

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 *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

THE CHRONIC DISLOYALTY AMONG EVANGELICALS TO THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

JUSTIFICATION, instant and entire, bestowed freely by grace Divine on the score of Christ's merits only and received by the sinner through faith only, is what Evangelical Protestants hold and teach.

Their recognized exponents have from time to time given stated expression to their estimate of the paramount importance of the doctrine. This they have done in view of its immediate Christian Gospel essentiality, and still more especially in the light of its cruciality as a definitive safeguard against Romanism. Luther, to begin with, who described it as "the article of a standing or a falling Church," also affirmed: "It is by the preaching and publishing of this one point of doctrine that Popery is vanquished and banished out of men's hearts. For, though you traverse their tyranny, etc., never so much, yet you shall prevail nothing."¹ Calvin said that, if this truth were conceded, it would not pay the cost to dispute the other questions lying between the two opposing camps.² "It is," Hooker maintained, "the grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and the Church of Rome."³

Let there be added a few testimonies of modern date, taken at random and limited to spokesmen, belonging to Hooker's *Church of England*. Bishop J. C. Ryle declared that "there is no doctrine about which we ought to be so jealous. . . . All Rome's rotten props to support uneasy consciences are rendered necessary by her denial of Justification by Faith."⁴

¹ On Psalm cxxx. Tyranny "would cover the arrogancies of supremacy and infallibility."

² G. S. Faber, *Provincial Letters*, 132. In this Calvin is corroborated by Döllinger, who likewise held that all other elements of conflict between the two parties were in comparison not supremely serious. (Acton, *Essays on Freedom, etc.*, p. 394). Dr. Thomas Arnold, the Broad Churchman, also asserted that "the essence of Popery does not consist in the accidental exaltation of the Bishop of Rome, but in those principles which St. Paul found in the Judaizing Christians" (*Life by Dean Stanley*, II, p. 241).

³ Sermon on Justification.

⁴ *Knots Untied*, ch. 17.

Rev. J. M. Cramp, who wrote a century ago the history of the Council of Trent, asserted that "whatever else may be considered non-essential, this doctrine cannot be. It is a foundation principle: error here is fatal."¹ Rev. N. Dimock, probably the most erudite of latter-day Evangelical Churchmen, thus states the position: "As we stand at the fountain-head of the controversies which divide us from the Roman Church, here is the parting of the streams."²

Its historical place also as the decisive issue at the Reformation has been abundantly emphasized. Dr. Mackinnon, the author of the standard *Life of Luther*, though himself as a Modernist no supporter of the doctrine, insists that "the kernel of the Reformation is, indeed, the doctrine of Justification." "The Reformation would never have eventuated, had not the question of Justification emerged as the crucial one."³ After Henry VIII promulgated the reactionary pro-Roman "Six Articles" in 1539, Bucer wrote to Cranmer a lament on the grave outlook before English Reform, yet urged him to maintain and proclaim faithfully the, still permissive, doctrine of Justification, "so that the kingdom of Christ may yet remain among you."⁴ Salmon notes how "the Trent Fathers regarded Luther's doctrine of Justification as the central error from which all his other errors had sprung."⁵ When Laud's party, at the opening of the century following, reverted to the pre-Reform attitude on Justification and kindred doctrines, though still opposing Papal Supremacy, etc., the Romanists overseas proceeded joyfully to claim them as wholly theirs.⁶

In their prizing of and relying upon this blessed truth, Evangelicals have no allies throughout the whole religious world. All other religions, save the Gospel, as adumbrated in the O.T. and revealed in the N.T., set aside God's full and free and undeferred forgiveness. It elicits from the "natural" man no welcome but rather repulsion. Can he deserve nothing? Must he be wholly beholden to Divine grace? The Apostle, when he proceeded to insist on an unmodified anti-legalism, could safely ask the challenging question: "Am I now doing the man-pleaser?" (Gal. i. 10). "Specially for this article which

¹ *Test book* (second edit.), p. 101.

² *Protestant Dictionary*.

³ *Life of Luther*, II, pp. 329, 338.

⁴ *Original Letters* (Parker Society), 529.

⁵ *Sermons in 1861*, p. 229.

⁶ Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 42 (Dublin, 1719 edit.).

we so diligently teach," says Luther, "we encounter the hatred and persecution of Satan and the world." Yes, he goes on, "the religion of the (modern) Jews and of the Turks and of the Papists are all one—they all trust in their works and worthiness."¹ Similarly Sir Monier Williams, the forty years Professor of Sanscrit, bears testimony that "of the Sacred Books of the East the one keynote, the one refrain throughout, is salvation by works". So it has been up to this very hour; let the position adopted be still legalism in any form; there is indeed accusation of sin, but no assurance of a perfect forgiveness, since it has to be earned. Let it be revolutionary modernism: sin denotes the awakened sense of moral dissatisfaction, and therefore becomes itself its own proper condoner, if at all a condonation can be fairly needed. Accordingly, Luther's biographer, as already noted, himself disowns this pivotal tenet;² similarly, Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, the late eminent Congregational theologian;³ and we also find the doughty Dr. G. G. Coulton, consistently and regularly describing Papal Infallibility instead as the fundamental doctrine of Romanism.

It might be expected then that a spirit of gallantry and championship would unite with their sense of its transcendent importance and preciousness to secure a tenacious, unflinching adherence to this doctrine on the part of those who espouse it. Who among them, one would say, that has known or even heard of some previously thorough reprobate crying out, either literally or in effect,

*I in the depths of ruin lay,
But, praise the Lord, I'm saved to-day,*

could possibly ever waver on the point? Which of them that has read of the trepidation and semi-despair that haunts the dying moments of the Romish devotee (as distinct from the nondescript), in many an instance, could ever afterwards be found executing a somersault, however gradual, in their insistence on this blessed truth? Surely these words of the rationalist Lecky, the historian, ought to be emblazoned in gold: "It is the glory of Protestantism, whenever it remains faithful to the spirit of its founders, that it has destroyed this engine [of

¹ On Gal. iii. 13 and Ps. cxxxii.

² *ibid.*, iv. p. 264.

³ *Integrity of Scripture*, p. 161.

Romish priestly tyranny wielding its deathbed absolution]. . . . The doctrine of Justification by faith, which diverts the wandering mind from all painful and perplexing retrospect, concentrates the imagination on one Sacred Figure, and persuades the sinner that the sins of life have in a moment been effaced, has enabled thousands to encounter death with perfect calm or even vivid joy, and has consoled innumerable mourners.”¹ Who that can corroborate that impressive considered statement will be capable in the course of time of becoming unsteadfast and disaffected in his allegiance to this so Divinely-owned article? Who that is aware of the long deadly struggle wherein it was rescued for us, having been once taught to rest in heart upon its security, can later on backslide from it?

However, none other than Luther himself warns us against harbouring over-optimism in this regard. “It is most essential,” says he, “that we teach and repeat this article continually; it cannot be beaten into our ears too much. Though we learn and understand it well, there is no one that takes hold of it or heartily believes it to perfection. So frail and so disobedient to the spirit is our flesh.”² And the whole continuous history of the Church confirms his monition.

The record of inconstancy might be said to start with the Apostle Peter at Antioch (Gal. ii.). Peter intended no actual defection from the Gospel Justification doctrine, as Paul recognizes. But he would temporarily shelve principle in favour of expediency. For the Jewish disciples from Jerusalem, still scrupulous as to Mosaic ordinances which potentially compassed the whole Sinaitic law, it would be the contracting of ceremonial defilement to join Gentiles at meals: so let them be spared the stumbling block; let both communities take food separately during the indefinite interval; it would entail no hardship on the Gentiles. But Paul foresaw that ultimately this would impel the Gentiles, for the sake of parity of fellowship, to get circumcised, and to aim at keeping the whole Law and that for salvation. It would be, as he said, a building up again of what they as Apostles had just demolished.

That encounter (if it is proper to call it such) was but an episode in the protracted struggle which Paul conducted against Judaic work-salvation in Antioch, Corinth, and Galatia.

¹ *England in the Eighteenth Century*, II., p. 638.

² On Gal. i. 3.

He gained the day, but a day it only was: "the pathos of Christian history is that, not long after Paul's great victory was won, this very perversion of Christianity did triumph" (A. T. Robertson). When the Rabbinic merit-salvation went out by the front door, that of the humanly native type pushed in from the rear. The Pauline Epistles gradually and steadily fell into the background, and remained there till Augustine's day.

Augustine, for all his luminous flashes of insight into Grace Divine, was too much entangled in the then established ecclesiastical dogmas, as to baptism and its mechanically regenerating and sanctifying efficacy, ever to arrive, during his only averagely extended lifetime, at a Scripturally consistent position regarding Justification. He can, for example, allow for a choice between the imputed and inherent senses of "justify", but he will not for himself come to a clear determination. Yet it may be said on his behalf and to his credit, when we compare him with our post-Reformation weathercocks, that an erstwhile toper's glass to which he is seeking to restrict himself is a very different thing from the glass with which an erstwhile teetotaller is now tinkering, though in amount they are exactly the same. Luther himself in his earliest, his awakening, days used vacillating language.¹

The case is pretty similar with Bernard of Clairvaux. Luther² remarks on the contradictoriness manifested between his private devotional utterances and statements made in his public disputations. However, we must not fail to educe from the circumstance the reassuring and consoling reminder which it affords of the promise of Christ that the Spirit about to be sent would abide in His Church for ever (John xiv. 16). At the dawning of the Reformation the old message begins to receive reaffirmation among the Wiclifites.³ Savonarola also had got a grasp of it. It is pointed out to Luther's harrowed soul in the monastery by his vicar-general Staupitz. So far is it from being true to say that Luther "discovered" the doctrine, though under God he gloriously recovered it, for us.

The doctrine was then, at the Reformation, critically debated and became precisely defined, as it had not been before. And it is the ensuing period, up to the present day, on which

¹ McKinnon, *Life*, I, p. 200.

² On Ps. cxxx.

³ See Dyson Hague, *Wiclif*; S. M. Trevelyan, *Age of Wiclif*.

one would here venture to bestow attention restricting our survey to these British Isles, and to two-voiced statements of some of those who had (or have) officially subscribed, or at least as lay people given passive allegiance, to confessions which embodied this doctrine.

We can begin with "the greatest and wisest human being"¹ "the mightiest intellect that ever lived upon earth"² —Shakespeare. He in his will, made two months before he died, commended his soul to God, "hoping and assuredly believing, through the only merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting". Yet in *The Tempest*, one of his latest plays, Prospero, who is thought to have portrayed the dramatist's own self, is unable to say more than:

*My ending is despair
Unless I be relieved by prayer,
Which pierces so that it assaults
Mercy itself and frees all faults.*

Then, take Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. He left behind a sermon on Justification thoroughly Pauline and Lutheran. Nevertheless, in his studiously composed *Devotions*, he reproduced the petition which the Prodigal was given the instinct to withhold, "Make me one of Thy hired servants". And he asks for "good hopes of sins' remission through repentance and good works".

Again, we have the case of most of the Cambridge Platonists, specially Whichcote and Smith, blandly disowning any actual rejection of this doctrine, but taking good care not to preach it, for fear, forsooth, of a resultant antinomianism.

One notices another instructive seventeenth-century instance of this fluctuation of spiritual outlook on a lay person's part, in the Diary of the excellent Queen Mary (of Orange). Early in life she writes: "I approached the Table, as is recommended, relying entirely upon the merits of my Saviour"; and yet a little while after, she writes again: "This courage (which she puts in God's providence as to national affairs) I hope will serve to prepare us well for death". Then, in later days she records: "I went about my business thinking so long as I

¹ According to A. K. H. B.

² According to Hare (of *Guesses at Truth*).

was careful to do my duty to God and man, I might rest satisfied that my soul would be happy, whatever happened to the body"; yet presently she is praying: "Bring us unto Thee through Thy Son our Lord Who died to redeem and purchase to Himself a peculiar people".¹

As we pass on to the eighteenth century, perhaps we first bethink of the *Spectator* literary circle, complacent Churchmen all of them. Addison benevolently wrote a Defence of the Christian Religion, but it knows nothing of this foundation article. In his famous essay, *The Aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelicalism*, John Foster is eloquent and impressive on this smug doctrinal shelving.

Bishop Butler (of the *Analogy*) can be seen to have been Janus-faced enough also on the subject. Where the systematic and creedal is called for, he can quote, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us"; or "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them", and such like texts. But, while he is in his native stride, it transpires that Christ "obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life"; was made man, that he might teach us our duty, and more especially enforce the practice of it, reform mankind, and finally bring us to that eternal salvation of which He is the author"; that "resignation to the will of God is the whole of piety"; and that, "with regard to religion, there is no more required than what men are well able to do".²

The classic example of tergiversation, however, in this regard is afforded by John Wesley. Let us take a look through his *Journal(s)*. In 1738 he gains assurance of salvation through trust in Christ alone, whilst someone was reading out Luther on *Romans*. Next year, he insists that Justification by faith alone, the death and righteousness of Christ being the meritorious and faith the sole conditional or instrumental cause, is the grand antidote to Popery. All other of her errors, be they a hundred, are trifles light as air, compared to Justification by works, "or, to express the same thing more decently, by faith and works". Again in 1740: "We have wandered many years in the new path of salvation by faith and works"; "it pleased God to show us the old way, of salvation by faith only". But

¹ *Life*, by M. Bowen, pp. 116, 121, 230, 248.

² *Analogy*, I. chap. iv; II, chap. v; *Sermons*, xi, xiv.

in 1741 the "first love" is in process of getting left beyond recall. Luther's *Galatians* (which Bunyan had valued next to the Bible) is pronounced to be a "dangerous treatise", so much so that the London congregation must needs be warned against it. Meantime, on the other hand, he has been reading the Caroline Bishop Bull. Bull's book "sets out that all good works, and not faith alone are the necessary previous condition". Faith alone, indeed, may be taken as that condition, provided it be interpreted to mean "all inward and outward good works"! There are, in sooth, two justifications, inward good works preceding the first, and inward and outward ones together the second—the Romish grace of "congruity" and of "congruity". So far from abusing this, as he does Luther's, Wesley partly transcribes its contents.¹ He is retracing his steps again to "the new way". In 1750 his blunt avowal, to Bishop Lavington, of being an advocate of prayer for the "faithful" dead shows what he holds as to the entireness, completeness, of justification here below, as likewise his remonstrance made, later, to his own society at Canterbury, about some preacher's affirming that one might be justified "just now", shows how he stands as regards its instantness. The appended "only" to faith henceforward disappears, and that not always ingenuously; he issues an appeal in 1764 to the more orthodox revival leaders for a concordat with his own section on an agreed threefold basis which includes "justification by faith", without any reminder that there was such a thing as a Bull meaning for "faith".

In his published *Journal* in 1767 he asks if it was not high time to cast away Justification by Faith (apparently whether with or without "only") as so much frothy, long-drawn verbiage, seeing that we allow that a pious man may be saved without having had a clear conception of it. This with friendly critics passes for an epochal point in his career. Alex. Knox, the evening star of the Puseyite night, affirms that on that date a new light broke in upon his mind. Döllinger, of whose antagonism to Protestantism this doctrine was the centre and basis, conceived, according to Lord Acton, a mighty admiration for Wesley "as he was after Dec. 1st, 1767". But "the breach in the wall" had started as far back as 1741. Next, in

¹ We did not above notice that book in any temporal order, for Bull owns that he runs counter to "most divines" of his Church hitherto (1670), and takes shelter under the plea of an alleged indefiniteness of the standards.

1770, in his Conference Minutes, he enunciates that "nothing can be more false" than "that a man is to do nothing in order to justification".¹ "Works meet for repentance . . . if not in order to find favour, what does he do them for? . . . Is not this salvation by works?" And more to the same effect. At the same time, not unnaturally, he begins to evince an aversion to preaching the doctrine at all on normal occasions. At one time it is "shooting over heads", at another it is "not profitable", at another not "suitable". There were exceptional instances, however; pre-eminently in his "memorial" sermon at the Calvinist Tabernacle, following Whitefield's death in that very year, 1770. It was then and there "full and free justification"; "no merit in man"; "not by works, lest any man should boast, but by faith alone". The two foundation doctrines which Whitefield insisted on, Justification by Faith and the New Birth, "let us insist upon with all boldness, at all times, in all places"!! One is made bethink of the Latin *desultor*, "who rides two or three horses at once, leaps from one to the other, never on the back of any one of them long" (Trench). Yet, according to the R.T.S. prize volume on *Evangelical Belief* (1898), and to a paper read at the 1936 Islington (Evangelical) Conference, the three paladins of Justification by Faith have been the Apostle Paul, Luther, and —Wesley.²

Wesley has had at least one successor true to type. The 1928 President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, from his chair, told how, as candidate for the ministry (39 years before), he presented a MS. Sermon on this doctrine, and how a prominent Conference member afterwards told him: "Put it away; you'll never want it again". "He was quite right. I have never wanted to preach on that subject again. And what is more, I have never heard anyone preaching on it from that day to this. . . . We have dropped Paul's thoughts."*

Having thus herewith projected ourselves into our own times, we must not hark back. So let us adduce the case of Moody, the notable evangelist. On his second visit to England in 1883, according to Dr. R. W. Dale,³ he insisted on the

¹ Back in 1750 he has similarly taken exception to the Moravian position, "that we are to do nothing in order to Salvation but barely to believe".

² See *Journal*, in Dent's ed., I, pp. 102, 219, 225, 275, 316-7; II, p. 178; III, pp. 121, 172, 314, 368; IV, pp. 96, 333. *Works* (1872), VIII, p. 337; IX, p. 55.

³ *Meth. Recorder*, August 23rd, 1928.

initial need of repentance or penitence, on the part of his unconverted hearers, in order to qualify for the receiving of God's grace—as though it were a performing of some mental penance, an artificially self-torturing compunction, a putting on of some spiritual hair-shirt. And the outcome was that, though his audiences were as large and seemingly impressible as before, his preaching did not prove anything like so fruitful as on his first visit in 1875, when he, Luther-like, exultingly proclaimed God's free grace, as infallibly leading, when received, to penitence and to a thorough change of life.

The volume by Bishop O'Brien (of Ossory) on Justification by Faith ranked deservedly as a standard authority in the earlier Victorian days. Yet the Bishop in 1873, in his 81st year, announced to the public that he had "reasoned himself into" acceptance of the mechanical theory of Baptismal Regeneration, to the huge delight of the Puseyites.

The afterwards eminent George Salmon, of Dublin, preached and published, while he was Fellow of his university, two highly valuable sermons on this doctrine. The Reformers, he pointed out, made it the watchword by which all their battles were fought, and the Council of Trent accounted it as the central error of the Reform movement. He also dealt faithfully in them with the above Bull theory.¹ After he became Divinity Regius Professor, he delivered the course of lectures which, when issued under the title of *The Infallibility of the Church*, became famous and still safely retain their fame. But in that volume never a mention is accorded to Justification! Prove the Church or the Pope to be fallible and you give the finishing stroke to Rome. "If we can but strike one blow, the whole battle is won". And what was the further illuminating sequel? "For a man to say that he feels no interest in the R.C. controversy is to say", that book had declared, "that he does not care to know what are the conditions Christ has appointed for his salvation"; but, after he became Provost of the university, he could within a few years write: "I have not been keeping up even my interest in the controversy".²

"Free, instant, and entire" has been the time-honoured summary of the nature of this "act" of God's grace. But

¹ *Life*, p. 530.

² *Sermons in 1861*, pp. 225-9.

³ *Infallibility* (1890 edit.), pp. 8, 18; *Life of Provost J. H. Bernard*, p. 68.

ever and anon, to-day at "Evangelical" hands we are being treated to groundless distinctions between it and "salvation", or else to assertions or implications of its being itself progressive and incomplete (even if not conditional), which it would take a paper by itself adequately to traverse.

"I fear", said Luther, "lest this doctrine will be defaced and obscured when we are dead",¹ and the great reformer's foreboding has been well on the way to being verified. At the quatercentenary of the Augsburg Confession, in 1931, in the Lutheran Church, Paris, Pastor Lambert plaintively asked: "What has become amongst us of that gospel of Justification by Faith?" The Jesuit *Month* had substantial ground for making its scornful demand: "How many Protestants now hold Luther's doctrine of justification by faith?"²

What has been the fruit and outcome of all this inconstancy? In the purely personal relation it has dried up the fountain of Christian joy and gladness in salvation. The very term Gospel, good news, has become meaningless; the soul's justification is no longer free and instant and entire. What sense are we to assign to the Apostle's clarion note, Rejoice in the Lord? But surely we need not labour this point. Taking a wider outlook, we can see how it must needs have impaired materially the absolute paramountcy of Scripture as the Rule of Faith. And it has disabled us signally in winning over Romanists. A testimony to this from a dissentient quarter may be of interest. The present Protestant Dean of Belfast, well-known to be an intrepid and talented advocate of his cause, in reviewing in the Press the biography of a W. Ireland prelate of his Church of a century ago, with mild amusement noted that "the minds of our clergy at this period seem to have been much occupied with the more obscure³ doctrinal teachings of the Pauline Epistles. They were accustomed to debate as matters of the extremest importance the theology of justification". But he had already most appreciatively said, without decrying the connection, that "their work had far-reaching results among the people living round them. The number of converts won from Romanism was surprising".⁴ Certainly; like King David's Zebulonites, "they were not of a double

¹ On Gal. iii. 20.

² January 1937.

³ Yes, as Luther apprehended, they have been allowed to become "obscured".

⁴ *Ch. of Ireland Gazette*, December 16th, 1927.

heart": hence priestism could not stand scatheless before this message of theirs. How many, on the other hand, since those days, outside of Romanism, have, under stress of a disturbed conscience and without knowledge of the message those men so faithfully and soundly proclaimed, turned for relief to the priest? Furthermore, the backsliding is calculated to react to the security of our civil liberty. The doctrine has been the very parent of civil liberty. This has been acknowledged by even that foremost modernist, Dr. T. R. Glover.¹ It established an immediate personal relationship between the individual man and God, irrespective of any intervening functionary. All the implications were not felt at once or at first at the Reformation, but none the less Democracy in its best and broadest sense was the outcome. And, now that the doctrine is being jettisoned, civil liberty is being destroyed, *pari passu*, in the interests of a soul-killing and tyrannous collectivism.

The prime cause of the inconstancy on the part of evangelicals otherwise staunch and trusty can be nothing other than a proneness to mental oscillation in their sense and estimate of the gravity of sin in God's sight; and that at the expense unconsciously of loyalty to His revealed Word, with all its solemn expressive statements. They would not sophistically explain away sin, with the modernist; nor would they venture on helping out Christ to liquidate it with self-meriting activities, like the sacerdotalist. But how could God's love, God's Fatherhood, be over-stressed? Would we have Him appear harsh? We might, if we spoke of, hinted even at, danger ultimately dogging unpardoned sin; or if we intimated the actuality of there being two classes in His sight. We must of course try and find still an honourable, yet secondary, place for His holiness and His judgment to come. It is not easy, however, to conceive of respectable folk as "lost". They can hardly be quite as bad as that! Must such as they "flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before them"? During moods of this sort, the doctrine gets a holiday.

The main pretext alleged for the desertion has, as already adverted to, ever been dread of resultant antinomianism.

*Adieu to all morality ! if Grace
Makes works a vain ingredient in the case.*²

¹ *Jesus in Experience*, p. 249.

² Cowper, in irony.

Fallen human nature indeed being what it is, such an outcome—a wicked licentiousness sheltering itself behind Divine grace pretendedly accepted—is, in instances sadly numerous, only too liable to eventuate. And glaring samples of this met with in their experience may well have affected the equilibrium of many an evangelical teacher. It accrues largely, though no-wise wholly, from the doctrines having been presented to a hearer at the outset in a wrong proportion. One may not be stating the whole truth, though he states what is true and nothing but what is true. “We are justified by faith alone, but the faith that justifies is never alone.” The new birth wrought by the Spirit unfailingly accompanies the justification grasped by faith in Christ’s merits—righteousness imparted attaching to righteousness imputed. All other graces are faith’s inseparable comrades, though “they are shut out from the office of justifying”. How much harm has the slapdash only-believism of many a professional revivalist’s after-meeting been responsible for! And how rarely, if ever, does the settled evangelical pastor hold up the mirrors of good temper, veracity, forgivingness, unselfishness, non-respect of persons, etc., whereby his habitual hearers might test their redeemed standing in the Lord! Were it otherwise, your Burns, *e.g.*, would have learned to leave to someone else better entitled the girding at a minister when

*The moral man he does define,
But ne’er a word of faith in.*

Again, we have our dispensationalist teachers blandly ruling out God’s law from the concern of the believer in grace.¹ Unhappy factors such as these must be conceded.

But the Apostles were in their day likewise confronted with this most ugly thing, both theoretically and practically; yet they did not abate their affirmation of the Gospel doctrine one jot, notwithstanding. So with Luther, even though he is unreserved enough to declare that “when faith is preached, men *for the most part* understand the doctrine carnally”.²

Get rid of the sunshine and you will have no shadows. Get rid of morality, and we will be free of hypocrisy. Let us all become atheists, and Pharisaic formalism will disappear.

¹ *Evangelical Quarterly*, 1936, p. 283.

² On Gal. v. 13.

To the true evangelical "I believe in the Holy Ghost" is more than a creedal formula. He knows that God the Spirit, Who revealed the message, will "win His case when He comes before the court" of universal conscience, (Rom. iii. 4); that He will inspire His truly called ones to sing

*I will not work my soul to save,
For that my Lord has done.
Yet work I will, like any slave,
From love to God's dear Son.*

Newman himself has cleared the genuine evangelicals on that very count. "Protestants," says he, "do not think the inconsistency possible of really believing without obeying; and when they see disobedience they cannot imagine there the existence of faith", whereas Romanists hold that "faith and works are simply separable and ordinarily separated in fact".¹ Pusey, too, owned he had never in real life met an evangelical who held himself to be justified by bare belief.²

"Do we then make void the Law through faith? God forbid! nay, we establish the Law" (Rom. iii. 31). Here is the verdict of that great Unitarian Martineau: "If the establishment of the Reformation was marked by improved industry, sobriety, and order, by a more elevated estimate of human rights, and a more energetic sympathy with the outcast and oppressed, it must be remembered that on the very front of this great social Revolution was inscribed this very tenet. Those churches which have distinguished themselves by their powerful and beneficent effects, by their determined resistance to some social crime, by their dauntless protests against the corruption of a court or the oppression of a people, will be found to have been characterized by attachment to the same notion. Heathenism and slavery abroad, ignorance and depravity in our population at home, have been grappled with most strenuously by Christians of the same class. Christianity has never manifested itself in so disinterested and energetic a spirit as in churches which lay great stress on the doctrine of justification by faith."³ We may likewise recall the "Second Reformation" as it was at least to Britain, in the main the Evangelical

¹ *Difficulties of Anglicanism*, p. 223.

² *Eirenicon*, p. 4.

³ *National Duties*, p. 122.

Revival of the eighteenth century, and the encomiums of the historians, Lecky, Green, etc., upon the mighty blessings that followed in its wake. And then, to think that Evangelicals should now or ever be found half-ashamed to maintain and to proclaim the leading principle of those glorious spiritual awakenings!

J. WARREN.

Dublin.