

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

his glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, Light of light, God of God, the perfect image of the Invisible, the Eternal, the Infinite One; to be like him, the purified and perfected children of men, and also the adopted and glorified sons of God; to be *in* him even as he is in the Father — that will be the perfect blessedness of heaven.

ARTICLE V.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

BY REV. J. M. HOPPIN, PROFESSOR IN YALE COLLEGE.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE was born in the year 1805. He was educated at Cambridge University, entering Trinity College, but ending his course in the smaller college of Trinity Hall, which he joined in 1823, together with his future brother-in-law, John Sterling. Being at that time a dissenter he did not take a degree, although he had a fellowship offered him. Two years after leaving Cambridge, having then become a member of the Established church, he took a degree at Oxford. He was for a short time editor of the "Athenaeum," and since that period has been almost constantly before the public eye. He has written largely upon theological and practical subjects; has originated charitable and educational institutions for the working-classes; and for three years he held the chair of divinity at King's College, London, which he was compelled to resign for alleged heterodox views upon the doctrine of eternal punishment. At the present moment Mr. Maurice is rector of the church at Lincoln-in-fields, London, which is a peculiar ecclesiastical organization, holding a somewhat anomalous relationship to the Established church. As a preacher he is without action or any of the graces of delivery, and has a decidedly sing-song tone. He has nothing to

commend him in the pulpit but a spirit of simple earnestness, and now and then the flashing out of a striking thought, showing the scholar and thinker.

To describe Mr. Maurice's real position in the English church and world of thought is more difficult. To do this we will glance at the state of religion and of church parties in England. There is much of a pleasant social aspect in the religion of England. At Christmas-time especially, when the wind howls and the snow falls, there is a universal kind-hearted entertainment of the poor, and abounding hospitality. The benevolence of English Christians, although often dispensed in a perfunctory way, handing down from the steps instead of coming down into the street to the poor, is an indisputable fact. A vast deal of the ample wealth of England flows in philanthropic channels, so that one's eye can turn in no direction without seeing the visible signs of this. There is also a marked reverence paid to religion. It has its recognized and supreme place in society and in the state. Mr. Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer, addresses a meeting in the senate-house at Oxford on the duty of establishing a missionary college in Central Asia; and the lord mayor of London opens the Mansion-house to the Evangelical Alliance. Even the more devotional and spiritual duties of religion are engaged in with an apparent interest and sincerity by all classes. The duke of Wellington was a scrupulous communicant. Judges, leading members of the bar, and men in high official station, may be seen teaching in the Sabbath-schools, taking part in the prayer-meetings, and joining with the humblest and most ignorant in the services of the sanctuary. And in the sanctuary itself there is not wanting the delightful warmth of true worship, that spirit of common feeling and earnestness which is doubtless aided by the moving and majestic cultus of the church of England. There is also in English Christianity, or in its best aspects, a social refinement, a mixture of the free enjoyment of all that is truly good in nature and art with piety or the love of God, which is rarely found outside of the highest

Christian civilization, and which betokens the absence of cant and confined views of God and his truth.

There are nevertheless, it cannot be denied, inevitable evils connected with a great national religious establishment. The working of the huge machinery of the church consumes and grinds out its religious life. Where two archbishops, twenty-five bishops, and some ten thousand inferior clergy are to be sustained at the public expense, by taxes laid in part upon dissatisfied and dissentient communities, the bitter controversies, the ecclesiastical oppression, the destruction of Christian feeling and spiritual life, are sad and fearful.

Whatever the style and character of the clergyman may be, the simple fact that he is placed arbitrarily over a religious society that must bear with him whether they sympathize with him or no, cannot but be productive of pride and exclusiveness on the one side, and moodiness and actual hostility on the other. The cause of a pure faith suffers. The connection of church and state now, as of old, in more as well as less enlightened countries, necessarily in the end enfeebles and degrades the church. It compromises the loyal Christianity of the nation to follow slavishly the moral and social standards of the secular headship of the church. The national current of piety and opinion cannot under such a state of things rise above the level of the piety of the governing or aristocratic class. The English church, as some one has said, is in danger of dying of gentility. The clerical profession is particularly affected by this. The church which affords a place of refuge for "the younger sons of illustrious houses," cannot have the vigor and the spirit of self-sacrifice that churches drawing their ministry more directly from the people, and looking solely to moral and spiritual fitness, possess. "Plenty of causes have been assigned for this drying up of the clerical marrow; and the worst of it is, that any one of them is enough to account for the phenomenon, and therefore to insure its continuance. We incline to place among the foremost the wretched

distribution of public, and especially of ecclesiastical patronage, of which the last few years have furnished some flagrant instances. Under it, it has been publicly asserted that some dozens of first-class men who went into orders ten or more years ago are curates still, while people of inferior capacity, but of better connection or more pliable churchmanship, rise to wealth *per saltum*; and it seems to be an accepted axiom that unless a man is related to a bishop, or a minister, or a borough member of the right sort of politics, his only chance is to become a violent theological partisan — of the right sort again. Be the cause, moreover, what it may, there is, *de facto*, a secular tone about the universities which greatly astonishes clerical parents. Clergymen's sons do not incline to be clergymen; and the result of it all is, that whereas twenty years ago you took for granted that every man you met there was going into orders unless you knew he was not, now you take for granted that he is not unless you know that he is."¹ The education of an English clergyman in the university serves to make him too exclusively an accomplished ritualistic leader, rather than a sound and earnest teacher of truth. Indeed some have thought that the looser tendency of English theology at the present is owing more to the lack of that broad and profound comprehension of the fundamental truths of Christian philosophy which a full and thorough preparatory course of study in scientific theology gives, and which it is always difficult to make up in the after years of active professional life, than to any other cause. Certainly the course of theological training at neither of the English universities can be called a thorough one. At Cambridge the lectures and reading are chiefly confined to the examination of the Fathers, the history and polity of the English church, and the merely official duties of the parish priest. With some illustrious exceptions, the preaching in the English church is what might be expected from such an inadequate training — rambling, without solid thought, and, above

¹ Saturday Review.

all, lacking greatly in spiritual unction. The rigid stratification of society makes it difficult for faithful preaching, where it does occur, to be widely and deeply felt, and for religious feelings to be spontaneously communicated from class to class; so that anything like a general religious movement, or what we term "a revival of religion," is, humanly speaking, practically impossible.

Notwithstanding the formalistic and unspiritual character of so great a portion of English Christianity, we would gladly recognize the noble aspect of the English church as a whole, and we believe that there are no truer and more devoted Christian men and women in the world than may be found in all sections of the English church. Perhaps in England Christianity has reached, in individual instances, its most beautiful development. And there can be no doubt, likewise, that there is a deep substantial piety in the common people of England. Yet, as a general thing, after freely and gratefully admitting all this, in the Evangelical or Low church party, where this piety has its home, it is too often accompanied with excessive narrowness of view. Even though it constitute a staunch loyalty to revealed truth, in opposition to High church formalism and traditionalism, this piety is mingled with dogmatism in matters of belief and in ecclesiastical opinions. In contrast to Low church illiberality, as well as to the Romanizing tendencies of the Tractarian party, the Broad church party sprung up. Viewed in every light it was a deeply interesting movement. There can be no doubt of the original purity and earnestness of those young scholars of Oxford and Cambridge who began it. It was at its inception a grand protest for learning, light, and mental freedom. Such men as Julius Charles Hare, Dr. Arnold, Benjamin Jowett, J. N. Newman, F. D. Maurice, Archbishop Whately, Dean Trench, Canon Stanley, and their coadjutors, whatever may have been their after errors, and deflections from the truth, were undoubtedly the champions of spiritual liberty; and they were men of too large minds to yield a passive obedience to mere eccle-

siastical authority over the conscience. They contended for the full rights of reason and the rational interpretation of revealed truth. While holding faith to be supreme, they claimed the privilege of bringing all purely critical, historical, and scientific questions having reference to Christian faith and the scriptures, fairly into the sphere of intellectual jurisdiction. They thought that truth could not suffer from the broadest light thrown upon it. Said archdeacon Hare, speaking of the Bible: "We do not wrap it up in wool and lay it in a dark, unapproachable sanctuary. We know that it is the volume of God's word, and that therefore it has light in itself; yea, that it is full of light, and that this its light it is to manifest by holding its course openly in the eyes of all mankind, like that of the sun through the sky. Did we deem it a candle or a lamp we should screen it from the winds, and should fear it would burn out; but we cannot fear that either winds or clouds will ever blow out or blot out the sun."¹ They insisted upon the liberty of carrying out in their personal investigations of truth that individual reformation which is part of the great general Protestant Reformation, long ago begun, but never perhaps thoroughly completed, in the church of England. How temperate and yet bold is the language of Dr. Arnold in regard to the church of England. He says in a letter to justice Coleridge: "It seems to me that all, absolutely all, of our religious affections and veneration should go to Christ himself, and that Protestantism, Catholicism, and every other name which expresses Christianity and some *differentia* or *proprium* besides is so far an evil, and when made an object of attachment leads to superstition and error. The feeling of entire love and admiration is one which we cannot safely part with, and there are provided by God's goodness worthy and perfect objects of it, but these can never be human institutions, which, being necessarily full of imperfection, require to be viewed

¹ Vindications of Luther, p. 213.

with an impartial judgment, not idolized by an uncritical affection. And that common metaphor about our 'mother the church' is unscriptural and mischievous; because the feelings of entire filial reverence and love which we owe to a parent we do not owe to our fellow Christians; we owe them brotherly love, meekness, readiness to bear, etc., but not filial reverence. 'To them I gave place by subjection, no not for an hour!'" In his independent yet reverent search for truth, Dr. Arnold defends himself against the easy charge of rationalism, "in full faith that no truth can ever separate from the God of truth."¹

What has been thus said in praise of the Broad church movement in its beginnings, belongs equally to the praise of Mr. Maurice, as one of its earliest originators and most persistent advocates. He has nevertheless peculiarities of his own which distinguish him from all others of his own party. While he is one of the most suspiciously regarded of all the leading men of the Broad church in respect to his theology, and is hardly considered by the great body of the Established church as belonging to them; and while he may naturally lay some claim to Unitarian and dissenting sympathies,² he is nevertheless a more than ordinarily tenacious partisan of the church of England.

Where others have gone out from her fold, he stoutly remains. He argues his right to do so from the original church articles and confessions. He shares with the Oxford High church party in their admiration of ecclesiastical formulas, sacramental virtues, priestly offices, and the visible unity and catholicity of the English church, giving them his "heartly assent and consent." He reasons as earnestly from the Prayer-book and Thirty-nine Articles as from the Bible. He claims to be "a Hebrew of the Hebrews." He teaches what the church of England does believe, or ought to believe. He interprets her ancient oracles. He calls back her erring children to the primitive faith. He is

¹ *Essays on the Right Interpretation and Understanding of the Scriptures.*

² Mr. Maurice's father was a Unitarian minister.

saying nothing new, but is ever laboring for the confirmation and establishment of what is contained in the church's creeds, rubrics, and prayer-book.

Other intellectual peculiarities give to Mr. Maurice an independent individuality of position and influence among the leaders of the Broad church. Without the thorough scholarship and fiery genius of Arnold, without the profound spirituality of Hare, without the masculine force of Jowett, without the solid reasoning powers of Whately, without the crystal style and reverent faith of Trench, he possesses a subtile intuition, a genius for generalization, and a breadth of Christian sympathy, which have made him a confessed power, have won to him such spirits as Tennyson and Kingsley, and are now exerting an important influence on the rising theological mind of the age. As another has said: "Mr. Maurice has enjoyed popularity beyond his school; public expectation has hovered about him." Men have asked, Who is this Daniel come to judgment? Who is this man who promises to teach us higher views of divine truth? Who is this unselfish and patient spirit that, in spite of persecutions, urges all to Christian love and unity? Who is this sympathizer with my doubts, my inward conflicts, my spiritual darkenesses? Can he prove those glorious hints, those far-reaching and joyful promises which have sprung from him, attracting the ardent gaze of those who have become wearied with the old stereotyped theologies? Is he a true interpreter of God's word, or a false prophet?

It is not easy to answer these questions. Mr. Maurice's opinions must be derived from a great variety and multiplicity of writings on a vast many subjects, difficult now to collect, and enough of themselves to compose a small library. It is true, however, that in the spirit of the homely adage, one need not go through the whole to get at its flavor; and he is so peculiar a writer, that one can obtain a pretty good notion of the real significance or gist of his theological system without having read every line

of his works. He repeats in substance the same ideas endlessly.

But in the second place, and this is a more serious obstacle, his style baffles a satisfactory investigation of the positive results of his labors and his absolute additions to theological science. He is wanting in clear analysis and methodical development. As a writer his arguments rarely possess that firm and accumulative logical force which grasps and holds the mind like a vice. They are oftener nothing better than mere suggestions, or the more obscure relations of ideas. His connections of thought are concealed and even fanciful. He falls too suddenly from the main idea to the secondary or accidental. His preparations are large and imposing, but his result indecisive. Before you are aware that he has fairly entered into the heart of an important discussion you are surprised to find that he has brought it to a conclusion, and proceeds to make his generalizations as if such and such things were already proved. Thus he passes from one subject to another as if he had established his propositions by the most conclusive reasoning. He often raises questions that he does not even profess to answer. He trusts to the bare allusion to some new and valuable thought, and seems to take it for granted that all must see the idea as clearly as he does, and is too delicate and courteous to press the point further. He is a master of what a recent critic calls "the parenthetic allusive style," where it is assumed that the reader is in entire harmony with the writer, and therefore it is unnecessary to make the thought plain, but a hint is enough.

In his aversion to "technical theological language" he loses scientific accuracy. Thought springs from the spontaneous kindlings of his mind, rather than from a deep and concentrated fire. The vivider and more logical style of one of the distinguished pupils of his school, F. W. Robertson of Brighton, has translated to us many of the ideas of Mr. Maurice with far greater sharpness, beauty, and power than he himself has presented them. His obscure vagueness

is especially marked in scriptural interpretation, where he is forced to something like positive statement. There is constant tendency to refining and idealizing interpretation, which however, it must be said, if one analyzes it, will be found in almost every instance to take its consistent shape and bearing from the general system of truth which he has adopted.

Mr. Maurice has his merits as a commentator. He seeks to *explain* the Bible, to show that it is everywhere reasonable and consistent, and to develop its unity. His spiritualizing tendency springs often from his desire to retain the moral force of certain facts; to remove them from the outward to the inward world; or, as he would say, "to save them to faith." With a constitutional inclination himself to doubt, he freely admits and patiently weighs all manner of honest doubts. He takes as it were a stand outside of truth, and feels himself called upon to harmonize to minds outside all the difficulties of Christian theology. His tone is apologetic and charitable. He is anxious for the credit of Christianity with all men. This gives him, as an interpreter, a certain magnanimousness and large-hearted sympathy, which is doubtless his chief source of attraction to the best youthful mind. He has, moreover, a keen insight into the spirit of the author, and often shows true eloquence, or a power of bringing the reader into vital sympathy with the past. As to his use of critical scholarship in interpretation, we do not see much of it. He thinks more of bringing out the ideas that underlie scripture, than of the accuracies or niceties of philological discussion. He conceives that there may be even a danger in a critical method of studying scripture, and of accepting too unhesitatingly the dicta of scholars. His views on this point are expressed in the introduction to his work on the Unity of the New Testament. He says: "The modern Tübingen school, which has carried its speculations respecting the contradictions of apostles and evangelists further than any other; which assumes a direct contrast between the spir-

itual school of Paul and the Judaical school of James, Peter, and John; which limits the genuine epistles of St. Paul to four or five; which affirms the book of Revelation to be really the work of St. John *because* it is in direct opposition to St. Paul's doctrine; which takes the fourth Gospel to be a work of the second century, one that for the first time established Christian theology upon an Alexandrian basis, — this school has brought its erudition and its modern philosophy to explain those discrepancies in the character and primary objects of the books of the New Testament, which it supposes us all tacitly to admit, though we may express ourselves in ambiguous language respecting them. Now I do not say that if the notions of our commentators, our apologists, and our harmonists have sanctioned those which have crept into our schools, and are more and more pervading all our minds, are admitted, there is *no* refuge except in the conclusions of Bauer and his disciples, or in some others which may grow out of them. But I must confess my opinion, that the conflict with the learning of these teachers will be a very hard one, and ultimately a very useless one, if we are not prepared to reconsider the grounds which we and they have in common. We may now and then defeat them in a war of posts; they may be detected in perversions of ecclesiastical history, or in abuses of their critical skill; but the onlookers will regard it as a question for critics to settle among themselves."¹ He takes higher ground. Sceptics as well as Christians have to account for the great power of Christianity in the world, for the new divine life which Christ has introduced into human consciousness. Some ground respecting Christ must be taken. The Straussian view acknowledges this universal demand, but it does not satisfactorily explain the phenomena of Christianity. He would then approach the scriptures in a more reverent spirit, assuming that in the scriptures the truth of Christ is plainly revealed; and that Christ is revealed just as personally, just as livingly in the Epistles as he is in

¹ The Unity of the New Testament, p. 5.

the Gospels, and in the Acts of the Apostles as in the Gospel of John, though it may be under different aspects. In a word, he would interpret the scriptures in the spirit of Christian faith, in the humble acknowledgment of the real manifestation of God in Christ, and the truth of the existence of Christ's kingdom already in the world,—the greatest fact of the world's history.

Although conscious of our inability to give anything like a true delineation, we shall endeavor, as far as we have been able to arrive at definite conclusions, to present a brief survey of Mr. Maurice's theological views where they have anything peculiar in them, without attempting to pronounce upon their truth or error. We shall enter into no labored arguments to refute or defend them. They will find their commendation or reprobation in every intelligent Christian mind. We shall strive, however, to bring them out fairly, and shall make the author, as far as possible, speak for himself.

MAURICE'S THEOLOGY.

Never was the familiar saying truer of any one than of this author, that "the style is the man." The marked illogical character of his writing is an essential part of his religious philosophy. Although his treatises on ancient, patristic, and medieval philosophy show learning, comprehensive reading, and we must conclude considerable power of rapid and penetrating discrimination; yet that he has a truly philosophic mind we should doubt. With Luther, he despises logic in theology. He quotes Luther's saying, that "it is a vain phantasy to speak of a logic of belief. No syllogistic form harmonizes with divine things." In commenting upon Luther's denunciation of logic as an organ of faith, he says: "the syllogism was as little to be borne in the realm of faith as the notion that a succession of good acts come from a good habit, and so a good man."¹

In opposition to the dialectical form of reasoning upon

¹ Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, - 112

divine truth adopted by Calvin, and derived from the scholastic philosophy, Mr. Maurice belongs essentially to the new Coleridgean school, recognizing the distinction between the reason and the logical understanding; elevating the office of the reason; assigning the true province of divine things to that spiritual faculty in man, that "verifying faculty," which grasps truth intuitively, and is able to know God without the intellectual demonstration. This power he does not confine to the educated and thinking class, but sees in it the ground of religion, or the original capacity of man to receive divine truth. Here in fact is his strong point. He joins issue with those who would confine the knowledge of spiritual things to a particular class whose minds are specially or even supernaturally enlightened. He says: "where, then, do we differ? Only when you would make the mystery not an eternal, universal reality, but some apprehension of particular men. Only when you would make the initiated a peculiar set of wise or spiritual men, and not those who are content to see what is true for them and for all. Only when you make the spiritual organ not an open eye to receive God's light which flows forth for all, but a peculiar organ in which peculiar men may glory. Only when the spiritual man in fact becomes the carnal, the natural, physical man; for that he does become when he glorifies his individual soul — his separate wisdom above *the* wisdom, the divine wisdom, which is for *man*." ¹

He does not, however, allow himself to be led by his philosophy of the ideal into the barren and profane conclusions of Newman, that confer upon man, simply through his reason, perfect power over divine truth, and sets him face to face with God. Mr. Maurice claims to be an earnest believer in the divinity and redemptive work of Christ, — in supernatural and historical Christianity. Through Christ he holds that man, that every man, may truly know God, and may comprehend eternal things. God has descended

¹ The Unity of the New Testament, p. 406.

into humanity, enlightening it, and lighting it up to the apprehension and enjoyment of divine truth.

The starting-point of Mr. Maurice's theological system, if system he has, is charity. He says: "It seems to me that if we start from the belief, 'charity is the ground and centre of the universe—God is charity,' we restore that distinctness which our theology is said to have lost, we reconcile it with the comprehension we are all in search of. So long as we are busy with our theories, notions, feelings about God—so long as these constitute our divinity—we must be vague, we must be exclusive."¹ Again he says: "This love was to be the ground of all calls to repentance, conversion, humiliation, self-restraint; this was to unfold, gradually, the mystery of the passion and of the resurrection, the mystery of justification by faith, of the new life, of Christ's ascension and priesthood, of the descent of the Spirit, of the unity of the church; this was to be the induction into the deepest mystery of all, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."² Still again: "I have learned to say to myself: 'Take away the love of God, and you take away everything.' The Bible sets forth the revelation of that love, or it is good for nothing."³ It is on this love, or on the living God himself revealed by Christ in love, that Mr. Maurice builds his theology. "They may build their theology upon certain deductions of the intellect, or upon certain individual consciousnesses; mine rests on the eternal love which overlooks all distinctions, which embraces the universe."⁴ This resting immediately on the love of God, on God as revealed in Christ, and not on any human speculations about God, takes his theology, he holds, entirely out of the region of speculative theology, and makes it a *practical* matter with every man. The reasonings and abstractions of scientific theology are rendered unnecessary. "This faith is not notional, but practical; not for this and that man, but for mankind."⁵ He loves John's Gospel above all, because it

¹ *Theological Essays* (Redfield's Am. ed.), p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* — see

is thus practical, and delivers us from systematic theology. "If theology is a collection of dry husks, the granaries which contain those husks will be set on fire, and nothing will quench the fire till they be consumed. It is just because I find in St. John the grain which those husks sometimes conceal, for which they are sometimes a substitute; it is just because theology in his Gospel offers itself to us as a living root, out of which all living powers, living thoughts, living acts may develop themselves; it is just because there is nothing in him that is abstract, because that which is deep and eternal proves itself to be deep and eternal, by entering into all the relations of time, by manifesting itself in all the common doings of men; it is therefore, I believe, that he makes his appeal, not to the man of technicalities, not to the school doctor, but to the simple wayfarer, and at the same time to the man of science who does not forget that he is a man, and who expects to ascertain principles only by the honest method of experiment."¹

"I conceive that Gospel [John's] is nothing more nor less than the setting forth how Jesus Christ proved himself, in human flesh, to be that Word of God in whom was life, and whose life was the light of men, who had been in the world, and by whom the world was made, and whom the world knew not; how in that flesh he manifested forth the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father; how he manifested the fulness of grace and truth. It is because the theology of St. John comes forth in these human facts, that I affirmed it to be a theology not merely different from the systematic school theology, but the great deliverance from it."²

This Johannean theology, so pure and simple, which he considers to be the last and highest expression of Christian truth, beyond the sphere of analysis or speculation, he heartily adopts. His own view of it, which forms the keynote to all his theological teachings, may perhaps be thus succinctly stated: God has truly revealed himself in Christ,

¹ Commentary on St. John's Gospel, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 25.

so that he may be really known and loved. The divine love, or in other words, the living and loving God, was actually manifested in Christ as the light and life of all men. He did actually descend into all humanity, and does form the real ground of every man's sonship with God the Father, redeeming our human nature from its godlessness, selfishness, sin, and death. The Christian life is only a true recognition of, or awakening unto, this great fact, that God is united to us in Christ to redeem us. The church is the brotherhood of those who have already made the glad discovery of this truth, who have opened their eyes to see this Light which is come into the world and into their own souls.

This gives but a general and imperfect idea of Mr. Maurice's scheme of theology. We cannot now notice the numberless modifications, varied expressions, and careful shadings and guardings whereby his views are defended from the charge of heretical breadth and novelty, or of being a new gospel, and especially of being another form of Unitarianism. But we proceed to a more particular statement of our author's theological opinions.

CHRIST AND THE ATONEMENT.

Maurice recognizes the fact that the world's faith is more and more settling around Christ as the central object of faith, as personal God and Redeemer. Neander, the greatest theologian of this century, has taught us to see that faith in the incarnate God is the life-seed of religion; and that God was not only "manifest in the flesh" as an outer historic fact, but that through all ages, God is constantly manifesting and revealing himself as one with man's spirit in the inner Christian consciousness. The union of divinity with humanity in Christ is the essential truth of faith. This truth — this marvellous fact of the real union of God with man in the human and divine personality of Christ — is where Mr. Maurice plants himself. He looks upon it as a fact accomplished, ever present, ever efficient, and eternal.

Christ *has taken* the nature of every man.¹ Christ the Son is the express image of God the Father, and after this image of Christ man has been formed; so that every man's nature possesses, in some true sense, a divine likeness and sonship.² "Do we not really believe that Christ was, before he took human flesh and dwelt among us? Do we not suppose that he actually conversed with prophets and patriarchs, and made them aware of his presence? Or is this a mere arid dogma, which we prove out of Pearson, and which has nothing to do with our inmost convictions, with our very life? How has it become so? Is it not because we do not accept the New Testament explanation of these appearances and manifestations; because we do not believe *that Christ is in every man* the source of all light that ever visits him, the root of all the righteous thoughts and acts that he is ever able to conceive or do?"³

"I conceive that we have the highest warrant for believing that St. Paul's special work was to carry this message to the nations, to tell men that the Son of God was *in* them; that he was the real head and root of their humanity; that apart from him they had no life or righteousness or unity at all; to bring out this fact in relation to the experiences of their own minds, to the facts of history, to the calling of the chosen people, to their law, to the order of society, to the past, present, future condition of the world. He was to show how our Lord's incarnation, his death, resurrection, ascension, bore upon and explained his relation to human beings, expounded the riddle of their own existence, confuted the innumerable evidences which outward and inward facts seemed to oppose to a belief in his actual fellowship with them and dominion over them."⁴

By such passages, and multitudes that might be quoted, it is evident that Mr. Maurice lays peculiar stress upon the general truth of the incarnation, of the manifestation through Christ, of divinity in humanity, of Christ's common headship

¹ Theological Essays, p. 96.

² Ibid., p. 96.

³ Ibid., p. 49.

⁴ The Unity of the New Testament, p. 383.

of the race — making this by far more prominent than the special truth of the atonement. Christ is regarded by him as the type of human nature, as expressing its normal state, as revealing its true life, duty, death, and resurrection. Indeed, he assails many of the orthodox views of the atonement, charging them with being artificial and scholastic, instead of evangelical.¹ He inveighs especially against the idea that the atonement was for the purpose of reconciling, propitiating, or changing the will of God ; but holds, on the contrary, that Christ was the most perfect expression of that divine will.

Mr. Maurice's own idea of the atonement is very obscurely stated, and seems to grow out of his general view of Christ's relations to humanity. Christ having thus joined himself to our nature, and being in every man, then it follows that the atonement for man's sin, which brings man to stand complete in Christ's righteousness, is simply the fact that Christ as man, as one with humanity, as thus completely representing humanity, has lived a perfectly righteous life, and above all, has manifested that spirit of perfect *self-sacrifice* to do the will of God, which found its culmination in the cross. "The broad and simple gospel, that God hath set forth his Son as the propitiation for sin, that he has offered himself for the sins of the world, meets all the desires of these heart-stricken sinners. It declares to them the fulness of God's love, sets forth the Mediator *in whom they are at one* with the Father. It brings divine love and human suffering into direct and actual union. It shows him who is one with God and one with man, *perfectly giving up that self-will* which has been the cause of all men's crimes and all their misery."²

In Christ humanity has conquered sin, and manifested a perfect obedience of, or union with, the will of God. This, he thinks, constitutes the true or essential atonement. As to the literal sacrifice and death of our Lord, Mr. Maurice speaks thus: "It was *the* divine death and *the* human death,

¹ *Theological Essays*, p. 107.

² *Ibid.* n. 108.

the death which manifested the mind and will of the Father; it was the death in which all men were to see their own."¹ And again: "As the conscience was awakened by God's teaching more and more clearly to perceive that all resistance to God lies in the setting up of self; that this is the great barrier between him and his revolted creatures; it began to be understood that the atonement of man with man must have its basis in an atonement of God with man, and that the same sacrifice was needed for both. One thing yet remained to be learned, the most wonderful lesson of all; and yet of which God had been giving the elements, line upon line, precept upon precept, from the beginning. Could sacrifice originate in God? Could it be made, not first *to* him, but first *by* him? Could the sacrifices of men be the effect, not the cause, of his love and free grace to them? All our Lord's discourses concerning himself and his father, concerning his own acts as being merely the fulfilment of his Father's will, concerning the love which the Father had to him because he laid down his life for the sheep, — had been bringing these mysteries to light; had been preparing the humble and meek to confess, with wonder and contrition, that in every selfish act they had been fighting against the unselfish God, — that in every self-sacrificing act they had been merely yielding to him, — merely submitting to die, according to the law of his eternal being, which he had created men to show forth."² And yet again: "I have maintained that his death alone could take away the sin of the world, because it alone could satisfy the perfectly loving mind of God; because it alone could unite mankind to God in the person of his Son and our Lord, who was known before the foundation of the world, but who was manifested in the latter day on Calvary; because it alone could draw the minds of all men, each wandering in his own way, seeking his own ends, to the one centre."³

¹ St. John's Gospel, Dis. xxvii. p. 426.

² St. John's Gospel, Dis. xxi. p. 333.

³ Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament, p. xii.

Quotations might be multiplied on this point, but they would make the general idea no plainer — that, according to this view, the atonement, in the place of being a sacrifice for sin, satisfying the claim of the divine law of holiness, and removing its condemnation, consisted in Christ's manifestation for all humanity represented in him, of the holy and perfect will of the Father, to the entire sacrifice or giving up of his own will. The solemn testimony to this, the last indubitable sealing of its truth, was the shedding of his blood on the cross. Hence it was in essence wholly a moral or spiritual act in Christ's mind. It was, for once, the expression of an entire compliance with the divine will on the part of man, and of a perfectly fulfilled righteousness. This restored man, in Christ, to the love of God — this really brought him once more in union and fellowship with the divine heart. It requires very little penetration to see that this view, whether true or false, differs substantially from the prevailing creed of the Christian church on the subject of the atonement. Christ dying for the sins of the whole world, however variously and as yet ineffectually explained, and however perhaps inexplicable, is not, in point of simple fact, Christ leading a perfectly righteous life even unto death, and thus bringing humanity in himself into oneness with God.

FAITH.

The act of faith, whereby the atonement is appropriated or made effectual to the soul of the believer, is thus stated, we will not say clearly, in Mr. Maurice's own words. In a sermon on "The Perfect Sacrifice," he says: "But what if this wrong in every man was *his own self*, how could this be given up? How could this be got rid of? The text answers: "Christ, through the Eternal Spirit, offered *himself* to God." He made that wonderful sacrifice; he gave up, not something else, but himself. And this was not done by some mighty effort of his own. "By the Eternal Spirit he offered himself up to God"; he merely yielded himself

to God's will; God himself prepared the sacrifice. And how does that benefit us? How can we give up ourselves the more for knowing this? *We give up ourselves when we acknowledge that we have no power to give up ourselves; that it is Christ alone who could make the sacrifice for us all.* Each one of us does not try to do something in himself; he does not try to draw near to God in himself; he is content to own that he has no life except in Christ, and that he can draw nigh to God only in him; and he owns that even this he cannot do by any effort of his own will; he can only do it by the eternal Spirit which is in Christ, and by which he moves the members of his body. Now, brethren, this faith does not merely take away particular sins, it takes away the root of sin; it takes away that conscience of sin of which the apostle speaks. For the root of sin is our self-will; the conscience of it is finding out this self-will in ourselves. When we approach God as our reconciled Father in Christ, who accepts us for his sake, and bestows his Spirit upon us for his sake, *we give up our self-will, we acknowledge that our life is not in ourselves, but in him,* and that from him must come forth the power which enables us to enjoy the new life that we have in him. It is thus that the life-blood which is in Christ purges our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. For separate from God all our works must be dead; but this blood of Christ testifies that we are united to him. Where the will of God does not inspire our wills all our works must be dead. But this blood of Christ is a stream of life coming forth from God himself to quicken the spirits and souls and bodies of his creatures." ¹ He says again, more definitely: "Finally, learn that faith is the giving up of your own will to God's will; resting in him because you cannot rest in yourselves; living in him because you have no life of your own."² Even Christ surrenders his will to God. Faith, by this view, is doing the same, through his power in us, and is thus an appropriation of the benefits of the redeeming work, by

¹ Christmas-day and other Sermons, p. 111.

² Ibid., p. 184.

resting in the Spirit of Christ or in the will of God. It is an act of self-surrender, or rather suffering Christ as our representative to make this self-surrender for us. "Christ is in us, and we may know him if we will give up ourselves."¹

JUSTIFICATION AND REGENERATION.

It follows, according to Mr. Maurice's theory, that the saving results of the atonement consist simply in man's coming to see or to realize, or by giving up his selfish, sensual, and unbelieving blindness of heart, to know in what near and filial relations he stands to God in Christ. No new relation is created or needed, but the eternal relation of man to God in Christ becomes practically apprehended. When this is done, the man stands righteous in Christ before God, and born into his kingdom, taking hold with joy and freedom of his full rights as a child of God. Then, like Job, he discovers with delight the real righteousness of Christ within him, and is at peace. "You have such a righteousness. It is deeper than all the iniquity which is in you. It lies at the very ground of your existence. And this righteousness dwells not merely in a law which is condemning you, it dwells in a Person in whom you may trust. The righteous Lord of man is with you, not in some heaven to which you must ascend that you may bring him down; in some hell to which you must dive that you may raise him up; but nigh you, at your heart."² The justified and renewed life is considered to be the actual coming into the conscious possession of that which is every man's right, but which is shut up and obscured by an ignorant unbelief. Our author says to all men, all sinners: "Claim your portion in the eternal truth and love and righteousness which he has manifested to you, and of which he has made you heirs; for you are members of Christ's body, and Christ is at the right hand of God."³ Regeneration is an awakening

¹ The Unity of the New Testament, p. 409.

² Theological Essays, p. 51.

³ *Ibid.* - *see*

to this divine Life that has already come, a heartfelt reception of this divine Light that has already risen.¹ He who thus opens his eyes to the Light, who discovers that Christ is in him to redeem him, is new-born. He lives from that moment the new life of Christ. He is delivered from the old, separate, and selfish life, and shares the divine life of Christ, which is in the holy will of God.

SIN AND THE FALL.

From what has preceded we may see that our author's view of sin would diverge, perhaps radically, from the current evangelical belief. Looking at man more in the light of a child of God, or a partaker of God's sonship in Christ, than in the light of a subject of God as a moral governor, his estimate of sin becomes modified. Instead of being regarded as a violation of the express law of God, as an actual crime committed against an infinite Ruler, and punishable with an infinite condemnation, sin is held to be a state of spiritual separation from God, through wilful ignorance of our relations to him, or through absorption in worldly and sensual things. It is, at all events, a state rather than an act. It does not belong to man's nature or being. It is not part of his substance; it is an accident and an anomaly of his human condition. Sin is a state of not knowing or loving God, whose love is the great law of our being; and men's burden of sin consists in "a sense of separation from a being to whom they ought to be united, apart from whom they could not live."² As to the origin of sin, or the fall, Mr. Maurice combats the common ideas of it. He considers "the great error and denial of our time to be the denial that man continued to be in the image of God after the fall; and following this, the denial that man was originally created in the divine Word, and that apart from him Adam, or any other man, could have any righteousness."³ He supposes that man never originally possessed an independent

¹ St. John's Gospel, Dis. vii.

² St. John's Gospel, Dis. iv. p. 48.

³ Patriarchs and Lawgivers, p. ix.

innocency or righteousness, but was holy only as reflecting the holiness of God, as being made "in his likeness," as standing in true relations to God. The fall itself, he thinks, consisted simply in man's ceasing to acknowledge that he *was* made in the image of God, that he did possess his righteousness, and not any of his own.¹ It was breaking the law of fellowship with God, and setting up a selfish claim and life. It was separating from God, and thus falling under the dominion of nature. A selfish existence away from God is the fall of man. And every man's sin now, he holds, is precisely the same as that of Adam's. The restoration from the fall is the renovation of our selfish and natural will to acknowledge God's likeness and will within us.

RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT.

Linking man's resurrection with that of Christ, who has made himself one with man in life and death and all things, Mr. Maurice holds that the New Testament resurrection by virtue of Christ's resurrection, takes place at the time of death.² But death must be distinguished from all ideas of the grave. The mortal body of flesh and blood laid down in the grave, the prey of corruption, is not to be the raised body. The immortal body is the soul in its proper state, a "spiritual body," an incorruptible essence, the real man himself raised or delivered altogether from mortality, death, and sin, and having now nothing more to do with the body of sinful flesh, left altogether and forever behind.³ It is like Christ's raised body, that was made entirely free from the bondage of death, by the victory of the spirit over the flesh.⁴ This deliverance of the soul at death from a fleshly body, to assume its own proper body, relieves Mr. Maurice from the necessity of holding to the actual separation of soul from body at death, so that they must continue apart until the resurrection, or to any general future resurrection. The

¹ Patriarchs and Lawgivers, p. 55.

² Theological Essays, p. 129.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

⁴ St. John's Gospel, Dis. xxviii. p. 446.

scriptural resurrection is considered to be an impressive representation of the moment when man experiences his immortality, or the full revelation of God and of eternal things, above all at the moment of death. "And everything which warned a man that such a day was at hand, which roused him to seek for light, and to fly from darkness, was a note of the archangel's trumpet; a voice bidding him awake, that Christ the Lord of his spirit might give him light. And in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, by a fit of apoplexy, by the dagger of an assassin, the vesture of mortality which hides the light from it, might drop off from him, and he might be changed. What had merely seemed to him as some common earthly note of preparation for death, would then be recognized as the archangel's trumpet calling him to account, asking him whether the light that had been vouchsafed to him, while shadows were still about him, had been faithfully used, or whether he had loved darkness rather than light, because his deeds were evil?"¹

Connected also vitally with Christ, the judgment is, in our author's estimation, an inward and spiritual, rather than an outward and formal transaction. The Spirit of Christ, ever present in men, reproves and judges them; presenting to them a perfect standard of life, and disciplining their moral sense, by arousing in them the love and fear of God.² The judgment of God does not demand, he thinks, any literal trial, any general day of solemn adjudication, but is something even now taking place, something eternal in its nature. At the close of the chapter on judgment, in his *Theological Essays*, he says: "Do we not require a redemption of all that is human from its chargeable accidents: *a judgment and separation which shall come from the revelation of him who has redeemed and glorified our whole humanity, between that in us which is his, and that which we have contracted by turning away from him?* Do we not ask for a day in which light and darkness, life and death, shall never be mingled or confounded again? Is their any one who seri-

¹ *Theological Essays*, p. 134.

² Gospel of St. John, Dis. xix.

ously believes that it is a day of twenty-four hours in duration which we are thus expecting? Is it not one which has dawned on the world already, which our consciences tell us we may dwell in now, which therefore scripture and reason both affirm must wax clearer and fuller till he who is the Sun of Righteousness is felt to be shining everywhere, and till there is no corner of the universe into which his beams have not entered?"¹

In the italicised passage we have Mr. Maurice's idea of the judgment — that it is the full revelation of Christ in his relations to us, showing how truly he is made one with us, and showing us how far we have unbelievably closed our hearts against him, and live a Christless and worldly life. It may be seen how faithful our author is in all his views to this theory of religion, consisting in a revelation or discovery. The judgment is a *manifestation*. It is the full and perfect indwelling of Christ, and of ourselves likewise, in our eternal relations to him. This idea is brought out in the following passage: "For we must all [not appear, but] **BE MADE MANIFEST** before the tribunal of Christ." A time must come when it will be clearly discovered to all men what their state was while they were pilgrims in this world; that they were in a spiritual relation, just as much as they were to those visible things of which their senses took cognizance. That which has been hidden will be made known; the darkness will no longer be able to quench the light which has been shining in the midst of it, and seeking to penetrate it; each man will be revealed as that which he actually is, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."² The full discovery, probably at death, to their shame or joy, of men's actual relations to Christ, wherein they have, or wherein they have not, rightfully *recognized* these relations, and lived in them, constitutes, according to our author's idea, the real judgment.

¹ Theological Essays, p. 235.

² *Ibid.*, p. 227.

ETERNAL LIFE AND DEATH.

Mr. Maurice complains that there is a universal disposition to dogmatize upon the word "eternal," and to connect it invariably, in some way, with the idea of time. This was, he asserts, precisely the Judaic tendency in Christ's day, and which Christ reproved. "The sense of eternity — of a relation to the eternal God, to a Father of spirits — had almost forsaken these Jews. The sense of time — of a series or succession of years — had displaced every other in their minds; they could contemplate nothing, except under conditions of time."¹ Mr. Maurice holds that the idea of eternity excludes, especially and altogether, any idea of time, or of a continuation, succession, or duration of time.² He distinguishes, generically, the word "eternal" from the words "endless" and "everlasting." In his correspondence with Dr. Jelf, principal of King's College, he says: "I did not like, you perceived, the word "everlasting" as well as the word "eternal"; I could bear the one; I stumbled at the other. I am sorry you spent so much time in seeking for this test. I could have told you at once, if you had asked me, that the word "eternal" seemed to me a better equivalent for the word *αἰώνιος* than everlasting. Since *aetas* is the obvious translation for *αἰών*, the cognate Latin adjective seems peculiarly suitable to express the cognate Greek adjective. Since there is nothing that apparently corresponds to the Greek substantive in the Saxon adjective, it must, I should conceive, offer a less adequate substitute. The passages which you have collected to show how closely the use of *αἰών* is connected in the New Testament, with the use of *αἰώνιος* greatly favors this conclusion. I was so convinced, on this ground, of the superiority of the Latin derivation, that I ventured to complain of our translators for joining with it the word everlasting in **Matt. xxv. 46.** My main objection, indeed, was to the ambiguity

¹ St. John's Gospel, Dis. xvii. p. 256.

² Theological Essays, p. 325.

which arises from the use of the two words for one; still I had no doubt which ought to have been chosen, which thrown aside." He says afterwards, if everlasting had been used strictly in the sense of eternity, he would have made no objection; and he thinks, moreover, the translators of our English version did use it in that sense. "They were too well acquainted with the controversies of the fourth century and with the history of theology not to know how important it is that there should be a word expressing a permanent fixed state, not a succession of moments. The word *αἰών*, or *aetas*, served this purpose. Like our own word "period," it does not convey so much the impression of a line as of a circle. It does not suggest perpetual progress, but fixedness and completeness. The word *αἰώνιος*, or *aeternus*, derived from these, seemed to have been divinely contrived to raise us out of our time-notions — to suggest the thought of One who is the same yesterday, today, and forever; to express those spiritual or heavenly things which are subject to no change or succession. The king James translators, therefore, hailed the word with which Tyndale or some one else had provided them, as a generous addition to the resources and powers of the language. And they wished, I conceive, to raise their own Saxon word "everlasting" to its level. By using them indiscriminately, often together, they effected, to a great extent their object. Even in colloquial language, much more in considerate books of human and divine science, everlasting has acquired that impression of permanence which belongs to eternal, in virtue of its derivation."¹ The import which Mr. Maurice gives to the words "eternal" and "eternity" is, that they denote, primarily, a permanent, fixed state of relationship to God; which state is not a mere negation of time, nor is it, in any possible way, subject to time, but altogether excludes the idea of time; and is a state into which the soul may enter as soon as it comes into the true knowledge of God and union with his Eternal Spirit; even

¹ Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 15.

as it is said in the Gospel of John (xvii. 8), and as John speaks of it in his Epistles. Eternal life, therefore, is, he thinks, in its full and perfect sense, something real and absolute, something like the nature of God. It has reference solely to the infinite things and nature of God. It is "the righteousness, truth, love, which cannot be measured by time, which do not belong to time, but may be brought within the apprehension of the meek and lowly."¹ "The eternal life is the righteousness and truth and love of God which are manifested in Jesus Christ; manifested to men that they may be partakers of them, that they may have fellowship with the Father and with the Son. This is held out as the eternal blessedness of those who seek God and love him."² And what, then, is eternal death but the exact converse of this? It is the absence of this true knowledge of God. "What is perdition but a loss? What is eternal damnation, but the loss of a good which God had revealed to his creatures, of which he had put them in possession?"³ "Men are in eternal misery because they are still covetous, proud, loveless."⁴ Hell is the state of unrighteousness; heaven is the state of righteousness. Eternal death is no more connected with time than eternal life, but is essentially that *state* of darkness and sin, whether in this world or the future, which results from the total loss of the knowledge and love of God.

In regard to the character of the punishment of the future life, Mr. Maurice thinks that it is punishment enough to be without the knowledge and love of God. "I believe wickedness, impenitence, and unbelief to be the worst tortures to which men can be subjected; that, as the possession of righteousness, love, and truth constitute eternal blessedness, these constitute eternal damnation and misery."⁵

"There is a sense of wrath abiding on the spirit which has

¹ Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 18.

² Concluding Essay and Preface to 2d ed. of Mr. Maurice's *Essays*, p. 34.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵ *Letters to Dr. Jelf*, p. 25.

refused the yoke of love. This is one part of the misery. There is a sense of loneliness and atheism. This is another. And surely this, this is the bottomless pit which men see before them, and to which they feel they are hurrying, when they have led selfish lives, and are growing harder, and colder and darker every hour. Can we not tell them that it is even so, that this is the abyss of death, that second death, of which all material images offer only the faintest picture?"¹

As to the limits or extent of that death and condemnation, he says: "I ask no one to pronounce, for I dare not pronounce myself, what are the possibilities of resistance in a human will to the loving will of God. There are times when they seem to me — thinking of myself more than of others — almost infinite. But I know that there is something which must be infinite. I am obliged to believe in an abyss of love which is deeper than the abyss of death. I dare not lose faith in that love. I sink into death, eternal death, if I do. I must feel that this love is compassing the universe. More about it, I cannot know. But God knows. I leave myself and all to him."²

He defends himself from the charge of being a Universalist: "I have said distinctly that I am not a Universalist; that I have deliberately rejected the theory of Universalism, knowing what it is; and that I should as much refuse an article which dogmatized in favor of that theory as one that dogmatizes in favor of the opposite. I object to the Universalists because they seem to me to stand on the very ground upon which you stood. The word *αἰώνιος* is with them a word of time. Far from saying, as I have, that the substantive *αἰών*, by its very limitation, serves to suggest the thought of a fixed state out of time, they eagerly dwell on the fact that an age must consist of a certain number of years; it is terminable, they say, by its very nature. Therefore, at the end of a certain term, say thirty or forty thou-

¹ Concluding Essay to 2d ed. of *Essays*, p. 59.

² Preface to concluding Essay of 2d ed. of *Essays* — "

sand years, we may believe that God's punishment of wicked men may be over, and they may be restored to favor. I have an utter want of sympathy with statements of this kind; they clash with all my convictions."¹ "You asked me in one of your earlier letters to tell you what I thought of the cases of Judas and Voltaire; you complain in your final letter that I avoided the question. I certainly passed it by, because I wished to speak only of what is revealed. Nothing has been revealed to me about the state of Voltaire. I know a little about my own sin, about my own resistance to God's will; nothing at all about the length and breadth of his. Something is said about Judas: "It were [or had been] good for that man if he had not been born." This is our version of our Lord's words in Matt. xxvi. 24, and in Mark xiv. 21; the construing of them is difficult, but I have no other to offer. I receive them with awe and reverence, as the words of him who knows what is in man, and who died for man. Nor do I find them merely terrible, though they are so terrible. I think the inference of those who walk the streets of Christian London, from their observation of what is passing there, might naturally be, that it would be good for ninety-nine hundredths of its people, and of all the people in the world, if they had never been born. This natural opinion is immensely strengthened by the current doctrine among religious men respecting the fixed doom awaiting those hereafter who are sunk so low here."² Viewing this doctrine practically, in reference to preaching, Mr. Maurice says: "But, be that as it may, I do not find these everlasting torments, upon which you dwell, are brought home in our sermons to the consciences of particular evil doers. They float vaguely about in the rhetoric of preachers; the individual drunkard, adulterer, gambler, parasite, oppressor, does not in the least perceive they are intended for him. In his study he may have settled that they must apply to such and such persons; when he is brought face to face with them, he begins to think of all the influences

¹ Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 24.

² Ibid., p. 27.

which may have acted upon them from childhood upwards to tempt them into evils to which *he* has never been tempted; he stammers, mutters dangerous encouragements, and leaves them to think that they may go on in their destructive habits and find some "uncovenanted mercies" to help them at last. If they had been told plainly that the state of body and of mind which they have brought themselves into, or in which they have become fixed, is an accursed, damnable state; that from this they need a present deliverance; that God offers them one; do you think that they would have nothing in their daily experience, or in their inmost conscience, to confirm the words?¹ This is important and instructive; but if we omit distinct scriptural enunciations of the infinite evil and consequences of sin we lessen our hold of the conscience, we sap the foundations of morality, and make void the need and the reality of the infinite work of Christ.

THE CHURCH.

Mr. Maurice looks upon the church as the living witness and revelation of the love of God.² It is that portion of the human race who, being baptized unto Christ, have come truly to know God, that he is their Father. It is they in whom he is revealed. They do acknowledge that God is in them, and has redeemed them in Christ. All men are thus redeemed; but the church consists of those who duly acknowledge this blessed fact, and live accordingly. In them the light that is come into the world really shines. As to the true foundation of the church, he says: "I believe that this universal church is founded on the union established between manhood and Godhead in the person of Jesus Christ, and upon all those acts of birth, death, burial, descent into hell, resurrection, and ascension, in which his union with our race was realized, and his union with God manifested. I believe that as this union of Godhead and manhood rests, so the church itself rests, ulti-

¹ Letters to Dr. Jelf, p. 37.
VOL. XXII. No. 88.

² Theological Essays, p. 10.

mately upon the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, wherein is expressed that highest, deepest, most perfect unity which the spirit of men in all ages has been seeking after and longing to find.”¹ As to the peculiar work of the church in this world, he says: “The church, it seems to me, exists in the world as a witness to mankind that there is a continual, divine, gracious government over it; as a witness to each nation that God is not less king over it than he was over the Jews; that there has been a more complete revelation of his government, of the mode in which it is carried on, of the purposes which it designs to accomplish, than that which was made in the old time, but one which does not in the least set that revelation aside or make it obsolete for us. The church is to tell men that the more completely divine any government is, the more human it is; that it belongs to all circumstances, ordinary interests, actual business. The church is to tell men, that if God was a Redeemer of old, he is a Redeemer now; that if he was the judge of kings, priests, nobles, in old times, — if he called them to account for their cruelties, punished them for their superstitions, reproved them for their exactions, — he does so still. The church is to tell men, that if God in other days took cognizance of the bag of deceitful weights and of the sins of the employer who kept back by fraud the wages of the laborer, he does so still. The church is to teach men that society exists for the sake of the human beings who compose it, not to further the accumulation of the capital, which is only one of its instruments. The church is to declare that any civilization which is not based upon this godly principle will come utterly to nought; that all the real blessings which have flowed from it have proceeded from the acknowledgment of this principle; all the curses which have accompanied the growth of wealth and luxury, from the forgetfulness of it. The church is to declare that the spiritual and eternal kingdom which God has prepared for them that love him is about men now;

¹ Letters to Rev. W. Palmer. p. 7.

and that they may enter into it; and that his government of this spiritual and eternal world does not make him less interested for the earth which he has formed for the habitation of man, in which he watches over him and blesses him." ¹ In a word, the church is to strive not only for the spiritual, but physical and social regeneration of the world. This is the principle of that strenuous and generous activity of Maurice and his school, in all matters of educational and civil reform. He would seek to improve men as men, and to bring out in free and joyful action all their powers of being. He recognizes all the laws of man's nature, as God's laws. He would call forth a large and noble type of Christian manhood. He has, we believe, proved himself a friend of freedom, in these days when the principle of freedom is undergoing a trying test. He would bring men up far above worldly ideas of living, of legislation, of morals, to the full realization and perfect development of his functions, rights, and enjoyments as a child of God, in that righteous and universal kingdom of God which is even now come among men. He considers this kingdom to be given to all men, or to be one in which, by baptism, we may all register our names and those of our children, and Christ will welcome us. ¹ He looks upon Christ as the *personal centre* of the church, infinitely above human opinions and ecclesiastical systems, and in whom there is a real unity and headship of the whole church, or rather of the whole race. It must be added, that these broad views are often lamentably obscured in Mr. Maurice's writings, by much that is bred of a prouder and more exclusive spirit of high-church Anglicanism.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We may have failed to give a correct delineation of the theological system of our author, but it appears to us, through all its eloquent obscurity and haze, to be quite a simple one. It has, in truth, but one main idea, viz. that all religion, all truth, all living Christianity, is but the *revela-*

¹ Patriarchs and Lawgivers, p. xx. ² Christmas an

tion of that which is already accomplished for and in us. No new thing is to be done. There is no new act to be performed on the part of God, and no actual new birth or total change of the nature to be done or effected on the part of man. We are but to discover and to yield ourselves unto what is true and eternal in us. Our highest duty and our supreme attainment is simply knowledge. God is love; and we may and should all know this loving God. God has verily joined himself to us and wrought out our redemption in Christ, and we may and should all partake of and enjoy this divine life into which Christ has brought us. Christ is in us; our responsibility consists in not extinguishing this revelation of Christ within our souls by a separate, selfish, and sensual life, and in thus failing to find it. Our author inclines evidently to the belief that this life of God is so truly come within us, within the nature of every man, that it cannot be altogether and entirely extinguished. There is a depth of divine love in and toward man, below and beyond all the possible sin in man, so at least he hopes. Our impression is that he seeks to show what is the real essence of eternal misery, that it consists in a moral and spiritual separation from God. He would make this truth clear and operative to the conscience; and then he would leave it on this ground, for the present and the future.

But if a man were thus exposed to remain indefinitely, and perhaps everlastingly, in a state of ignorance and separation from God through sin, what would this redemption of every man in Christ, this actual union of every man to Christ, be worth to him? If the true knowledge of it never came to man, what would be the benefit of it to him? This is the practical difficulty with Mr. Maurice's whole theory, which he has never fairly met.

The personal, rather than the abstract view of God, prevails in Mr. Maurice's theology. The greatest work he has done as a theologian, is, we think, in bringing out the absolutely amiable, good, ineffable, and inexhaustible loving nature of God, in opposition to many lamentably false views

of this. It is God really present with us, brought down into the life and daily needs of our nature, into our intimate and tender relations to him as his children. But has Mr. Maurice, after all, sounded the deeps of theology? Those great spiritual truths of divine sovereignty, law, vicarious sacrifice, pardon, reward and punishment, and their correlative truths of probation, free-will, sin, justification, which have tried the strength of the most profound minds in all ages, and which spring from God's infinite government over our spirits and prove the foundations of moral truth, laying their strong hands upon the conscience, and leading the soul, convinced and humbled, before the throne of the divine holiness, — these certainly do not stand out clear in his theology, although he uses all these terms, and discusses these doctrines. We fear that a soul under his teaching would never wake from its sleep of sin to *see* the glorious things of which he tells. His system wants power to reach the entrenched heart of apathetic pride and sinful rebellion. It is, in fact, superficial.

Yet our hearts gladly acknowledge the love and penetration of a mind that sees much of God in every man; and that believes that there is in every man a certain instinctive yearning for the divine goodness, for that beautiful and divine perfection of humanity which Christ himself manifested. He gives scope to the feelings and affections, to those profound sympathies which prove that a true theology has its seat in the heart even more than in the head.

We cannot but recognize in Mr. Maurice much that is noble, affectionate, and true. He is undeniably one of the leaders of that new and attractive phase of belief which is coming over the theological opinions of the age, softening some of the sterner features of the Calvinistic theology, making it less abstract and metaphysical, and more human, practical, and free. Whether this be a healthful change or no, Mr. Maurice, in the English world at least, is one of its most persevering exponents, and he derives his influence from this fact, rather than from any extraordinary original

genius. His views are silently permeating the theology of our day. Is it not well that they should be generally understood, and that we should strive to ascertain whether they be true or false?

He has, without question, said many quickening things, for which personally we would be forever grateful to him; and he has suggested, rather than developed or clearly established, what would seem to be some important truths; but we do not think him able to construct a new theology, or to reconstruct the old. He has not the patient strength, nor the philosophic grasp of thought, for such a work. His kindly and earnest spirit cannot but be loved. But he has a method of putting old truths in such new lights, and so much of his writing on religious subjects has such a strange look, that we prefer to examine further before pronouncing it to be, in all respects, "the truth as it in Jesus."

Whatever, let us say in conclusion, affects the religion and the religious mind of England, powerfully affects us. Her great thinkers think for us. Such a man as Mr. Maurice, with his earnest, loving spirit, and his constant devotion to the higher supernatural truth, we cannot but listen to with an affectionate regard, even when he boldly goes against our fixed opinions and habits of thought; while at the same time we reject those thinkers springing from his own soil and school who reason from the low level of naturalism and human science solely, and who exhibit unmistakably the spirit of virulent hostility to the revealed word. And even in respect to him, whenever our religious instincts tell us that he has, in indefinable ways, emptied the gospel of its old, immutable precious, and saving power, of its very essence as the "word of life" and salvation to our souls, we will say, though sorrowfully, to him: "we must leave you and take the plain, obvious meaning of scripture, without equivocation, without refining upon it too much, without at times being able wholly to comprehend it, and rest our souls in peace and hope on the simple word of God.