

Anglican Communion which in the interests of Christianity among all English-speaking races—aye, and throughout the world—is most to be longed after and prayed for. The effect of such a reconciliation upon our conflict with infidelity at home, upon our assaults on Mohammedanism and heathenism abroad, upon the irreconcilable Church of Rome, and upon the degenerate, but improvable, churches of the East, would be simply incalculable. On the other hand, great as are the risks to which we have been hitherto exposed through our unhappy divisions, their continuance in the future appears likely to plunge us into more serious dangers, and to imperil the very maintenance of Christianity as our national religion. May He Who alone can order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men inspire the hearts of Churchmen and Nonconformists alike with a desire for union, and enable the desire to take effect in a wise and prosperous conclusion!

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.



## ART. II.—THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

(Concluded from the July CHURCHMAN, p. 537.)

### II.

AND now, having shown how inconclusive is the language so often quoted from Bishop Andrewes in support of the doctrines of our opponents, we proceed to show how thoroughly conclusive is language which may be quoted from him in support of the true Reformed doctrine of the Church of England.

It will probably be allowed that there is hardly a more conclusive evidence of adherence to the Reformed theology on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence than the figurative interpretation of the words of the institution.

By Lutherans and Romanists alike, by all who maintained the Corporal—or, as it is now called, the Real Objective—Presence, it was consistently maintained that no figurative sense was admissible in understanding the words of our Blessed Lord, "This is My Body." That solemn words, uttered on such an occasion, must be interpreted "ut verba sonant," and must not be allowed any metaphorical meaning—this was the very strong fortress of their position. To admit that such words could admit of a figurative interpretation—this was, in their view, to abandon the true faith of the Eucharist, to renounce a very true part of the faith of the Christian Church.

It would be an error, indeed, to speak of the interpretation

of our Lord's words in the upper chamber as a crucial test of Eucharistic doctrine. There have been, and there are, those who reject the figurative sense, while rejecting also the Real Objective Presence. But in vain, we believe, will any example be sought of any divine in our own or in former days (since the Reformation),<sup>1</sup> who upheld a figurative sense of the words, and yet maintained the doctrine of the Corporal Presence.<sup>2</sup>

How stoutly Lutheran theology set itself against such an interpretation is matter of history. How strongly such a sense of our Lord's words is opposed by the teachers of the new theology in the Church of England may easily be gathered from their writings. In his "Real Presence from the Fathers," Dr. Pusey has inserted a note "Against the attempt to explain away the force of the words 'This is My Body,' by the introduction of a figure." Let the reader be asked to read attentively the following quotations from this note:

God does not leave us doubtful whether, in Holy Scripture, He is speaking to us plainly or figuratively. Where there is a figure, God shows plainly that there is one. In the passages commonly quoted by Calvinistic interpreters to prove that the Holy Eucharist is a mere figure, Holy Scripture itself determines that there *is* a figure wherever there is one. Thus Gen. xli. 26, "The seven good kine are seven years: and the seven good ears are seven years." It is the explanation of a dream, in which Joseph said, "God hath showed unto Pharaoh what He is about to do." Ezek. xxxvii. 11, "These bones are the whole house of Israel," is the explanation of a vision. Matt. xiii. 38, 39, "The field is the world," is our Lord's exposition of a parable. And Rev. i. 20, "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches," are our Lord's exposition of a vision (pp. 64, 65).

In other places which these interpreters allege they have simply misunderstood Holy Scripture . . . Gen. xvii. 10, it is not said "Circumcision is My covenant;" whereas in verse 11 circumcision is expressly called the "token of the covenant." . . . Exod. xii. 11, "It is the Lord's passover" does not mean, "It is the sign of the Lord's passing over" (pp. 65, 66) . . . The argument from language is conclusive. There would be endless confusion, and our whole faith might be turned into a figure, if men might assume as they pleased that this or that, which they did not like to take literally, was a figure (pp. 65, 66, 68).

Now let the reader be asked to put beside this teaching the following from Bishop Andrewes, and to mark how clearly the Bishop comes under the condemnation of Dr. Pusey:

---

<sup>1</sup> Reforming divines frequently appealed to *earlier* writers who had taught that (but for the definitions of the Church) the words of the institution might very well have been understood in another sense than that of the Church of Rome. See, *e.g.*, Jeremy Taylor, Works, edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 12; and Andrewes, "Ad Bell. Resp.," pp. 12, 13, A.C.L., and especially Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 262.

<sup>2</sup> Picherellus (Opuscula, p. 23) may perhaps be quoted as an exception. And it would be satisfactory to learn that others have followed the example of his candour. But his Eucharistic doctrine will hardly (we suppose) be recognized as Romish by Romanizers.

Possumus . . . ut in aliis Sacramentis, ita et in hoc, Figurate : et nihil coactivum appareat, ut aliter intelligamus" ("Ad Bell. Respon.," p. 13, A.C.L.)<sup>1</sup>

Porro, negotium sibi facit, de Scripturarum sensu, Novatores (ubi Scriptura propriis verbis loquitur) pro nihilo ducere. Imo, pro nihilo non ducere, sed quod propriis verbis loquatur, negare. Nec tropos quaerere, sed, de Sacramento uno loqui ad morem reliquorum. De circumcissione, Hoc est factus meum in carne vestra. De Agno, Hoc est enim Pasche, id est, transitus Domini. . . . Tum, nec mille figuris rem agunt. Una modo ; nec alia, quam qua vos ipsi explicatis illud, Hic est calix, qui effunditur ; quem nec vos expedire potestis sine tropo. Denique, vestri homines, dum figuram unam fugiunt, mille se questionibus involvunt (*Ibid.*, pp. 213, 214).

(By the side of this last quotation should be read the margin, "Scripturæ sacræ sæpe figurate sunt intelligendæ.")

Is it possible, we ask, for any to read these extracts with ordinary attention, and not to see distinctly that these two divines are opponents coming from two hostile camps, and joining issue on this vital point? Will any, after this, be persuaded to believe that, on the matter of the Eucharistic Presence, the teaching of Bishop Andrewes was ever meant to give support to such teaching as that of our new theology?<sup>2</sup>

Not less strong and decided is the opposition of this new

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop is referring to the language of Cajetan : "Non apparet in Evangelico coactivum aliquod, ad intelligendum hæc verba proprie, nempe, Hoc est corpus meum."

It must not, of course, be supposed that Bishop Andrewes meant to reduce the sacramental elements to bare signs, or to give to the words of institution nothing more than what is commonly called the Zwinglian interpretation. He is, with the whole body of our Reformed divines, very strong in the repudiation of such a notion. Witness his words : "The truth is, Zwinglius was more afraid than hurt. It is well known whither he leaned ; that, to make this point straight, he bowed it too far the other way. To avoid *Est* in the Church of Rome's sense, he fell to be all for *Significat*, and nothing for *Est* at all. And whatsoever went further than *significat* he took to savour of the carnal presence. For which, if the Cardinal mislike him, so do we" ("Answer to Perron's Reply," Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 14).

Compare Bishop Morton : "Protestants do teach (as then Cardinal Bellarmine truly witnesseth) that in these words of institution ['This is My Body'] the bread is called Christ's Body *figuratively*, as being a sign or figure of Christ's Body ; yet such a figure as doth truly convey unto us the thing signified thereby ; for the which truth's sake Christ said not 'This bread is a figure of My Body,' but 'It is My Body.' Wherein we see two things plainly professed by all Protestants ; first, that the words of this Sacrament are not to be expounded according to the literal and proper sense ; secondly, that the matter of this Sacrament is the very Body and Blood of our Lord truly offered and exhibited unto us" ("Catholic Appeal," ii., ch. ii., § 24, pp. 121, 122. London, 1610).

<sup>2</sup> The Real Presence in the elements was certainly not the belief of one who could write of the Romanist as "Pretium Redemptionis suæ ita temere inter calicis labra positurum" ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 6, Ox., 1851). These words alone might have sufficed to clear the memory of Bishop Andrewes from the erroneous doctrines which have been so frequently imputed to him.

school of theology to the teaching of the Reformed, as to the Real Presence being the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the condition of death. There were not wanting, indeed, some among Lutheran divines who even maintained that faith which believes in the omnipotence of God, may very well be taught to believe in the very Corporal Presence in the elements of the dead body of the Saviour, or, at least, of the Body and Blood of Christ in a state of present separation.<sup>1</sup> But generally, we believe, it has been felt by our opponents, that the Real Objective Presence which they conceive to be upon the altar, cannot be believed to be the presence of that which now is *not*. Therefore they would have us believe that, though represented as in the condition of death, and perpetuating, in some sort, the victim condition, the Body and Blood of Christ which are really present are the Body and Blood of the living and glorified Redeemer.

What contempt is now being poured on what is called the *Cadaver* theory of the Eucharistic Presence!

It is well known to theological students how distinctly our old English divines have taken their stand with the teaching of the Reformed<sup>2</sup> in this matter—following the examples of the ancient Fathers, and maintaining, as with one voice, that the true *res sacramenti* of the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, not as in heaven, but as on the cross, not as glorified, but as crucified.

Now what was the teaching of Bishop Andrewes on this

<sup>1</sup> Witness the following: "Quod in decimo articulo dixerunt, si modo inibi factum est, corpus Christi sine sanguine et sanguinem ejus sine corpore esse non posse, plane est rejiciendum ac repudiandum, siquidem nugæ et fabulæ ipsorum cum primo fidei nostræ articulo, qui Deum omnipotentem adserit et confitetur, manifeste et ex diametro pugnant. Deus igitur cum sit omnipotens corpus sine sanguine, et sanguinem sine corpore nobis præbere potest, vivo nihilominus Christo, et salva corporis ac sanguinis Ejus substantia" ("Apologia Osiandri," in "Cælestini Historia Comitiorum MDXXX. Augustæ Celebratorum," tom. iii., fo. 86 b).

So certain Romanists also have maintained: "Corpus posse per Divinam potentiam simul vivum et mortuum in diversis locis esse" (see "Alberlinus, De Euch.," i., cap. xii., p. 76, edit. 1654).

Bellarmino, however, declares: "Ille autem non facit, nec est facturum in æternum, ut Christi corpus aliubi reperiatum mortuum" (De Euch. Lib. iv., Cap. xxi., c. 869).

<sup>2</sup> It may be true, indeed, that (as Waterland thinks) Calvin's teaching did not sufficiently clear the distinction between the *Crucified Body* as eaten by, and the *Glorified Body* as *united* to the Christian man. And possibly this may be a weak point in some teachings of Laudian theology also. But it should never be forgotten that (as Waterland himself has expressed it) "We eat Christ crucified in the Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of His death; and if we thus have part in His *Crucified* Body, we are thereby, *ipso facto*, made partakers of the Body *glorified*" (see Waterland's Works, Ox., 1843, vol. iv., p. 609; also pp. 570, 579, 601).

most important point? Does he in anywise separate himself from the teaching of other English divines in this matter? or does he stand on the same side, and join his voice with theirs? Let the following extract answer our inquiry:

He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve. Christ offered is it. Thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver* ("Sermons," vol. ii., p. 302, A.C.L.).

Again, "We are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering. So and no otherwise doth this text teach; so and no otherwise do we represent Him"<sup>1</sup> (*Ibid.*, pp. 301, 302).

Let the reader judge for himself whether the force of these quotations can be broken by alleging that Andrewes was too great and good a divine to mean what his words so obviously and plainly seem to say?<sup>2</sup> What the Bishop here says is perfectly consistent with all his other teachings. And we are at a loss to know how he could have spoken more unequivocally on this crucial question.

Elsewhere the Bishop has said, "Accipite Spiritum . . . . Accipite Corpus . . . . And no more need the bread should be changed into His Body in that, than His breath into the Holy Ghost in this . . . . both truly said, truly given, and truly received, and in the same sense without any difference at all" ("Sermons," vol. iii., p. 272, A.C.L.).<sup>3</sup>

The real difference between the two great contending schools on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence should be traced up to the difference of view in respect of the sacramental union. It must never, indeed, be supposed

<sup>1</sup> So again the Bishop says: "He left us the gifts of His Body and Blood: His Body broken, and full of the characters of love all over; His Blood shed, every drop whereof is a great drop of love" (Sermon VII., A.C.L., vol. iii., p. 233).

<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Wake says: "Whatever Real Presence this Bishop believed, it must be of His Crucified Body, and as in the state of his death; and that I think cannot be otherwise present than in one of these two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge: either figuratively in the elements, or spiritually in the souls of those who worthily receive them" ("Discourse of the Holy Eucharist in Gibson's Preservative," vol. x., pp. 69, 70).

<sup>3</sup> If further evidence were needed as to the doctrine of Bishop Andrewes on the Real Presence, it might be found in the answer to Cardinal Du Perron, written by Casaubon, "rege dictante," which is found among the works of King James, edited by Bishop Montague (See Pattison's "Casaubon," pp. 347, 348). There it is said of the dogma of Transubstantiation: "Istud non est rei veritatem pie credere: sed importuna curiositate modum decernere: quod Rex cum ecclesia sua nunquam est facturus numquam probaturus. . . . Ut igitur certo cognoscas, quid in hac Ecclesia super illa re credatur, quid doceatur, describam hic Reverendissimi viri Domini Episcopi Eliensis locum integrum, e libro quem

that the *unio sacramentalis* was rejected by the theology of the Reformed. Unguarded statements may doubtless be quoted from some perhaps hasty utterances in the earlier stages of the controversy. But it is a serious misrepresentation to speak (as Dr. Pusey has spoken) of Calvinistic interpreters as desiring to prove that the Holy Eucharist is a mere figure. The giving of the sign with the name of the thing signified for solemn purposes of donation, makes the sign itself an effectual sign—a sign effectual for the giving and receiving of that very thing the name of which it bears in the transaction. And the thought of reducing the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to bare signs was constantly and strongly repudiated by Reformed theologians, abroad as well as at home. The *unio sacramentalis* was upheld by divines of both schools alike. But there was a wide difference in their teaching as to the question—wherein this sacramental union consists. On the one side were those who taught that by this union the *res sacramenti* and the *sacramentum* were made on the altar into one compound adorable whole; on the other side were those who held that the union consists in that relation, in virtue of which the giving (by the minister), and the taking and eating of the *sacramentum* (by the body) is accompanied by and in union with the giving (by Christ), and the taking and eating (by the soul) of the *res sacramenti*. It is well expressed by Bishop White thus:

The bread may truly be termed the Body of Christ, because of a relative, pactional, and sacramental union and donation of the thing signified, together with the signs worthily received. . . . The object or thing carnally and bodily received is the elemental creature. The object and thing received spiritually and internally is the Body and Blood of Christ crucified upon the cross. The donor and distributor of this inward gift is the Blessed Trinity, the Son of God Himself, and by appropriation the Holy Ghost. The eating and drinking of it is by faith ("Reply to Fisher," pp. 405, 406; London, 1624).

So Perkins writes: "This sacramental union . . . is respective, because there is a certain agreement and proportion of the external things with the internal, and of the actions of one with the actions of the other" (Works, vol. i, p. 72; Cambridge, 1616).<sup>1</sup>

---

paucos ante menses adversus Cardinalem Bellarminum edidit." Then, after quoting the words of Andrewes, it is added: "Hæc fides Regis, hæc fides Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ: Quæ ut brevi compendio rem omnem complectar, in cœna Domini, realiter participem se fieri credit corporis et sanguinis Christi, ut patres Græci dicunt, et quod Bellarminus ipse fatetur, spiritualiter. Per fidem enim Christum apprehendunt et manducant: creduntque nullum aliud manducationis genus ad salutem utile esse posse. Quod et omnes vestri semper fassi sunt" ("Principis Jacobi Opera," Francofurti ad Mœnum, 1689, p. 188).

Now, from these two different views of the sacramental union there results of necessity a difference of regard in respect of the sacramental signs. Those on the one side will naturally be led to an adoration which, however explained, to those on the other side, will seem to border at least on idolatry. Those on the other side will naturally be led to the use of language which (notwithstanding their desire to be reverent) will seem to their opponents as bordering, at least, on the profane. And we cannot do better than conclude this paper by setting before our readers two quotations, one from Bishop Andrewes, the other from Dr. Pusey, asking to have their repugnance one to another well marked, and their significance fairly estimated, in view of this difference of doctrine concerning the sacramental union.

Thus, then, wrote Bishop Andrewes: "*Crustaceus panis pro Deo non sine sacrilegio summo adoratur*" ("Tortura Torti," p. 135). "*Fiat, quod fieri voluit Christus, cum dixit, Hoc facite; nihil reliqui fiet, quod monstret Sacerdos, quod adoret populus, de pyxide*" ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 267, A.C.L.).<sup>1</sup>

And thus wrote Dr. Pusey: "The question, then, as to the adoration of our Lord present in the holy Eucharist, should be considered apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. People have profanely spoken of 'wafer-gods.'<sup>2</sup> They might as well have spoken of 'fire-gods.' . . . Much more might they have used the title 'Infant God,' as a term of reproach against the Holy Child Jesus. The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He

<sup>1</sup> The saying of Bishop Andrewes—"Ubi corpus, ubi sanguis, ubi Christus"—may have been suggested by the words of Florus Mazister, "Ubi Corpus Ejus, ibi Jesus est" (De Expos. Miss. § 67), on which it may suffice to refer to "Eucharistic Worship," p. 34. Andrewes certainly did not mean to indicate any real presence of Christ to be worshipped on the altar (see above, p. 537). It was well said by Bishop Morton: "I may ask any ingenuous man whether he ever heard (I do not say our Church, but) any approved Doctor therein, teach that we do or ought to kneel before the sacrament, that *by it*, or *in it*, we may personally worship Christ, as if He were really present" ("Defence of Ceremonies," p. 235. London, 1619. "Published by Authority").

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey could hardly have been aware how completely Bishop Andrewes was lying under the lash of his condemnation—the condemnation of the good Bishop's profaneness. In truth, Andrewes appears to have had a certain peculiar fondness for the forms of expression which to Dr. Pusey were so peculiarly abhorrent. Witness the following:

"Memoriam ibi fieri sacrificii, damus non inviti. Sacrificari ibi Christum *vestrum de pane factum, nunquam daturi*" ("Ad Bell. Responsio," p. 251, A.C.L.).

"*Missam privatam Patribus ignotam asserit, asserit et non privatam qua scilicet panem illum transubstantiatum adoratis*" (*Ibid.*).

"Let them adore the Divinity concealed under the species and made from the bakehouse [*de pistrino factum*]. Sion would have without doubt shuddered and started back from this" (Opuscula, p. 92, A.C.L.).

is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us than the dress which He wore as man" ("Real Presence," p. 329).

We make our appeal to the candour and common-sense of intelligent and earnest-minded Churchmen. Let them judge: Does the doctrine of Bishop Andrewes support the teaching of Dr. Pusey? Does the school of ultra-Church theology among us rightly claim to be following in the steps of the great Anglican divine?

We feel persuaded that many in this matter have been unwittingly misled. We venture to hope that some will be led to study afresh the writings of Bishop Andrewes, and will rise from the study convinced, not only that the good Bishop was thoroughly free from all Romanizing tendencies in his teaching, but also that his Reformed theology is a true reflection of the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.

And now, having discharged the unwelcome task of showing the misconceptions which have been made to support the dangerous innovations which have been introduced among us, let us, in conclusion, acknowledge very frankly that those misconceptions are not (as we believe) to be put down all and altogether only to the account of those who so widely and seriously differ from us. At least, we will venture to submit for serious consideration the following inquiry: Have not many of those who have been persuaded, and rightly persuaded, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained, not merely for a figurative memorial of Christ's death, and a figurative teaching that His atonement should be the food of our spiritual life, but also for a real *κοινωνία* of the Body and Blood of Christ, been repelled, and perhaps drawn towards the teaching of the so-called Real Objective Presence, by the over-cautious avoidance of the teaching of what really is objective (according to the use of modern philosophical language)<sup>1</sup> in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? And might not these, many of them, have been attracted, rather than repelled, if—instead of taking so much pains to insist on the truth (a mere

<sup>1</sup> In the sacramental controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the words *objective* and *objectively* were used in a sense in which they stood opposed to *real* and *really*. Thus, e.g., the Saxon theologians in 1530: "Quod aliæ res, quia habeant loca dissita, tamen præsentem sint corpõri non *recliter*, sed *objectiva*. Ita disputat tantum imaginariam esse præsentiam. Sed Bucerus decipitur hac imaginatione. Quia nunquam concedit *realem* et *veram* præsentiam" (See Hospinian, "Hist. Sacr.," in Works, 1681, vol. iv., p. 183b). So Bishop Morton: "We say . . . the same Body, as the same death; but it cannot be the same death, but *objectively only*. Ergo, can it not be the same Body, but *only objectively*?" ("On Euch.," Book VI., chap. vii., § 4, pp. 473, 474).



truism, acknowledged even by Romish doctors) that the inward and spiritual grace may be received without and apart from the outward Sacrament, and seeming sometimes to lay themselves open to the charge of setting faith to create, by imagination, a presence which is not a true presence at all;—if, we say, instead of this, our Evangelical clergy had taken pains, after the example of Bishop Andrewes and other Reformed theologians, to insist upon the truth of the real giving (only after a heavenly and spiritual manner), and the real taking and receiving verily and indeed of the true *res sacramenti*, by the faithful, to the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine?<sup>1</sup>

We desire, indeed, to give all honour to faithful men whose godly zeal constrains them to use great plainness of speech in testifying against the revival of errors which have been carefully eliminated from the teaching of this Church of England. How shall we dare to make light of those dangerous deceits from which our Church was purified at the cost of blood? Nevertheless, we are persuaded that, in dealing with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it behoves us to beware of dealing too much in negations.

It is fully in accord with the theology of the Reformed to dwell rather on what we *do* receive, than to be ever insisting on what we do *not* receive in the Supper of our Lord: even as it is fully in accord with the same theology to wish that men should direct their thoughts more to what they *have* in that holy Sacrament, and less to the *mode* in which they have it. Surely it were well if the words of Hooker were ever present to the hearts of those whose minds are exercised on this Eucharistic controversy:

Shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how? . . . Let it be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise. . . They are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this new wine: this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold; this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare of soul and

---

<sup>1</sup> Well does Bishop Andrewes insist on the partaking of the bread as "the partaking of Christ's true Body (and not as a sign, figure, or remembrance of it), 1 Cor. x. 16," adding: "For the Church hath ever believed a true fruition of the true Body of Christ in that Sacrament; ("Sermons," vol. v., p. 67). But, observe, the Bishop did not write "a true *fraction* of the true Body of Christ," as his words have been quoted in error by Mr. Russell, in "Life of Bishop Andrewes," p. 38.

body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. With touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief; it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ. What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not; it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness hereof sufficeth; His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this—O my God, Thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy! (E. P., V., lxvii. 3, 12).

N. DIMOCK.

---

### ART. III.—PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

IN an article which appears in the April number of the *Nineteenth Century* Professor Huxley shows us how men of science, as represented in this particular instance by himself and the Tübingen theorists, deal with the subjects to which they apply their informed intelligences. He is not very complimentary to English theologians. In his opinion the methods of our poor "counsel for creeds" are so antiquated, so prejudiced, so hopeless, that he has been impelled out of sheer benevolence to make effort to arouse those of us who are still lying under the spell of their soothing sophisms from our "dogmatic slumbers." He tells us that "the serious question is whether theological men of science, or theological special pleaders, are to have the confidence of the general public," implying, of course, that he and all who agree with him are theological men of science, and all who think with us are theological special pleaders. What, I think, strikes one, in reading his rejoinder to Dr. Wace, is the boldness of his assertion rather than the reasonableness of his argument. His article savours too strongly of complacency. We do not seriously complain of that. If Mr. Huxley thinks that all the wisdom is with him, he is welcome, so far as we are concerned, to whatever amount of satisfaction he may derive from the reflection. But if he imagines that our faith in his powers is likely to be measured by his own estimate of their value, then I am afraid his expectations will hardly be realized.

With a view to obtaining as much benefit as may be derived from a study of the "scientific" methods of our Agnostic opponent, let us examine that part of his argument which affects to supply us with what he terms "the key to the comprehension of the problem of the origin of that which is now called Christianity." He essays to prove to us, with the aid of witnesses whose testimony will be received as unimpeachable by both sides, that that