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

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

ARTICLE III.

CHURCH PARTIES AS APOLOGISTS.

BY REV. FRANCIS WHARTON, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR IN THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

My object in the following pages is not to engage in the controversy as to church parties in which Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Lecky, and Cardinal Newman have recently taken part. What I have to say concerns rather Christianity in general than the church of England. as I desire to speak mainly of parties as arising from causes not peculiar to that church, but common to all Christendom. If these parties have disturbed the current of that church, or impeded its progress, such also, it may be shown, has been their action on other churches. Of the other hand, if the collision of these parties from time to time has not impaired the vitality of the church of England, so has it been, as we will see, with other churches in which the same parties have appeared. My purpose, therefore, on entering on this discussion is not partisan, nor is it for the purpose of attaching any particular credit to the church of England. I desire to view the subject as a basis for apologetics; and my contention is that the fact that the surface of the Church, viewing the Church as in this sense convertible with the aggregate of the orthodox churches of the Reformation. has been from era to era, without the dissolution of its integrity, exposed to a succession of vehement party torrents, enables us to ascribe something like perpetuity to its faith. Or, assuming, as I shall show that we have a right to assume, that party standards are the barriers erected by the Church to oppose some threatening heresy, then we may say, that when a church erects such barriers, first on one side, and then on another, from time to time moving its forces from one to another of these barriers, then

we may infer a centralized, persistent, and vital energy, by which these barriers, superficially opposite as they may appear to be, are manned, and by which the whole system is animated. Perhaps I might extend this proposition so as to embrace the whole of Western Christianity. The errors of the Roman Catholic church have arisen from the moving of the metropolis into the outpost; from her adopting as sites of essential truth, advanced fortresses she erected, sometimes very indiscreetly, to repel some heresy, acknowledged to be such by ourselves. But be this as it may, I conceive that the existence of a succession of parties, sweeping the surface without decomposing the substance of the Church, may be used apologetically, as showing its essential unity, ubiquity, and perpetuity. As such, I purpose to consider church parties in the present essay.

I. The first party that asserted itself, so far as concerns the Protestant side of the church, after the inauguration of the Reformation, was the *Dogmatic*. There was a reason for such a party to be organized. On the one side, on cutting adrift from Rome, there was a disposition to rush into the wildest doctrinal license. On the other side, there was a feeling among the religious and the conservative, that Rome had preserved the essential traditions of the faith, no matter how much she had overlaid them; and that the danger was, that in tearing down the superimposed corruptions, the essential substance underneath might be destroyed. The theological leaders of the Reformation, from policy, as well as from orthodoxy, were determined to prevent this. The faith was to be logically fenced in. It was to be separated definitely from Romish corruption. It was also to be separated definitely from antinomianism, from anabaptism, from religious outlawry of all kinds. For this purpose, the Romish doctrine of the *opus operatum* was to be emphatically repudiated, and a like definite stamp of disavowal placed on other Romish superstitions and perversions. This, indeed, was easy enough, but it was not easy to state the opposing theses held by the Reformers; and when they came to limit with

logical precision these theses, they propounded, as was eminently the case in reference to the sacraments, a series of propositions so conflicting as to produce collisions almost as fierce and intolerant as those on the same topic with Rome. But this was not all. On those essential doctrines, such as the Trinity, divine sovereignty, human depravity, which the Reformers held in common with the rest of Western Christendom, they felt it necessary, in order not merely to silence heresy, but to quiet the anxieties of the orthodox, to put themselves beyond suspicion. Consequently, in reference to the Trinity, and especially in reference to divine sovereignty and human depravity, their utmost dialectic skill was employed. They, as well as their Romish antagonists, had been trained in the school of St. Thomas Aquinas. To them, as well as to these antagonists, all other forms of reasoning were suspicious. They set to work, therefore, to define these mysteries with a nice exactness, in which even the most rampant and acute of orthodox Romish doctors could find no flaw. There was, however, this difficulty. Their orthodoxy might in this way defy Romish attacks. They might on the Trinity be more exact than Athanasius, and on human depravity be more uncompromising than Augustine, while the spirit of Athanasius and Augustine might be theirs. And yet, while this might be so, what forms of words, when we strike into a new ramification of orthodox differentia, could suit all classes of minds? The consequence was, that while different schools framed on these mysterious topics separate expositions varying in some slight, though pregnant terms, these expositions, when afterwards trusted to the uncertain current of popular belief, were apt, as we will see, to collide.

That a dogmatical school was at the time necessary, is seen by the fact that such a school is the consequent of the organization of all new communions. When a separation takes place, the distinguishing tenets of the separatists must be clearly set forth. The more purely doctrinal is the reason for separation, the more strictly and subtilely is the dividing line drawn. The articles of the church of England are com-

paratively liberal in their definitions, because the separation of the English from the Roman church was not exclusively on doctrinal grounds. Next in liberality comes the Augsburg Confession, for the German Reformation was political as well as doctrinal. But when separations are based on purely doctrinal grounds, then the dogmatic school finds itself in unrestrained play; and the keenest intellects it possesses, and its highest training, are employed to construct a scheme of orthodoxy, so comprehensive, so complex, and yet so specific, as to settle, as far as can be done, every future contingency of dispute. This is eminently the case with the Westminster Confession, a scheme based on an ecclesiastical and doctrinal separation from the church of England, and which had to differentiate, therefore, not merely the relations of the church of England to Rome, but those of the new Reformers to the church of England. The burden of a still more complex and minute formularization fell on the Puritans, when they settled in America. They had to construct standards which would embody the differentiation between themselves and the Westminster Confession; between the Westminster Confession and the Thirty-nine Articles, and between the Thirty-nine Articles and the doctrines of Rome. They had to say, "we hold to Lambeth as distinguished from Rome, and Westminster as distinguished from Lambeth, and to our own specific views of secular power as distinguished from those of Westminster." And relating, as those standards do, to the most intricate subtilties of government, to the profoundest problems of metaphysics, to the sublimest themes of theology, as well as the most mysterious aspirations of devotion, it was necessary that they should be at once almost unlimited in their range, and almost infinitely exact in their application.

So arose the Dogmatic party, not only in the first epoch of the church of England, but in the first epochs of the other great Protestant communions, and so it arose in what may be called the *creed-making* epoch of the early church. At such epochs it is necessary that there should be a definition of the

faith, which should be at once exact and comprehensive. The work is one of immense value; yet, when the energy which prompts its execution becomes a continuous passion; when the party employed in it engages in insatiable deductive specialization, grafting limitation upon limitation; when submission to each new specialization becomes a test, not merely of orthodoxy, but of loyalty to Christ; when the importance of the ethical and spiritual elements in the faith is subordinated to the dialectic, then we encounter certain great risks.

The first is the violence done to intellectual liberty, and the ultimate consequential revolt against even the essentials of faith. We must recollect how wide is the compass of the formularies set out in what may be called the second stage of the creed-making era. Several of them, as we have seen, undertake to settle in perpetuity the government of the church, but how can church government be so settled? Must not the government of the church sympathize in its general structure with the government of the state; and as with state, so with church, can a government stand which is not in unison with the temper of the people governed? Could an oriental or Jewish government be adapted to a Caesaristic era, or a Caesaristic system to an era of wild disorganization, such as that which followed the barbarian deluge; or a barbarian government to feudal conditions; or a feudal system to the centralization worked out by the Tudors and by Richelieu; or a Tudor government to a democracy; or the government proper to a democracy to an era cherishing the checks of constitutionalism? How can a church polity fitted to any one of these eras be made to fit any one of the others?

To metaphysics, also, these standards reach; but how can the metaphysical standards of any one period be applied, without torture and revolt, to any successive period? The metaphysics of one age is never the metaphysics of another, and in metaphysical inquiries there have been, from age to age, vast accumulations of material, leading to new inductions. In fact, periods of intense theological controversy are usually

periods of metaphysical torpor; and so was it eminently the case with the era of the great general councils in the primitive church by which our creeds were formed; and with the Reformation period, from which sprang most of our present primary standards. In the former era there was no metaphysical teaching in the church; in the latter, chiefly the monotonous voice of St. Thomas Aquinas, a great intellect, indeed, but occupying comparatively a narrow sphere, and relying exclusively on *a priori* processes of thought. But when we turn to the opulence of the material now about us; when we find ourselves with the hoards of wealth which have been accumulated by so many intermediate generations of keen intellectual labor; when we remember that since the great Protestant creed-making epoch such intellects as Bacon, stimulating a new mode of eliciting truth; and Leibnitz, vastly increasing the material from which the truth can be extracted; and Cuvier, pointing to it as illustrated in the skeleton; and Bell, in the muscles of the human hand; and Darwin, indicating a still more intricate chain of what I believe to be divine purpose, though he might perhaps call it instinct; I cannot but feel that in all this opulence *we* are the fathers, with intellects unsubdued by time, and brains uncongealed by age, and with the resources of maturity at our feet, while those called the fathers, eminent as they were for intellectual powers, were unendowed with many of the materials from which a right meaning of the sacred text can be derived. When we pass the inspired era, the early church is very far from being the ancient church. The church has been becoming each year more ancient in knowledge, while none the less decrepit in intellect, and how, therefore, can its early speculations in matters critical and metaphysical be made to bind its maturer years?

To theological formularies, at least in their apologetical and metaphysical relations, the same criticism is applicable; but from the attempt to establish as a perpetuity subtile and minute theological definitions another difficulty flows. No truth is more generally conceded, and yet more practically repudiated,

than that which affirms the multiplication of differentia by the specification of definitions. We think that we will make a new definition which will be complete and minute and exhaustive enough to settle all controversy; but instead of this it only creates as many new controversies as it contains words. The statute of frauds, for instance, which was adopted in England for the purpose of preventing frauds and perjuries consequent upon purely oral proof of contracts and wills, provided that contracts and wills should, with certain exceptions, be in writing, and should be proved in a particular way; but there is no word in the statute of frauds which has not been the subject of innumerable suits, and of the most intricate distinctions and subdistinctions. The bull Unigenitus was to settle the Jansenist controversy, but it did not do so, for we had at once not only a multitude of new questions as to the meaning of each sentence in the bull Unigenitus, but up sprang the still more radical question whether, as to matters of fact, the Pope had the right to publish any bull at all. So far as concerns the Thirty-nine Articles, hardly had the church adapted herself to them, when new articles were called for, and the Lambeth formularies were constructed in order to settle questions as to the divine sovereignty left open by the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Westminister Confession followed, making still more minute and precise the Lambeth formularies. Had we not passed from the creed-making period, it is difficult to say to what extent we would have gone on defining the definitions of our definitions. We went, however, far enough to generate in every direction controversies almost implacable. It is remarkable that these contests were not as to the essence of the faith. As to the Thirty-nine Articles, there was a general feeling of submission; but when it came to the rubrics, then followed revolt, and one side provoked a schism, and the other accepted it, for the sake of a posture or a garb. Scarcely less worthy were the controversies by which, through excessive minuteness of definition, other communions were disturbed. Whether Adam was our federal head, we sinning in him, according to

the old philosophy, or whether he was a sinning parent, from whom is inherited, according to more modern philosophy, a sinful nature, may seem a point as to which a church might well have liberty; but not having liberty, belief on the one side or the other is made a test of communion. The more minute and copious the differentia, the more numerous the agencies of disruption. It is very well, when a limb is broken, to encase it in a plaster mould, so that until the muscles are re-knit and the bone re-united, there can be no motion. But when vigor pours into the fibres of the now unparalyzed member, and when it is in a whirl of eagerness to stretch itself, and step forth on the green sward, by what cement, no matter how compact and tenacious, can it be restrained? And what becomes of the cement itself, giving, after all, in its outer shape so imperfect a view of the real limb underneath? Undoubtedly the moral guards essential to shut off the recurrence of a second breaking should be kept in mind. Undoubtedly, in order to retain life and vigor, there should be moral ligatures applied; but it is impossible, when the man is well, to continue to swathe him in the casement which was proper enough in a peculiar transition crisis of his malady. Words change; circumstances change; that which is rational enough at one time ceases to be rational at another, and becomes destructive instead of recuperative. Not that the cardinal facts of the universal creeds are not universally binding; not that our more intricate formularies may not be retained as articles of peace; but they should not be maintained as to matters in which they were based on theories merely local or temporary, simply to become articles of war. And if retained, they should not be sub-defined.

One other evil of the dogmatic party, viewing it as a party continuously intent upon the refinement and the polemical enforcement of formularies, I have already incidentally noticed, and to this I briefly recur. How can it be otherwise than that both the ethical and spiritual elements in Christianity should recede from the vision exclusively occupied with the imposition of new tests drawn by arbitrary *a priori*

argumentation from old? Why should we be surprised if, in an era in which this with many is the dominant idea, those permeated with this idea should consider logical orthodoxy to be the ruling note of Christian life? Side by side, in fact, with the undue protuberance of the one, we notice the undue depression of the other. What could be more logically precise than the orthodoxy of the leading members of the court of Edward VI.; yet, if we leave out that hapless boy, and his still more hapless cousin, whose coronation throne was her scaffold, where can we find a group of men more oblivious of moral duty than those who appear and disappear, murdering and murdered, plundering and disgorging, in that turbulent court? Or, if we proceed further, can we fail to be struck with Cromwell's dying cry, "If I had assurance, as I had, I was elected; if elected, elected forever; if elected forever, elected to holiness;" and as we hear this, omit to remember the strange dissimulations, the unscrupulous strategies, the disloyalties to the cause of freedom which once he held so dear, by which that splendid and haughty career was marked? Can we forget the massacres and perfidies which went side by side with the Synod of Dort? Or can we forget that at a time when our New England divines were entering on a new era of creed-making, when some of the greatest of human intellects were absorbed in the application of a differential calculus to all mysteries, Whitefield arrived in New England, preaching a gospel they acknowledged to be severely orthodox, and yet a gospel that was to seize the heart, and moralize the life, and can we forget the uproar and contumely with which he was received, and how the finest of all distinctions were launched at him to shut him out, accompanied with the coarsest of anathemas to stun him? Or can we fail to be struck with the strange union, in the hymns of some of the noble French ladies who took up Calvinism as a party cry, of strict dialectic theology with amative sentiments far from strict? It is true that the minute formularization of metaphysical theology is by no means inconsistent with a holy life. It is true that many men engaged in this work

have been eminently holy. But it is also true that when these formularies, thus elaborated, became party standards, when to the heated mind salvation depends on them, then the ethical element subsides.

II. Hence follows, in logical reaction, what may be called the *Ethical* party, the party, as it has sometimes been styled, of moderatism, a party which dominated Scotland, England, Germany, France, and in some measure New England, in the eighteenth century. It is a mistake to speak of this party as *latitudinarian*. The latitudinarians of Cambridge, who have recently been recalled to us by Dr. Tulloch, avowed their reception of the standards in a liberal sense, and to that sense they were true; but the moderates, or the ethical party of reaction from dogmatism, did not trouble themselves about the standards at all. They professed to take those adopted by their particular church, but they took them as historical relics, as things to be hermetically sealed, and then deposited in title chests; as *asymptotes*, perfectly true, yet never touching practical life, and, therefore, not themselves to be touched. The prevalence of this temper for a long period, over spheres so detached, and in other respects unsympathizing, is one of the most remarkable incidents in history. Blackstone, whose high cultivation and acute vision made him an eminently competent judge, tells us that at one time he visited almost every church in London to hear what the preacher said, and not in any case did he hear anything that might not have been preached by Confucius. There are many shelves of German sermons, much admired in their day, many shelves of Scotch, and some of English, of which the same thing might be declared; while there were two influences tending to the same direction in France — that of the Jesuits, whose studies and duties led them to the exposition of casuistry, and that of the more worldly Gallicans, who accepted the papal decisions merely as a fashionable form. "He is a Jansenist, I am told," so objected Louis XIV. to an abbé, who was proposed to him as a tutor for one of his illegitimate children. "Oh no, he is only an atheist," was the satisfac-

tory reply. The reaction was not in favor of Jansenism, it was not against the proscriptive formularies issued by the Vatican; it nominally retained and subscribed these formularies, but it treated them as speculations belonging to a non-existing world. It was not so bad in England; but even in England things went very far. We take up Swift's works, and find them divisible into three parts: one undoubtedly freighted with great political truths, tellingly put; another consisting of poems and essays, tainted with sensualism so putrid that the senses start back with a shudder; the other of sermons, whose monotonous and mundane morality is only enlivened by an occasional malignant thrust at dissent, or a vindication of technical orthodoxy as a "scientific frontier." We turn to Sterne's works, and we find the Sentimental Journey advertised as the work of a clergyman of the church of England, and then a collection of sermons advertised as preached by the author of the Sentimental Journey. We read with sorrow Sidney Smith's ridicule of evangelicalism in the Edinburgh Review and we would read with delight Sydney Smith's sermons, now bound up in one American edition in the same book, could we believe that those sermons were the brilliant essays of a man of the world, and not the works of a clergyman of a church whose articles contain the very evangelicalism which a few pages before is ridiculed as absurd. Cobbett brought over, on his last return from America, as a sort of precious relic, the highest theme of true hagiology, the bones of Thomas Paine, which he dug up in Long Island, and which he carried in a sort of processional through the London streets; but even this performance of a man who declared that loyalty to the church of England was his first principle, ought not to surprise us so much as the fact that Cobbett about the same time published a series of industrial essays, which were preached as their own sermons — so his biographer tells us in a work just issued — by many clergymen of the Church of England. Nor were these mere eccentricities. Moderatism, as a party, for a least half a century, swept everything before it in Scotland, filled almost every

post of dignity in England, and stalked not infrequently in the decorous garments and with the stately mien of some of the contemporaneous New England divines.

Now what was the consequence? Under the distinctively moralistic *régime* did morality flourish? Taking England by way of illustration, we can hardly say that such was the case. Queen Caroline was the most potent patroness of the moderate or moralistic school, but if we run our eyes over the correspondence of Lord Hervey or of Lady Sundon, by whom the secrets of her councils were preserved, we have very little reason to respect the moral tone of the eminent divines who sought and received her favors. Undoubtedly there were exceptions. Tillotson, whose saintliness predominated over even his dogmatic laxity, was an exception in the days of William III.; and Butler's majestic, though sombre and solitary genius, would tower above all classifications in any age in which he might be placed. But so far as concerns the dignitaries who sought Queen Caroline's bounties, nothing can be more menial, nothing more inconsistent with high morality, nothing more oblivious of gospel loyalty, than the attitudes in which they present themselves. It is true that beneath them in the ecclesiastical scale there were multitudes of faithful and pure parish priests. But it is by the upper ranks of the ministry that the example is set; and in the upper ranks, both then and in the following reign, the example was of absenteeism, of worldliness, of indifference to moral sanctions, of truckling subservience to the court, of dogged opposition to all social reform, and of resistance to the mitigation of penal discipline, to the abolition of the slave-trade, to the equalization of political representation, to the modification of the game laws, to the relaxation of the manacles which were imposed on non-episcopal religious teaching.

Nor was it in the church of England only that English religious moderatism found its seat. A majority of the Presbyterian ministers in London adopted the moderate theology, and at last, when the court of chancery was called upon to seek for a church which would answer the proposed bounty of

a pious Presbyterian lady of a former era, and meet the description given by her in her will, the search was made for a long time in vain. "I knew the time," writes a correspondent of Dr. Doddridge, on October 3, 1744, "when I had no doubt when I went among dissenters but that my heart would be warmed and comforted; now I hear prayers and sermons I neither relish nor understand; primitive truths and duties are quite old-fashioned things."[1] It is true that the moderates of this school did not persecute. For this they had no power. But what they could not burn they could congeal.

How was it with the upper classes of society, and how with the lower? I have only to say that while in the peerage, for instance, zealots have been found for high-churchmanship, and zealots for evangelicalism, there has been no zealotry for moderatism, unless in the work of extermination of zeal. As to the lower classes, never was there such crime, such misery, such despair, as under this stagnant *régime*. Among the poor were distributed no means of grace, to them was preached no hope of glory. And in England, at least, there followed a ferment of discontent, of lawlessness, of depravity, which would have been England's doom, if it had not been for two causes — first, a secular cause, the uprising of national spirit to repel Napoleonic aggressions; and, secondly, a divine cause, the revival of evangelicalism.

III. *Evangelicalism* may be here spoken of as the attribute of a party, because it was the impetus of a combined movement, at once aggressive and compact, in antagonism to the then prevailing religious temper. It may be spoken of as a revival, because in the main the evangelical spirit is that of the gospel and of the Reformation, viewing the Reformation in its best sense. The good work done by those guiding this movement, the collieries into which they poured the gospel's comfortable tidings, the cottages which they transformed from the sites of gloom and squalid discontent to the abodes of cheerfulness and comfort, the sense of order and of civic duty

[1] Doddridge's Life (American Tract Society ed.), p. 339.

they diffused, the multitudes of savages whom they reclaimed, and of outcasts whom they recalled, the fires they kindled on many a darkened altar, the energy and self-sacrifice they implanted in the heart of many a pastor who before had forgotten his flock, the sense of earnestness they aroused in the higher orders of the ministry, the conviction they instilled even into patrician breasts that the most splendid life is not worth living unless subordinated to the life to come, the varied merciful agencies they instituted, the numerous missionary and educational societies they framed, the great and decisive part they took in the leading liberal and humane reforms of the day, in the amelioration of the penal system, in the abolition of the slave-trade, in the removal of the galling fetters of ecclesiastical proscription — all this has been told lately by others, and eminently by Mr. Lecky, with an ability I cannot equal, and a fulness I cannot approach. My object, also, is not to vindicate a party, and to close my sketch at its zenith, but to survey for apologetical purposes, all parties; to show that parties are the advance guards of the church, thrown out, first on one side and then on another, to meet and repel some hostile force. They may be composed sometimes of the very body-guard of truth, sometimes of forces more remote from the throne and less permeated by its spirit, but in any case it is important to study both their merits and their defects. Their merits, superficially antagonistic as they may be, point us to the central power which they surround and entrench, and by which they are animated; and whose constancy and perpetuity they, in their very mobility, attest and emphasize. And their defects show that in no one of them is this central power incarnate. Let us turn, then, to some of these defects, not of the evangelical spirit, but of the party by whom that spirit was for the time distinctly represented.

The first of these is, that they spoke lightly of Greek diphthongs. What is a Greek diphthong, they said, to a man who has to save souls, by proclaiming the truth? But they forgot that without Greek diphthongs there is no finding out what truth is to be proclaimed.

A second error was a contempt for style — for style in writing and for style in conversation. The earlier evangelicals numbered several nervous writers, and many eloquent speakers; but among the clergy of that connection, Cecil was the only man of power who used his power effectively with the pen. Nor, while some of them were distinguished for their graciousness of mien, was this the characteristic of the school, as was peculiarly the case with the old moderate divines. With this may be coupled a contempt for the aesthetic, particularly in music and architecture; and, hence, in church decoration, and in rendering the services, whatever would delight eye or ear was avoided, rather than sought. One of the consequences was a sort of prejudice among literary men against the evangelicals. Another was that the sons of leading evangelical men broke loose from at least the technical associations of their parents. To few men have sons of such diversified and exuberant genius been allotted as to the leaders of the Clapham school — Zachary Macaulay, Wilberforce, Sir James Stephen; few men's sons have radiated more variously from their fathers' stand-point.

A third defect was a tendency to undue subjectivism. Not that the Articles were undervalued. So far from this being the case, they were held to rigorously by the leaders of this school, and that in which the Articles might be supposed to be deficient was supplemented by experimental treatises, an acceptance of which was regarded as essential to full party recognition. The dislike of objectivity, if I can call it such, was shown, at least by some, in a disparagement of the outward ceremonials and signs of grace. The service was often performed with slovenliness. The chancel was bare and austere. It certainly was not necessary in order to show that the holy table was not an altar, that it should be mounted on four gaunt legs, with no drapery, with none of the hangings by which the humblest cabinet-maker shades his work when for parlor use. It was not necessary, in order to show that it was only a table, that the minister should lay on it his hat and cane. It was not necessary, in order to spurn

saint worship, that the church door should be scrupulously closed on days on which both state and church ordered certain saints to be commemorated; nor was it necessary, in order to mark the supremacy of the gospel over the sacraments, that on top of the holy table should be reared the reading desk, and on top of the reading desk the pulpit. It is true that this depreciation of the formal, if not of the sacramental portions of the service, was exhibited by but a few. It was imputed, however, to the whole movement, and led, with the causes I am about to mention, to the feeling that evangelicalism did not present the full mind of the church.

The remaining defect was the individualistic tendency of the evangelical school. Man is undoubtedly saved as a unit, but he is also saved as part of an organic whole. He is in one sense solitary in his dealing with God, yet, in another sense he deals as a member of the race, which, as a whole, Christ has redeemed He is one with the corporate church of the past, as well as with that of the present; he is saved by himself, and yet he can never sever himself from the host of the believers who have gone before, or from the host struggling by his side. We have, indeed, in this solidarity, contrasted with this singleness, two apparently opposite propositions; but if so, they combine in forming a truth neither of whose parts can be rejected without rejecting the whole.

IV. The difficulty with the evangelical was that he overlooked the corporate side of Christianity. The difficulty with the *Institutional* party, whom I next notice, is that it overlooked the individual side of Christianity. It is true that we cannot say that, in strict chronological order, the institutional party followed the evangelical, because institutionalists exist in greater or less force in all churches and at all times. But it is also clear that in the days of moderatism, institutionalism existed in tranquil ease, not troubling itself with the condition of those outside of the church, believing that they, with their tempers and habits, were best where they were, and thinking pretty much the same about

the heathen, among whom no one ought to think of intruding anything so little likely to fit as the church. But when, under evangelical teaching, men felt that religion was a real thing, and that by preaching Christ dying souls could be saved, and when the vigor of evangelicalism as a pure force had exhibited itself in practical life, there was a feeling, not unnatural, that this vigor could be most effectively exerted through the institutional agencies of the church. Religion without a church could not be safe; a church is necessary to religion, and what church so proper as that in which the first prayers of childhood had been uttered, whose early confessors fought valiant battles for the truth, which in structure, is analagous to, and in lineage descended from, that established by Christ?

It is a mistake, however, to suppose that institutionalism is limited to any particular church. No church, for instance, sprang into the world less dependent upon lineage than did that founded by the Puritans in New England; yet there have been few churches in which institutionalism took so uncompromising a stand. It was the church of the wilderness to them, the church they had gone into the wilderness to seek, the church they had to defend against a strange and wild climate, and still stranger and wilder aboriginal foes; but they had gone into the wilderness and encountered these savage foes to seek it, and when found it was heartily loved and exalted. Its scriptural organization became indisputable in their eyes, and ought not to be disputed by any one. What Cartwright had argued rather tentatively, in his discussions with Hooker; what Hooker, so far as the philosophy of the question is concerned, so triumphantly refuted, the *jure divino* right of, independency as a church polity, was treated by many as a settled truth. Clergymen of the English church, not only with their degrees, but their orders, fresh upon them, were re-ordained before permitted to take charge of Congregational churches. None but communicants of these churches were allowed to vote. All who did not attend the established worship were subjected to heavy fines. Dissent-

ers were banished, and sometimes dealt with more severely, if their dissent was tinged with anything like disrespect to the church. What might be called the festive side of church observances was sternly repressed. The harmony with the spirit of English institutionalism was marked even in this divergence. The extreme Puritan, it is true, made penal the sports and festivities which the extreme Churchman made obligatory; and here the opposition is apparently complete. But the harmony is in the fact that both by Puritan and by Churchman such right of regulation was assumed as a divine prerogative of the church.

Yet, after all, the institutionalism of those days was impotent compared to the institutionalism which, in after times, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, received into its veins the vigor and fervor of evangelicalism. It was like Pygmalion's ivory statue — classical, symmetrical, pure, yet powerless, until, under the inspiration of a new life, the eye began to sparkle, and the veins to swell, and the countenance to breathe forth exultant energy, and the hand to be lifted to woo or to strike. When thus inspired, institutionalism became a mighty power; and under it, the evangelical spirit being blended with the sense of historical continuity, of a government, even, firm, ancient, but elastic, and in harmony with the constitution of the state, the church of England made immense strides in her missionary work abroad, as well as in her pastoral work at home. She united and employed great powers — the power of the faithful evangelist, the power of the wise economist, the power of the sagacious administrator, the power of the accomplished commentator and apologist; for the possession of organic institutions, not merely venerable, but now made sacred by the infusion of evangelical unction, enabled her to use and distribute all the various agencies that she controlled, not to let some drop because they might not be sufficiently pastoral, nor others because they were exclusively pastoral, but to use them all, each in its place, honoring all, yet assigning to each element its demarcations and subordinations as well as rights. This work,

at least partially, she did, and is doing; and this work will be at least partially done by every church which unites the institutional with the evangelical.

Yet, has not institutionalism also its shadows? It certainly has when the evangelical spirit within it declines, and submission to it is claimed simply because it is established by the state, or because it comes to us with *jure divino* claims. It undertakes, when so directed, a destructive work. It denounces mere dogmatism as a creed without either a church or a religion, and evangelicalism as a religion without either a church or a creed; but when the evangelical spirit departs from it, and it repudiates both the dogmatic and the spiritual for the authoritative, it stands before us a church wanting both religion and creed. Occupying this hard attitude, it is natural that both the spiritual and the intellectual should wither on its advance. It compresses and crushes, without fructifying. Spiritual life it repels haughtily as something with which government has nothing to do. Literature it encourages, when it is that kind of literature which delights in exploring title deeds, and tracing genealogies, and exhuming remote and obscure data which may serve to prove that formal rites are recorded to have taken place in ages in which no formal records were kept. And it makes the church the slave, not the reformer, of the world. Paul it instructs to tremble before Felix.

V. It was on the desolate and desiccated form of institutionalism, from which the evangelical spirit had departed, that *Sacramentarianism*, which is the next party we have to consider, grafted itself. One phase of institutionalism, that into which evangelicalism had entered, remained in vigor; but as to the other, deserted as it was of life, what could be more natural than that sacramentarianism should seize on it. For what, it was naturally asked, is this apparatus of succession meant, with its connections thus miraculously preserved, unless it be to transmit something? We look, so it was said, at the aqueducts of ancient Rome, and we say, "Here was a line of skilfully laid pipes, with their junctures well cemented,

in which was led water from distant hills to the crowded and thirsty city. It is true that it might be answered that this careful welding of links and attachment of couplings is meant, at least in structures of other classes, to secure strength, and that the tubular supports of the bridge may be those which unite the greatest tenacity with the greatest endurance. But still is the question repeated, "What is this for"; and to certain classes of minds the answer seems obvious. If a chain is *jure divino*, it must needs communicate grace. The conclusion is not limited to matters eclesiastical. As long as English kings were held to reign by divine right, children were brought to them to be touched for scrofula, and it was believed by multitudes that through the royal fingers trickled curative powers. Nor is this belief peculiar to Episcopal communions. In New England, to which we again turn for illustration, we find numerous cases in which the Puritan divines, after they had made up their minds that Congregationalism was a divine institution, maintained that through them grace flowed.[1] Intruding ministers, of irregular succession, were warned off, sometimes very summarily; and in Connecticut, in 1742, the legislature passed a statute providing that not only should no minister preach without invitation in another's parish, but that foreign ministers so trespassing should be regarded as vagrants, to be sent out of the state by the constable, under which statute Samuel Finley, a Presbyterian evangelist of note, afterwards President of Princeton college, was driven over the borders.[2] Clergymen of other communions, as we have seen, were re-ordained.[3] In the ordination of such, as well as of others, the gift of the Holy Spirit was vouched, or, as an authoritative historian, when speaking of the ordination of the Reverend John Cotton, already a clergyman of the church of England, expresses it,[4] "The pastor and the ruling elders, laying their

[1] To this effect may be cited a sermon of President Oakes of Harvard College (1675), given in Mather's Magnalia, B. iv. p. 168.

[2] Uhden's New England Theology (Conant's Translation), p. 278.

[3] Neal, New England, Vol. i. p. 133; Paige, Camb. pp. 248, 250.

[4] Hubbard, New England, p. 188.

hands upon his head, the pastor prayed, and speaking to him by his name, did thereby design him to the said office, in the name of the Holy Ghost, and did give him the charge of the congregation, and did thereby, as a sign from God, endue him, or at least prayed that he might be endued, with gifts fit for his office, and blessed him." "We cannot but believe," declares a tract of high Puritan authority, published in 1616,[1] "it to be unlawful and sinful to fetch, receive, yea to use, a ministry formerly received from the prelates, and that a minister so reputed, without any particular flock, is, indeed, no minister."[2] The Bible was not to be read in the churches without authoritative comments; and this alone the minister of the parish, as a rule, was entitled to give.[3] "Ministers," said President Clap, "in their public preaching and joint consultations in counsels, are an ordinance appointed by God, to hold forth light and life to his church, and declare the true sense and meaning of Scripture." Weekly communions were recommended, and fasts and vigils were prescribed as means of grace, Cotton Mather keeping no less than sixty fasts and twenty vigils in the course of the year. Baptism was held, as we have seen, to bring the infant children of believers into the covenant of grace, though whether both parents should be baptized in order to entitle the child to baptism, was a question by which the church was for a generation convulsed. The order of deaconesses was advised, though with only occasional success, the maturing of the plan awaiting the future action of advanced thinkers of another communion. And although the controversy as to the validity of the famous leather mitten ordination of Mr. Israel Chauncey, son of President Chauncey, turned rather upon the question

[1] "The Confession and Protestation of certain Christians," attributed to Henry Jacobs, Hanbury Memorials, Vol. i. p. 296; Trumbull's Lechford's Plain Dealing, p. 16.

[2] To the same purport, though not so explicit, is the Cambridge Platform, as condensed in Uhden's New Eng. Theol. (Conant's Trans.), p. 159. President Clap, in his discourse on New England Churches, published in 1755, doubts whether any communion which is not congregational can be a church. All non-congregational bodies are "sects."

[3] Compare Welde's answer to W. R. pp. 37, 38.

whether the ordainer who wore leather mittens was himself an intruder, than upon whether leather mittens were non-conductors; yet the very fact of a discussion as to the regularity of such an ordination shows the importance which, in the eyes of many, ordination assumed.[1] And besides this, to the New England clergy was committed, in colonial times, to a degree unknown in other modern communions, the power not merely of excommunication, but attaching to such excommunication secular penalties.[2]

It is true that while the dominancy of the clergy was generally accepted, the high sacerdotal views of which I have spoken, were held only by a small party; but it must be remembered that it is only by a small party, active, vigorous, and able as it may be, that extreme views of this class have been maintained in the English church. And an obvious cause is that I have mentioned — the vacuum of institutionalism as an organism abandoned by life. Who shall enter in? What inmate more proper than sacerdotalism, treating the institution as itself emitting grace?

Yet I may notice another cause of sacramentalism, which, if less obvious, is the more effective, because it operates incidentally rather as part of a popular scientific tendency than by direct theological propagandism. How does a "germ" differ from a "protoplasm"? What is the primordial monad on which materialism, turning back to stage preceding stage of development, rests its weary gaze? What is the color or shape of that minute pulp from which proceed, in motley but mighty procession, thoughts which agitate, which delight, which instruct, which remodel the world? How significant it is, but how undefinable! How without *differentia*, and yet, the progenitor of every kind of differentiation! How utterly powerless itself, and yet how productive of power! And is not this the case, according to the sacramental theory,

[1] Eliot's Biog. Dict., p. 101; Pierce's Hist. Harv. Coll., p. 163.

[2] As an illustration may be mentioned the ecclesiastical censure, by the minister of the parish, of President Dunster of Harvard College, for holding that faith was a condition of baptism. This censure was followed by an indictment from the grand jury.

with the germ of grace, in itself invisible, intangible, defying analysis, yet endowed with immense contingent force as a protoplasm? And as, on a theistic-materialistic view the monad, with its want of differentia, yet its capacity of ultimate vast differentiation, is implanted by God, why not the germ of sacramental grace, revived by the waters of baptism and the eucharistic bread? And must we not here admit that we have a great advance on the theory of Locke, and of the rationalistic divines whom Locke led, and of Stuart Mill, who so often quotes these divines? For we are thus taught by the theistic materialist, as well as by the sacramentarian, that conscience is not the creature of the world about us, injected, as it were, hypodermically by extraneous mundane power. It is not the slave of education, but education's monarch; it is the "categorical imperative" which directs society, not the cringing dependent which society creates. It may come into us as either "germ" or "protoplasm"; it matters not what we call it, if it be thus the crowning characteristic of our race. And whatever we may call it, we may recognize it as in accordance with the statement of the sacred text, that in the beginning God gave his Holy Spirit to man. In this sense the sacramentarian, holding to germs of grace implanted at the origin of our race, and revived by baptism, may accept the view given by Herbert Spencer, in his late remarkable essay on the Data of Ethics, where he tells us that conscience was originally a monad, planted in the breast of the earliest of our progenitors, and from thence transmitted, varying, like other primordial gifts, under extrinsic training, as race differs from and succeeds to race. And when this theory of conscience is maintained, apart from revelation, by men of high intellect and scientific weight; when its superiority over that propounded by Locke is felt by all devout minds; when in this way the power of grace may be based on grounds not merely probable and popular, but consonant with the opinions of some of the most eminent of the fathers of the ancient church, we should not unduly criticise the sacramental theory of "germs." It may not be true. But view-

ing it as embodying the idea of grace divinely imparted and afterwards fructifying in the heart, not merely of man individually, but of mankind collectively, it may be nearer the truth than is the counter-proposition that grace is obtained by each man fresh for himself.

Another cause of sacramentarianism may be found in the natural reaction of devout minds from the lightness with which the sacraments have been sometimes spoken of by those accepting too exclusively the subjective side of faith, and by those holding to merely its formal side. A sacramental reaction, indeed, would be of value if it would teach us to reverence the sacraments as divinely appointed means of grace, and as the symbols of the pardoning and reconciling work of Christ. A sacramental revival would be still more valuable if it went further, and taught us to dwell more on the sacramental character of marriage, not made so by any sacerdotal benediction, but by the nature of the estate itself, as an ordinance which, established by God, and concerning matters not of ceremony, but of the highest and most essential morality, cannot be modified by man. But a sacramental revival would cease to be valuable, and would become pernicious and destructive, if it teach us to seek the substance of grace in the sign.

VI. Of *Ritualism*, as a sort of efflorescence of sacramentarianism, it might be proper to speak; and yet it cannot but be felt that ritualism, in its merely aesthetic shape, is not the peculiarity of any particular church, but is the outcome of an age which is both artistic and humane. Who among those who love to ornament their own houses — who feel that in so doing they foster valuable industries and nourish refined tastes, while making home more winsome to their children — but must hold that it is proper that such ornaments should be placed in the house of God? In days of stern simplicity, when plainness had its particular strength, it might have been otherwise; but not so in days when energy, skill, probity, and industry are wrought up in the production and exhibition of the beautiful, and when from such exhibition

so many elevating influences stream. God might himself, had it suited his wisdom, have excluded the beautiful from his works. He might, for instance, have led water from hill to valley through iron tubes, in sombre and severe economy, without waste in what may appear to us superflous fructifications. But instead of this, he has sent it singing and dancing through the winding channels of grass-lined brooks, over which stoop in the spring the lily, and in the fall the golden rod, and the purple aster, and over whose currents myriads of gay and delighted creatures hum and wheel. It is certainly not in accordance with the divine will, as expressed in nature, that we banish from the house of God the beauty with which we adorn the houses in which we dwell ourselves. And the poor — is it not well that for them there should be a home glowing with rich colors, whose tesselated roof rests on majestic enfoliated arches, speaking at once of delicacy and of strength, and through whose aisles solemn music floats? And ministers' dress — when we walk through that sumptuous room in Memorial Hall in which banquet the students of the now largest college of Puritan institution, have we the heart to criticise the costumes of the eminent Puritan divines, whose portraits hang on walls mounted by grotesque mediaeval gargoyles, relieved by Chrysostom sculptured in his chasuble, and Bossuet in his rochet? As we inspect, under these comprehensive auspices, our Puritan predecessors, can we say that the embroidery of their lace bands is out of place, or the precise and elaborate uniformity of their black gowns? They were strong and plain men; yet they felt that official robes are something, and they sometimes resented with no little spirit — so some of their biographers tell us — disrespect to this dress. And if we here withhold our criticism, can we consistently censure the Anglican parish minister, whose stipend is small, whose social honors are not numerous, who holds no political rank, whose every-day coat is threadbare, whose frame, when you meet him in the street, bends with care; if, when officiating in his chancel he lifts himself in what may appear proud erectness in his

white robes, careful that they should be neat and clean, a sort of emblem of the attitude of the minister of God? Certainly we ought not to cavil at this; nor ought we to cavil at music we might consider a little too rapid and incessant, or ornaments we might consider a little florid, if they create in worshippers, especially in poor worshippers, an increased interest in the places in which they worship. But cavil we must, if ritualism goes farther. It certainly is straining too far the materialistic analogies on which sacramentarianism rests, to suppose that as oxygen is emitted by flowers and electricity by fur, so there may be a sort of capillary emission of grace from the flowers and furs of ceremonials. And when this is done the frivolous takes its place with the idolatrous.

VII. Finally comes *Broad Churchmanship*; but we must at once feel that broad churchmanship is a party only in name. Thus Presbyterians of modern days, who reject *jure divinoism* in polity, follow Hooker in broad-church views of church government; while the modern exclusive high churchman, in his narrow views of polity, follows the Puritans, whom Hooker refuted. As to open communion, Episcopalians and Presbyterians are broad, in contrast with the Baptists. As to flexibility of ritual, the Romanist is broad in contrast with the Episcopalian. The Unitarian may be as narrow in the primacy assigned by him to culture, as is the Romanist in the primacy assigned by him to the pope. Breadth of comprehension of the gospel, also, may arise from very different causes. The mystic, unable to distinguish the orb from the penumbra, may regard the penumbra as all orb; the rationalist, unwilling to make the distinction, may regard the orb as all penumbra. Romanticism may idealise the church, viewing it, as sometimes did Mr. Kingsley, as a chivalry; or repressionism may enroll it, as did Lord Eldon, in the police; or enthusiasts may summon it forth as a crusader; or utilitarians may depress it into a poor-house; and to each of these observers others may seem to be "broad." There have been devout men, also, of all ages, who have been called "broad,"

because they overlooked the lines of dogma or polity accepted in their day; yet these men may be grouped in schools differing more widely from each other than they do from the church which they were supposed to hold to lightly. If, however, we are to particularly distinguish as broad churchism the critical school, which is now, in all Protestant communions, engaged, it may be boldly, in inquiring into the authenticity of the several particles of the canonical Scriptures; in determining what is the sense of these Scriptures when relating to facts established by physical science; in comparing current theological dogmas with the conclusions of psychology and sociology; then we may recur to the position with which we started, and inquire whether it is inconsistent with the nature and traditions of the church that we should regard investigators of this class as advance guards, who from the very order of things, start forth instinctively to struggle on frontiers on which the church may be assailed, and to entrench themselves on the asailants' own ground.

The struggle at present, let it be remembered, is for the possession of posts which, if manned by the church, would not only strengthen it, but add to its sway. What if by Christians it should be proved that in the patience of God's eternal purpose, the earth, filled as it now is by beings who may endure for countless ages, should have been for countless ages in evolution before it was fitted to become their habitation? Would it in any way lessen our conception of the divine power and wisdom should Christians unite in demonstrating that the dust, from which Scripture tells us the first man was framed, was in itself the pregnant germ of future ascending, as well as multiplying life? Would the authority of the sacred text, would our sense of the dignity of man, be diminished, if Christian apologists should occupy the position that in the breast of the first man God implanted a germinal moral sense, to flow, swelling and refining from age to age, through the breasts of his descendants? Would the authenticity and authority of the canonical Scriptures be weakened, if Christian critics should show that passages heretofore

suspected are spurious; and that these Scriptures, as well as all other authoritative records, when they unite substantial unity with circumstantial discrepancy, conform to what is an unvarying incident of complex documentary truth? Suppose that Christian expositors should argue that the many and few stripes which Christ describes as the discipline of the next world, involve great variation in the duration, as well as the intensity, of future punishment; and suppose that in this way the position of the wiser of humanitarians be occupied in vindication of Christianity, — suppose this be done, would it in any degree lessen the liberty of those who hold to no such inequalities? If there be a party engaged in these various efforts, who can say that such a party, acting under that very instinctive energy of extension and vindication which we have already found existing, as if from the nature of things, in the church, may not be properly ranked among those skirmishers by whom the position of assailants is sought and tried, and by whom new defences of the faith are established on what was before alien ground? We must recollect that in this way some of the surest advances of Christianity have been made. When the meaning of the text was believed, in the apostolic age, to be, as at the first glance it is, that Christ was to reappear on earth in that very generation, it was by thinkers who, propelled by the essential vital force of Christianity, advanced boldly into the ranks of those who insisted on the permanence of the race, and seized upon this permanence as a fortress which belonged to Christianity of right, — it was by these thinkers that the truth of the permanent adaptation of Christianity to a permanent race was made good. In the same way Gnosticism was met, and its strongholds occupied, by men who were regarded by the more timid as assailing the church themselves, but who by this advance dominated a territory in which many devout Christians have since found an abode. In this way there were men, even among the clergy, who, in spite of the antagonism of the church as a body, accepted the positions of Galileo as adding additional

strength to Scripture, and illustrating with fresh power the nature of the mission of Christ. In obedience to the same vital and expansive instinct, the Bible, as the Reformation was brooding, was thrown into the vulgar tongue, though in the process new meanings were shot out. So was it during the Reformation, when wise and devout men seized upon what the old church called rationalism, and held this very fortress, previously hostile, in defence of the faith. So was it in times near to us, when geology, as a new science, proclaiming creations and long endurances and demolitions, and then new creations, was at first denounced, and then, when an ally against the common foe of positivism, accepted as a friend, and its breast-works manned by contingents from among our most orthodox schools. So may it be in our own days. It may be that the party, if it be a party, which boldly, yet in Christian loyalty, enters into the field of textual criticism, destroying the untenable and fortifying the tenable, may make the field of textual criticism one of the chief outposts of the truth. And so may it be with those who seize on the theory of development, cosmical or individual, and on that field erect the banner of Christ, proclaiming that it is in accordance both with his word and mode of working that seed and germ are made pregnant with protoplastic power; that in the beginning he framed them, thus wonderfully endowed; that over their propagation and variation in development he watches; and that their multiform fruit he will at last gather into his many-mansioned house.

If, therefore, there be a party engaged in this work, we may place it in that line of advance-guards who go forth, first in one direction, then in another, wherever the church may be at the time assailed, occupying new eminences, from which Christianity may dominate new fields. The contention, then, to which I return, is, that from this long series of parties, proceeding in this way as pioneers, each on its distinct mission, as if in obedience to a common instinct, though in modes very diverse and to quarters diametrically opposite, we may argue not merely the vitality, but the unity and

perpetuity of the church from which they proceed. We could have argued at least the temporary vitality and unity of imperial Rome from the troops she sent forth, generation after generation; some indurated to winter, to build roads and plant forts on the Scotch marches; others tempered to oriental heats, to subjugate the East; each legion, when conquering, to some extent assimilating with and absorbing the distinctive civilization that it overcame. We might say the same of England in our own day, with her troops on the Red River, in South Africa, in North India. But Rome passed away; for a few generations only was the tread of her soldiers felt on snow or sand; and her heart beat less and less rapidly until it was congealed in death. The power of England has its time in which to wane. But Christianity has not waned. It has witnessed from its divine throne the obsequies of dynasty after dynasty, some long and majestic, others fitful and tragic, yet each with its own temporary signs of life, its central activity, its propagandism far or near. They have vanished, and Christianity has remained, growing calmer, more thoughtful, more comprehensive, more far-reaching, more sympathetic with new phases of temper and new processes of thought, as time flows on. Still go forth from her parties advancing to new positions and occupying new fields; and, far as some of them may appear to depart from her centre, still do they continue to attest, with a strength proportioned to the energy of their advance, her constancy and her vital power. I do not say that the church's vitality and perpetuity can in this way be demonstrated. For no moral truth can be demonstrated. But I do say that in proportion to the length of the endurance of this spiritual empire, thus seizing and occupying new fields of civilization, may not only its vitality and perpetuity, but its unity, be inferred. The instinct is from the centre. The power with which these parties act argues a central law of vitality in the body from which they proceed, just as the procession of curative and fortifying functions to any wounded part of the human frame argues a central law of vitality

in that frame. Their long procession and fresh renewal through centuries, while secular throne after throne has passed away, argue the permanence of the institution from which they spring. Even the circumvallation they construct about the outposts enables us to determine the centre of the faith.

As we proceed from the centre to the outposts, the battalions into which the defenders of the faith are divided separate, as we have seen, more and more widely, and in the outposts at which they are stationed acquire more or less of the distinctive culture they go forth to possess. As these very battalions, when their term of service is over, return home, then does this distinctive culture, so far as it is alien, pass away; and the nearer they approach the centre, the nearer do they approach each other. The time will come when they will mingle in a common host about the throne. But as this time draws nigh, each will have something to impart, as well as something to retain. Each has its conquest to divide, and its primordial faith to retain. This faith is evangelical — belief in Christ for us, and Christ in us, Christ the propitiation for our sins, and Christ giving us new life. But around this central faith are ranged subordinate banners, won in many hard fields — that of institutionalism, vindicating the right of the church to historic continuity; that of ethics, exhibiting the dependence of morality on religion; that of sacramentarianism, maintaining the reality of things spiritual; that of free thought, claiming all the domain of intellect as subservient to the truth. As we ourselves approach the period when we will be disbanded from earthly service, we will not become less evangelical. But we may find ourselves more and more sacramentarians in the true and pure sense; more and more impressed with an appreciation both of the ethical and of the institutional sides of the faith; more and more loyal to the catholic creeds; and more and more fearless in appealing to reason as, co-ordinately with revelation, the factor by which these creeds are established.