, while he rejects *in toto* the Creed-statement of the divine origin and supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, and rejects also several other fundamental doctrines of the Creed and of Consistent Calvinism. This astonishing claim may be grounded upon alleged inconsistency between the Declaration and the Creed. The result of making and justifying this claim may be, that the said professor will not only refuse to teach doctrines of the Creed which he has promised to teach, but will also maintain and inculcate Universalism, or Unitarianism, or any other of the errors which he has solemnly promised to oppose.

(*e*) But while the clause, "according to the best light God shall give me," does not modify the first, it does modify the second, promise in the Declaration. Every professor, in connection with his assent and subscription to the Creed, makes the following declaration: —

> I do solemnly promise . . . that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the Creed by me now repeated, together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion, so far as may appertain to my office, *according to the best light God shall give me*, and in opposition to [thirteen specified errors] and to all heresies and errors, ancient or modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men.

The True Intent of the Clause.

What now are the purpose and meaning of this oft-repeated clause, "according to the best light God shall give me"?

1. It may need to be said again by way of emphasis, that there is not one word in this clause about "new light," or "loyalty to the new light," or "new doctrine," or about a professor's "right" and "liberty" to accept and teach "new theology" on the Andover Foundations. We submit to the judgment of all intelligent and candid men, that this modifying clause can never be legitimately and honestly quoted in defence of promul-

gating, by aid of the Andover Seminary and funds, any new doctrines which are opposed to the Seminary Creed, and are known to have been abhorrent to the Founders.

2. This much-emphasized clause is the *second* of three successive modifying clauses. The first of these, "so far as may appertain to my office," needs no comment. In the third, the professors promise that they will maintain and inculcate all the designated doctrines "*in opposition to*" various religious errors. This third and most vital modification of the second promise in the Declaration has seldom been cited, or even referred to, by the legal counsel and other supporters of the defendant. Over and over, and with great gusto, they quote the words, often printing them in capitals, "ACCORDING TO THE BEST LIGHT GOD SHALL GIVE ME"; but they stop with the word "*me*," thus making the impression that the Founders added no other modification to the second promise, and that these words about "*the best light*" do in some mysterious way give to every Andover professor full liberty to accept and promulgate any "*new light*" which may come to him, even though it may prove to be (under a new name) Rellyan Universalism or Unitarianism or any other of the errors specified or indicated in this third and most important modifying clause.

3. But indispensable as is this third modification to a true understanding of the second modification and of the whole intention of the Founders, it has been kept by the defence in the background, and the second modification has been constantly pushed to the front. The words "according to the best light God shall give me," have been again and again "wrenched from their connections," and worked for all they were supposed to be worth in support of the right of the defendant to promulgate "*new* light" in the form of a "new theology" by means of the funds and the prestige of Andover Seminary.

But what are the import and purpose of this second modifying clause? Every professor promises that he "will maintain and inculcate" *certain carefully designated doctrines 'according to the best light God shall give him.'* This clause was intended to qualify the verbs "will maintain and inculcate." Its whole and only purpose was to designate the *manner* in which professors should "maintain and inculcate" certain *definitely prescribed doctrines.* Plainly such was the intent of the Founders in the inser-

tion of this clause, and they had no other intent. They never dreamed of its being used by a professor in defence of his alleged right to substitute his own "*new* light" in the place of the designated doctrines he has promised to teach, and to teach too in the very *best manner possible*. The purpose of the Founders was to secure from every professor a promise given as by oath, that he would teach *the very doctrines* which *they had prescribed* in their Statutes, and teach *them* too according to the *best* light, according to the *best* knowledge and wisdom God should give him. But in exacting this promise, the Founders give to their professors no authority whatever to teach any other than the *prescribed doctrines*. The promise itself is a bar to their teaching any doctrines which are in the least degree inconsistent with those prescribed in the Statutes of the Seminary.

If a president-elect of the United States, in taking his official oath, should solemnly swear that he would execute all the laws of the United States, "so far as may appertain to his office, according to the best light God should give him," it would by no means follow that he is authorized by that oath to *discard* the laws of the United States, and execute in their place *new* laws of his own invention and creation under the specious plea that his *new* laws are less antiquated, more advanced, and every way better than the old ones. Such action on his part would be insufferable usurpation and tyranny. For such a crime a President would be impeached, and forthwith removed from office. Now every Andover professor solemnly promises to maintain and inculcate all *the doctrines* which are carefully prescribed by Creed and Statutes, 'according to the best light God shall give him,' and to oppose all antagonistic doctrines; but it by no means follows that he is authorized by that promise to *discard* these same carefully *prescribed* doctrines, and to maintain and inculcate in their place *new* and opposing doctrines of his own invention and creation, under the specious plea that these *new* doctrines are not antiquated, but are "higher," "larger," "more advanced," and every way better than those which he has religiously promised to maintain and inculcate. Such action is an intolerable usurpation of authority, and a criminal breach of contract. The least required by the Statutes to be done with such a professor is, that he forthwith be removed from office.

4. We add in the next place, that while the Founders require every professor to teach doctrines "other" than those of the Creed, so far as may appertain to his office, yet they do not leave it to the professor to determine what those "other doctrines" are. The strange claim has been put forth, that the Founders *do* leave the determination of this to the professors. It has been affirmed

> That the Founders . . . require their Professors to teach "all other doctrines of our holy religion" — leaving it for them to determine what those "other doctrines" are, — "according to the best light God shall give them." [1]

But this statement is not true. As has already been shown, the *Founders themselves* determine what "the other doctrines" are. Their language is not "all other doctrines," but it is, "all *the* other doctrines." They have in mind certain definite doctrines. Other words of vital significance they also add. They say: "all *the* other doctrines of *our* holy religion." Of whose holy religion? Of the holy religion of the professors? Not necessarily. Of the holy religion of Rellyan Universalists? By no means. The Founders say: "all *the* other doctrines of OUR holy religion." The writers of the Creed and Declaration were Consistent Calvinists, and when they said "*our* holy religion," they meant the holy religion of Consistent Calvinists, and all *their* doctrines were clearly defined and well known. It was assumed that no man fit to be a professor in Andover Seminary would ever subscribe to the Creed of the Founders before knowing definitely what the doctrines of that Creed are; and that no man fit to be an Andover professor would ever subscribe to the promises of the Declaration of the Founders, before knowing definitely what he promises to do. Any man of sufficient scholarship to occupy any chair in Andover Seminary *does* know what the doctrines of its Creed are, and what "all *the* other doctrines of" the Founders' "holy religion" are. Any man destitute of this knowledge of Consistent Calvinism is thereby disqualified to hold a professorship in this Seminary. The Founders never intended to allow men to subscribe to their Creed not knowing *what* they subscribed to, and then leave it to *them* to determine afterwards to what they

[1] The Creed of Andover Theological Seminary, by Rev. D. T. Fiske, D.D., p. 26.

had subscribed. Nor did they ever intend to allow men to subscribe to the solemn promises of their Declaration, not knowing *what* they promised, and then leave it to *them* to determine afterward what they *had* promised. Even if it shall be found — which may God forbid! — that there are men in the administration of Andover Seminary who are willing that professors-elect and professors in service should make the most momentous and sacred promises not knowing *what* they promise, and then are willing to leave it to the professors to determine at their leisure, "according to the best light God shall give them," what they *have* promised, yet two things are certain: the Founders did not belong to that class of men; and they never intended that that class of men should ever have part in the administration of their Seminary.

The doctrines intended by the Founders to be maintained and inculcated in their Theological Institution are clearly designated in their Creed and Declaration, and as clearly in their Declaration as in their Creed. It cannot be affirmed, that the phrase "all *the* other doctrines of *our* holy religion" is equivalent to the phrase "all other doctrines of the holy religion of any man who may be elected to, or may wish to retain, a professor's chair in Andover Seminary." Nor can it be denied, that the phrase, "all *the* other doctrines of *our* holy religion," as written by the Founders, does mean exactly, and was intended to mean, *all the other doctrines of the holy religion of Consistent Calvinists.* This designation of doctrines is not indeterminate and elastic, as it has falsely been represented to be. It is a positive, definite, and clearly decisive designation. Every man qualified to be an Andover professor knows what these "other doctrines" are; for according to the Statutes of the Associate Foundation, a professor on this Foundation *must* be a "Consistent Calvinist": and to say that a man can be a Consistent Calvinist and not know what the doctrines of his own faith are, is like saying that a man can have a clear and positive belief in the existence of God, and yet not know what his own belief respecting the existence of God is.

Every intelligent man, therefore, who subscribes to the Creed and Declaration of the Founders of this Seminary knows exactly what doctrines he promised to maintain and inculcate, or, if he does not know, but intends to determine later at his leisure, "according to the best light God shall give him," what doctrines he

has promised to maintain and inculcate, then, beyond controversy, he is not an honest man. He has not been true to himself; he has dealt dishonorably with the Founders, and deceitfully with the official guardians of the Seminary, and so is morally disqualified to occupy any chair in the Andover Theological Institution.

Summary of Designated Fallacious Arguments.

We have now presented several examples of the fallacious arguments used by the defendant and his supporters in their replies to the charges of the complainants: First, the worthless argument based upon the false statement of the defendant, that "the question of the personal relation of Christ to the entire race," "was not before the minds of the authors . . . of the Seminary Creed"; secondly, fallacious arguments based upon an adroit use of undefined fundamental terms and phrases — a method of reasoning in which the Andover progressives use the same theological words and expressions now in one sense and now in another sense, thus attempting to be at one and the same time on both sides of great theological issues, or, as the Rev. Frederic Palmer impressively expresses it, "taking back with one hand what they give with the other"; and all this for the confessed purpose of making and keeping up connections with the existing evangelical doctrines of the Andover Creed, which doctrines Mr. Palmer, as well as the complainants, claims they have utterly abandoned; and thirdly, the fallacious arguments of the defence, built upon a total misrepresentation of the meaning and purpose of the now famous clause, "according to the best light God shall give me."

VIII.

CONCLUSION.

THE evidence and arguments which the complainants desired to present are now before the Reverend and Honorable Board of Visitors. We have abundantly substantiated, as we claim, the first, second, third, fifth, sixth, twelfth, and thirteenth particular charges; and in proving the truth of these specific allegations, we have also fully justified the four general complaints which we have presented to your Board. The remaining charges we have refrained from considering at this hearing, not because we deemed them unimportant, but partly for lack of time and partly because, in our opinion, the presentation of evidence and argument in proof of seven specific charges would be sufficient to convince the Board of Visitors that "Progressive Orthodoxy," as now held and taught by the defendant in Andover Seminary, is not the Consistent Calvinism which the Seminary was founded to maintain and inculcate, but is undeniably in absolute conflict with the Creed and Statutes of the Founders.

THE DOGMA OF PROBATION AFTER DEATH NOT CONSIDERED.

It may have been expected, however, that we would again call special attention to the eleventh specific allegation, which charges that the defendant holds and teaches, "that there is, and will be, probation after death for all men who do not decisively reject Christ during the earthly life." But we have not occupied your time in presenting directly any proof of this charge for two reasons: First, the cogent and exhaustive, the unanswered and the unanswerable argument of our departed associate complainant, the Rev. Henry M. Dexter, D.D., in support of this complaint is in print, and is in the hands of the Board of Visitors. Such an argument as that needs nothing supplementary from us. Secondly, this doctrine or hypothesis of a probation after death, though most baneful in its spiritual and moral influence, and certainly "hazardous to the souls of men," is yet not the central

and dominating principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy," or, in what we have shown to be substantially the same thing, Rellyan Universalism. Indeed, when the root-principle of this new-old theology of the Andover progressives is fully developed and applied, it will be found that they do not believe in any probation, in the evangelical sense of that term, either in this life or in the next. This notion of a probation continued into the next world has been merely the red flag of the defendant and his immediate supporters in all this controversy. They have kept it waving briskly, especially by means of their conflict with the American Board, for the purpose of absorbing public attention while they have devoted their best energies to the more serious work of evolving and applying — and also of disclosing little by little, as evangelical people and churches should be found to bear it — the *root-principle* of this system, which is the *vital union of the entire human race with Christ.* While the complainants have not directly considered this notion of a future probation, yet in uncovering the true character of this root-principle in "Progressive Orthodoxy,' and in showing that that principle is utterly unproved and groundless, ridiculous and false, that it is of heathen and not of Christian origin, we have also unavoidably shown that such a probation after death as the defendant believes in and advocates, is absolutely impossible. His idea of probation, if he is consistent with his own fundamental and guiding principle, must be, that it is simply opportunity given to men to attain the knowledge of their own vital union with God in Christ, that is, knowledge of their own deity. But if there is no such vital union of all men with God in Christ, opportunity to attain knowledge of it is impossible. For these reasons we have not thought it needful to take up your time in presenting evidence and argument in proof of the eleventh particular charge.

The Great Questions at Issue in the Andover Case.

It was stated at the opening of this argument that there are in the Andover Case two great questions, one theological and the other moral; and that the latter is the supreme question in this trial.

The theological question is this: — Is the "new theology," called "Progressive Orthodoxy," which is now confessedly held

and taught by the defendant and his progressive associates in Andover Seminary, *in accord with*, or *in irrepressible conflict with*, "the Christian faith as expressed in the Creed," and in that Consistent Calvinism prescribed in the Statutes as the only theology which can be lawfully held and taught by any professor on these foundations? The determination of this theological question is preliminary, and absolutely necessary to the determination of the moral and supreme question in the Andover Case.

The Supreme Question at Issue.

The moral question is this: — Is it a righteous act on the part of an Andover professor who has subscribed to the Andover Creed, and has promised, as under oath, to teach "the Christian faith as expressed in that Creed," after having radically changed his theological beliefs, and accepted a faith opposed to that Creed, to still occupy and to insist upon occupying his professorial chair in the said Seminary? Is it just and honorable for an Andover professor who was elected to his office as a Consistent Calvinist, who declared himself to be a Consistent Calvinist, and on his honor as a gentleman and a Christian promised to teach Consistent Calvinism, to claim afterward the right to remain in his chair and be supported by the Andover funds, although he has ceased to be a Consistent Calvinist? Is it right and honest action on the part of such a professor who has ceased to be a Consistent Calvinist, and is now holding and teaching *another* theology, admitted by him to be *another* and a "*new* theology," and designated by a new name, to insist upon retaining his professorship, and using the Seminary, its funds, its prestige, its name, and its fame to aid him in maintaining and promulgating this "new theology," proved to be opposed to that of the Creed and the Statutes of the Founders? Such is the moral question. And it towers high above all other questions which are at issue in this trial.

The Answer Given to the Theological Question.

The complainants would gladly learn that they are mistaken in the conclusion which they have reached upon the theological question. But upon our honor we cannot believe that we are mistaken. We have now presented evidence and arguments abun-

dantly sufficient, as we believe, to more than justify all our complaints, and to convince the Board of Visitors, and all other intelligent and unprejudiced Christian men, that this new-old theology called "Progressive Orthodoxy" is not 'orthodox and consistent Calvinism,' but is in irrepressible conflict with the theology defined in the Seminary Creed and Statutes, and required by the Founders to be taught on the Andover Foundations.

The Answer Given to the Moral Question.

Therefore, the answer to the moral and supreme question in this case, is, we submit, obvious and inevitable. The moment it is decided, that "Progressive Orthodoxy" is antagonistic to "the Christian faith as expressed in the Creed" and Statutes of the Founders, it is also decided that the defendant, in holding and teaching "Progressive Orthodoxy" while supported by Andover funds, is guilty of immoral and criminal action. He is getting possession of other people's property by unlawful methods, and using that property in the service of his own interests. As surely as "Progressive Orthodoxy" is not the Consistent Calvinism of the Andover Creed and Statutes, but is opposed to it, so surely the defendant is doing morally what James Relly did when he got possession of another person's money by unlawful methods and put it to his own use; for doing which he was tried and condemned in court, and on account of which, and because of other "scandalous practices," his followers forsook him and left him to die in disgrace. As surely as the defendant and his progressive associates are teaching in Andover Seminary, under cover of the name, "Progressive Orthodoxy," a theology which is opposed to that defined in the Creed and Statutes, so surely they are doing substantially what John Murray did when he obtained support and endorsement from orthodox people, and the free use of orthodox pulpits and churches, under false pretences, by making the impression that he was an orthodox man, and was preaching the evangelical faith, when in fact he was a Rellyanist, and was covertly, little by little, as his orthodox hearers would bear it, preaching Rellyan Universalism. The Andover progressives, as surely as our decision of the theological question is correct, are now obtaining support and endorsement from orthodox people, and the free use

of a richly endowed orthodox Seminary, of its honored name, its prestige and its funds, by deceptive methods, by claiming that they are holding and teaching a theology which is "new," and is properly and truthfully called "*Progressive Orthodoxy*," when in fact, it is not new, and as judged by the standard of the Andover Creed, is neither orthodoxy nor progressive, but is heterodoxy and retrogressive. The truth is, unless all our evidence and arguments are at fault, these same self-styled progressives are moving, as fast as their peculiar circumstances in an orthodox Seminary will permit, backward and downward towards the old pagan Pantheism of Greece and India. Consequently we are compelled to believe, that the defendant, in teaching in Andover Seminary what we claim to have shown to be Rellyan, or Pantheistic, Universalism, is guilty of morally disreputable and even criminal conduct.

Expert Opinion.

Moreover, according to expert opinion as given in the religious press, and in our larger periodicals, The Reviews and Quarterlies, denominational and undenominational, conservative and liberal, we are warranted in saying, as we are prepared to show by citations, that the almost universal verdict of trained theologians of all schools and sects upon the theological question in the Andover Case, is, that the "new theology" recently introduced into Andover Seminary is in irrepressible conflict with that of the Seminary Creed and Statutes. Consequently and inevitably the almost universal verdict of our religious papers, evangelical and liberal, and of our larger periodicals, so far as they have discussed the Andover Case, upon the great moral question at issue in this trial, is, that to teach this "new theology" on the Andover Foundations cannot be justified by any right standard of morals. There is abundant evidence, also, that this capturing of an orthodox theological Seminary, and then using it for the maintenance and inculcation of an unorthodox and liberal faith, is a type of dishonesty which is peculiarly odious.

There is a species of bird that never builds its own nest. It is called the "cow bird." It watches some other birds as they laboriously build their nest and begin to lay in it their eggs. Then it steals into their cozy nest, or, if need be, fights its way

into it, and there lays its eggs also, and thus compels the owners of the nest to hatch out and rear a brood of cow birds. It is a mean bird that will do that. There is a species or class of religionists, that never yet, so far as we know, has built its own theological seminary. They have sometimes been called Rellyanists. Some men of this faith have been casting covetous eyes upon a richly furnished and famous Seminary on Andover Hill. This institution was built and endowed by orthodox and Consistent Calvinists, for the express and sole purpose of sending forth from it every year a brood of Christian young men, trained at the expense of the Founders, to go everywhere in the wide world, preaching the Christian faith as defined by Consistent Calvinists. But these modern Rellyanists are now capturing this same orthodox and richly endowed Seminary, and are using it for the purpose of sending forth from it every year a brood of young men, trained at the expense of its Calvinistic Founders, to preach Rellyan Universalism to their fellow-men, — a faith with which the Founders, to their sorrow, were well acquainted, which they abhorred, and which by statute they pledged every professor in their Seminary to the end of time *not* to teach, but to oppose.

Now there is no blinking the fact that the universal public conscience declares, that *that* is not an honorable thing for any class of men to do; and that any religious faith that will prompt, or even allow, such action is an immoral faith. Can any man point out, in all history, a single instance in which *Calvinists* — Consistent Calvinists, or any other kind of true *Calvinists* — have thus captured a seminary, or any other institution, or property, belonging to some sect or school of a liberal faith, and then used it for the propagation of Calvinism? Calvinists have not been found doing such things, nor have they been found counseling and encouraging one another to do such things as a shrewd and easy method of disseminating their Calvinistic beliefs.

The New York Observer (August 11, 1892), in an editorial decidedly pertinent to these times, and in particular to this Andover Case, asks the following questions, and practically answers them: —

What Calvinist ever advised Calvinists publicly to subscribe to an anti-Calvinistic creed, and then to teach and defend Calvinism within an anti-Calvinistic denomination? What Calvinist ever advised Calvinists to

hold office and take emoluments on anti-Calvinistic foundations? What orthodox body ever put to its own use endowments that were given to spread "progressive" theology? The history of religious endowments shows without an exception, if we are not mistaken, that it is the looser creed that filches from the stricter, and not the stricter from the looser.

These questions and this statement of *The Observer* not only pay a just tribute of praise to Calvinistic honesty, but also contain a severe indictment against the morality of the so-called Andover Progressives. But this citation is only a sample of the almost universal judgment, so far as we can ascertain, of the religious press, upon the great moral question in the Andover Case. There can be no doubt, that before the august tribunal of the public religious conscience, the defendant, for teaching what he calls "Progressive Orthodoxy" on the Andover Foundations, already stands adjudged as guilty of morally disreputable and criminal conduct. This verdict reinforces the conclusion which the complainants have reached through the most careful examination which they have been able to make of "Progressive Orthodoxy" itself. as compared with the theology defined in the Andover Creed and Statutes, and as set forth in that clearly described and well-known system of Christian Faith, which Andover Seminary was founded to maintain and inculcate, and which the Founders called "Consistent Calvinism."

Final Appeal to the Board of Visitors.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors: Our responsibility in this Andover Case has terminated, but yours has not. The momentous question, What is to be the future of this great Institution of sacred learning, is now to be decided by you.

By the Statutes under which you act, you are invested with large powers. Your authority is supreme in this Seminary. The Statutes make it evident, that you were invested with such extraordinary powers and authority, for the very purpose, that in a great emergency like the present, you might be able to determine, in the face of all opposition, that the theological instruction in this Seminary shall not be opposed to "the Christian faith as expressed in the Creed" to which every professor has subscribed, but shall be in full and hearty accord with "the true intention" of the Founders as declared in their Constitution and Statutes.

By appointment from the Founders themselves, you three gentlemen stand as in their "place and stead, the Guardians, Overseers and Protectors" of their Foundation. Standing thus in the place of the Founders, you are required to "*see*" that this sacred *Trust* is executed by all persons who have any responsibility in its execution, in strict accordance with the purposes for which the Seminary was established and endowed. You are also required to "effectually guard the same" sacred Trust "against all perversion, or the smallest avoidance of the true design" of the Founders.

It is likewise made your imperative duty "to determine, interpret, and explain the Statutes of the said Foundation in all cases brought before" you in your "judicial capacity." This critical and decisive work of interpreting the Statutes was not intrusted to the Faculty. It was not committed to the Board of Trustees. To *you*, the Board of Visitors, and to *you alone*, is intrusted the high power of determining, interpreting, and explaining the Statutes of the Seminary. To-day, you, and you only, are invested with the power to give a legal and authoritative interpretation of the principal Statute which we have brought before you, namely, that which embodies "the Creed and Declaration." You are now called upon to "interpret and explain" in your "judicial capacity," this Statute in its relation to the "new theology," so called, which has recently been introduced into the Seminary, and is now taught in the place of the theology of the Seminary Creed. The facts in the case have been presented. The Andover theology — the only theology that can ever truthfully be called the *Andover* theology — that which is defined in Article II of the Statutes of the Associate Foundation, is before you. Another theology also, named recently by its pretended discoverers "Progressive Orthodoxy," is before you. Can this "new theology" of the defendant and of his progressive associates rightfully usurp the place of the Consistent Calvinism of the Founders? Can "Progressive Orthodoxy," which has been boastfully set forth as "The Theology of To-day," but which is not necessarily The Theology of To-morrow, be lawfully and righteously taught in Andover Seminary, in the place of the theology of that Creed, concerning which the Associate Founders declare in Statute XXVII, that "every article" of it "shall for-

ever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, addition or diminution"? These are the questions which we place before you. The responsibility of answering them rests upon you.

But, permit us to add, Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, that, in the Providence of God, you have here and now an opportunity, such as has rarely been given to men on this earth, to serve in the largest way some of the dearest, grandest interests of countless individual souls, of the Church universal, and of the world itself. This Seminary was founded to reach round the globe with its evangelistic, redeeming, and glorifying power, and then onward through all the ages until Christ shall come again.

It is your high and blessed privilege to be, under God, the supreme guardians of this head fountain of a world-wide redemption; to stand where you can be true to those large-hearted and God-fearing men, the Founders, according to your solemn promise; true to their sacred and sublime purposes; and at the same time true on the largest scale to God's kingdom of truth and righteousness. For yours is the rare, angelic mission to perpetuate this evangelical Theological Seminary as a great fountain of gospel light and salvation, by declaring, with all the authority of your high office, that there shall be no more trifling in these holy places with sacred obligations; that no professor on these foundations shall promise to teach one theology, and then teach another, which is opposed to the one he has promised to teach; but that in the heart and mind, in the life and teaching of every professor who shall remain one day in office, there must be that living, energizing, evangelical, orthodox, and Calvinistic faith, which the Founders in their Statutes declared to be '*The Christian faith* as expressed in their Creed'; which faith is no new discovery of yesterday or of the day before; which is not merely an experiment of to-day, and may be thrown aside to-morrow; which is not either the old pagan wisdom of ancient Greeks just rediscovered, and now paraded before the public as the newest, most advanced, and most "progressive orthodoxy"; but which faith is in truth "*The Christian Faith*," that for nearly nineteen centuries has been "the power of God, and the wisdom of God" "unto salvation to every one that believeth"; which going forth from this one Seminary into all the world during now

the larger part of a century, has brought uncounted multitudes into the eternal service of Christ; and which, if permitted by one word and one act of yours to do so, will yet bring millions more into the kingdom of God. Thus, through your fidelity to a great and holy *Trust*, this Seminary, in strict accordance with the grand purpose of the Founders, shall do its honorable part in the sublime and beatific work of fulfilling the last great command of our ascending Lord: "*Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost:* TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I COMMANDED YOU."

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01252 0138

DATE DUE

~~FACULTY~~			