

suggest the necessity for reconsidering many portions of the book that have not been touched on in these articles.

[I would take this opportunity of correcting two *errata* on p. 555 of the CHURCHMAN for September, 1906. Ten lines from bottom, "p. 137" should read "p. 137 *et seq.*," and Lev. xxvii. 30, 31" should be "Lev. xxvii. 32, 33."]



The New Theology and Protestant Orthodoxy.

BY THE EDITOR.

THERE is, perhaps, no Bishop on the bench whose utterances command more earnest or widespread attention than those of the Bishop of Birmingham. His personal character, great scholarship, perfect frankness, and welcome fearlessness combine to give weight to his pronouncements, and those who are the farthest removed from his ecclesiastical and theological position are among the first to admit the freshness and suggestiveness of his contributions to present-day discussions. It is not surprising, therefore, that Bishop Gore's addresses on the "New Theology," which were delivered during Lent in Birmingham Cathedral, received general attention, and were reported in full in several papers. With much that the Bishop said on the Person and Work of our Lord in relation to current criticism we are, of course, in heartiest accord. Nothing could well be clearer or more convincing than his statements on several of the fundamental articles of the Christian creed. It is when he comes to diagnose the situation created by the New Theology that we are compelled to part company from him, and to express our conviction that his diagnosis is not only inaccurate, but misleading. According to the report of the address in the *Birmingham Post*, the Bishop considers that

"year of jubilee," *vide op. cit.*, pp. 5-11, 94-98 (*cf.* CHURCHMAN, May, 1906, pp. 292, 293); H. R., pp. 282, 283, "firstlings and tithes," *vide* CHURCHMAN, July, 1906, pp. 425-430, September, 1906, pp. 548, 549, 554, 555; H. R., pp. 283, 284, "Levitical cities," *vide op. cit.*, pp. 17-22, CHURCHMAN, July, 1906, pp. 422-425.

the New Theology is due to a reaction against some of the defects or one-sidedness of Protestant orthodoxy in the last century. And then Bishop Gore criticizes Protestant orthodoxy in these words :

“ The Protestant orthodoxy of the last generation had three defects. Its idea of God was too largely coloured by deism—a God outside the world ; secondly, it made a corner-stone of its system the infallibility of Scripture as a record. He did not think he exaggerated when he said that that position had been really riddled by modern historical criticism. He spoke only as he thought, but he had given the matter his best attention for most of the years of his life. The doctrine that there was no statement in historical form in the Bible which was not historically true was a doctrine which he did not think, from a scholarly point of view, or the point of view of historical inquiry, was in the least maintainable. In the third place, the Protestant orthodoxy of the last century centred upon the Atonement, a matter upon the manner and method of which, as upon the previous question relating to the inspiration of Scripture, the Church had never made any declaration.”

Now, it is a matter of no little importance to inquire whether the Bishop's view is correct. Like everything else, Protestant orthodoxy is human, partial, and tends to lay stress mainly on certain aspects of truth ; but it is quite another question whether this one-sidedness is responsible even in part for the New Theology.

The Bishop's first charge against Protestant orthodoxy is that “ its idea of God was too largely coloured by deism—a God outside the world.” We are not quite sure what period of time Dr. Gore would have us understand by “ the last generation,” but if we take it pretty literally, we may recall the fact that this period saw the rise of the great Moody and Sankey missions, the Keswick Movement, and the Salvation Army, all of which tended to emphasize the reality of present and immediate fellowship with God, a position which was not at all “ coloured by deism—a God outside the world.” But going farther afield, and considering Protestant orthodoxy over a much longer period, is it true to characterize it as “ too largely coloured by deism ” ? Is it not a fact that the Reformation was largely conditioned by Luther's rediscovery of justification by faith, which means the personal, direct, immediate union of the soul with God ?

What was the prevailing view of God in the Middle Ages but of "a God outside the world"? What is the essential idea of God involved in a human priesthood, which comes between the soul and God, but one that is "coloured by deism"? What is the meaning of the worship of the Virgin Mary, its rise and progress, but a protest against the view of "a God outside the world," which had culminated in the philosophical Christology that followed Chalcedon? What is the inner meaning of the experience of the medieval mystics but a standing protest against the prevailing view of the remoteness of God in the Church of that time? What is the explanation of the moral sterility of the eighteenth century but its departure from the spiritual position emphasized at the Reformation? What is the meaning of the Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century but a return to living, warm fellowship with God in Christ? What section of the Church has so strongly emphasized the indwelling of Christ through the Holy Spirit as Protestant orthodoxy? Where is the Roman or High Anglican work of the seventeenth or eighteenth century to compare with Owen's great work on the Holy Spirit, or Goodwin on Ephesians, or Leighton on St. Peter? Where has the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, or the doctrine of the indwelling Christ, or the doctrine of the believer's direct fellowship with God received greater prominence than in Protestant orthodoxy? It is clear, therefore, that Dr. Gore has left very much out of consideration.

It is, of course, perfectly true that Protestant orthodoxy in its Calvinistic and Puritan elements emphasized the transcendence of God; but the question is whether this emphasis went beyond Scripture, and whether the doctrine of the Divine immanence was not properly safeguarded whenever Protestant orthodoxy was taught and experienced in its fullness. Let Scripture be examined on this point and the true proportion of faith seen. In the Old Testament the transcendence of God is certainly made prominent, though the Divine immanence is also taught and illustrated in the Psalms and Prophets. Yet even in the New Testament the doctrine of the Divine transcendence is

never allowed to take a secondary place. St. Paul, the cultured Semite, in dealing with cultured Aryans at Athens, shows the true perspective and proportion of the two truths by starting from, and closing with, the view of God's transcendence. Has Protestant orthodoxy ever seriously forgotten or departed from this position? Has not Catholicism, Roman and Anglican, often done so?

The truth is that only when the Divine transcendence is put and kept foremost, as it is in Protestant orthodoxy, do we obtain an adequate doctrine of sin. Protestant orthodoxy lays stress on the supremacy and sanctity of law, and teaches that sin is not weakness, but wilfulness; not only error, but wilful rebellion. It is curious that modern science, with its emphasis on the inexorableness of law, is in close agreement with Protestant orthodoxy as to the fact of what the Bible calls sin.

Western theology as represented by Tertullian and Augustine was truer to life and human need than Greek theology ever was. And it is not without significance that the revival of Greek theology is earnestly desired by men of the Broad Church school. The tendency of Greek thought, philosophical and theological, has ever been to ignore or minimize sin, by reason of its one-sided stress on the immanence of God. Mr. Campbell's New Theology is but an illustration of this tendency in an extreme form. It may please the modern mind to denounce Calvinism (and it is denounced by Rome, extreme Anglicanism, and Rationalism), but Calvinism stands for one of the essential and fundamental positions of any true theological system, and it cannot long be ignored or opposed with impunity. No one can be surprised at the strong and persistent opposition offered to Calvinism by the Church of Rome, and by those whose theological and ecclesiastical position is virtually one with that of Rome; for it is beyond question that the position laid down by Protestant orthodoxy in its Calvinistic form represents the teaching of a great part of the Bible. All the Reformers who were responsible for the Prayer Book were what would be called "Calvinistic" in views,

and no prominent Churchman was anything else until Laud appeared. And to those who go to the Bible for their theology these doctrines of Protestant orthodoxy concerning God and sin will always occupy a prominent place.

It is a well-known fact that Rome has always been semi-Pelagian in its view of sin; and those who, like Bishop Gore, make the essence of sin to lie in the will, are, all unconsciously but very really, occupying a virtually identical position. The truth is, that it is not sin, but *sinning*, that lies in the *will*. Sin, as distinct from sinning, goes deeper, and inheres in the nature as it now is. Article IX. is truer to Scripture and to life when it defines original sin as "the fault and corruption of the *nature*." We see, then, how easy it is to find points of contact between the New Theology, Romanism, and extreme Anglicanism in their views of sin, as we can also see the absolute contradiction between such a position and that laid down by Protestant orthodoxy.

Bishop Gore's second charge against Protestant orthodoxy is that it has "made a corner-stone of its system the infallibility of Scripture as a record." Now, it is perfectly true that the fundamental position of Protestant orthodoxy is the supreme authority of Scripture and the Bible as the final court of appeal. Whether authority involves "infallibility of Scripture as a record" is, of course, a separate question, as also whether infallibility is to be limited to faith and morals, or extended so as to include historical statements as well. Bishop Gore's statement seems to refer to the latter position, and he would have us believe that Protestant orthodoxy is bound up with belief in the infallibility of Scripture in everything. We assume that the Bishop would allow that Scripture is infallible on all things connected with the Person and Work of our Lord—that is, on all things essential to salvation. Thus, when Scripture speaks of the Incarnation and the Trinity, the Bishop would, of course, be prepared to accept its infallibility. So far well; but that section of Protestant orthodoxy which holds to the infallibility of Scripture as a record maintains a position which is at least arguable—namely, that if the writers of Scripture can

be proved to be guilty of inaccuracies where they can be verified, it does not tend to assure the readers as to their infallibility on points where they cannot be verified. A large number of inaccuracies on points of historic fact would surely go far to shake our belief in the infallibility of Scripture on faith and morals. And it is significant that all the researches of the last fifty years have tended to confirm the historical accuracy of the Old and New Testaments. The discoveries of an archæology in regard to the Old Testament, and the researches of Sir William Ramsay as to the Acts, are noteworthy examples.

But the real question at issue between Bishop Gore and Protestant orthodoxy is not the infallibility of Scripture as a record, but its position as the final and ultimate authority as the rule of faith and practice. This is the bed-rock of difference, and it is impossible to ignore it. In his book on the Holy Communion, "The Body of Christ," Bishop Gore has a fine and suggestive section on the use of Scripture in the medieval Church, and his judgment is that in the Middle Ages Scripture is "merged in a mass of miscellaneous authorities—the safeguard has vanished." It is against this merging of Scripture in a mass of miscellaneous authorities that Protestant orthodoxy has contended since the Reformation, and in doing so has advocated the position enunciated by Bishop Gore himself at the Bristol Church Congress that Scripture is "the final testing-ground of doctrine." This is the position set forth in Articles VI., XX., and XXI., whose language could not be clearer or more definite in the direction of Protestant orthodoxy. Opinions may differ as to the question of infallibility of Scripture as a record, but there is absolute unanimity among Protestants in accepting Scripture as the final and ultimate court of appeal in all matters of faith and practice; and, although Bishop Gore, in the words already quoted, appears to agree with this position, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile all his statements on this subject. Certainly the methods he uses in his books, "The Church and Ministry" and "The Body of Christ," do not suggest that he holds Scripture as supreme

and Church tradition as subordinate. Protestant orthodoxy simply refuses to co-ordinate Church authority and Church tradition with Scripture, preferring to hold fast to the unqualified and unambiguous statements of the Articles already referred to in which the Bible is set forth as absolutely supreme.

Bishop Gore's third criticism on Protestant orthodoxy is that it "centred upon the Atonement—a matter upon the manner and method of which . . . the Church had never made any declaration." Now, in the fullest and frankest way, we plead guilty to this charge of centring on the Atonement, and glory in it as one of the strongest proofs that Protestant orthodoxy has seized on the very central point and pivot of Divine revelation. It may be true that on "the manner and method of the Atonement" the Church has never made any declaration, but this is not really to the point. It is the *fact* of Atonement that Scripture, the Church, and Protestant orthodoxy have ever emphasized. During the last fifty years (Bishop Gore here extends his "generation" to a "century") several currents of thought have converged to lay stress on the Incarnation rather than on the Atonement. The general influence of the doctrine of evolution and the attempt to relate Christianity to the cosmos have doubtless had much to do with this trend of thought, which in England is so closely associated with the honoured name of Westcott. It has received one special emphasis in connexion with the extreme Anglican doctrine of the Sacraments as "extensions of the Incarnation" (whatever this phrase may mean). This view associates these ordinances with the glorified humanity of our Lord instead of with His death, as the New Testament clearly teaches. The Lord's Supper, in particular, according to the Gospels and St. Paul, is connected with the body of Christ as crucified, not as glorified; or, to use Cranmer's phrase, with the body "ut in cruce non in cælo." There is no doubt that in the New Testament, to use Dr. Denney's fine phrase, "the centre of gravity is not Bethlehem, but Calvary." The Incarnation is not a separate interest from the Cross, and to "Lux Mundi," perhaps more than to any other work, is due the

modern attempts to shift the centre from the Cross to the Manger. Yet we can only properly understand the Incarnation when we discover its purpose and construe the Person through the Work. As the Principal of the Leeds Clergy School well said at the Weymouth Church Congress: "To substitute the doctrine of the Incarnation for the Gospel of the free favour of God is to shift the focus of revelation, and thus to lose the unifying principle of Scripture. . . . The Incarnation is not the Gospel." These words exactly sum up the situation, as they certainly express the view which has ever been distinctive of Protestant orthodoxy. And it is significant in this connexion that the Principal of Leeds at the same time recommended his hearers to read Denney's "Life of Christ," which, as is well known, is occupied very largely with insistence upon the centrality of the Cross in the New Testament and in all true and vital Christian theology. We make bold to say that Protestant orthodoxy in thus emphasizing the Atonement rather than the Incarnation (considered apart from the Cross) is truer to the New Testament than are other more prominent currents of thought at the present day. The religion of Calvary can never be popular, though the religion of Bethlehem can easily be. We are, therefore, not at all surprised to find that opposition has almost always concentrated itself on the doctrine of the Cross as "a religion of the shambles," and has poured the vials of its wrath upon such hymns of the Atonement as "There is a fountain filled with blood."

If, therefore, the New Theology is a reaction from Protestant orthodoxy, it is a reaction from those very elements of Christianity that are the essential and outstanding features of the New Testament. It is, however, not so much a reaction from as a determined opposition to Protestant orthodoxy, an opposition that is inevitable, essential, and eternal. The doctrine of God set forth by the New Theology comes from that exaggeration of the Divine immanence which is found philosophically in Hegelianism and practically in Buddhism. Its attitude to Scripture is that which is characteristic of the higher critical movement as a

whole in its endeavour to get rid of the supernatural and to reduce inspiration within the narrowest limits. The view of inspiration put forth in "Lux Mundi" by its editor shows how easy it is to accept the higher critical position while holding a very definite doctrine of Church authority. It is curious and significant that Rationalism and Ritualism find a point of contact in their depreciation and subordination of the Bible; one to reason, the other to the Church. Renan's opinion that the Church of Rome had done wisely in withholding Scripture from the laity is not at all surprising, for a man's doctrine of the Bible practically rules everything. It is the insistence on Scripture as the supreme rule of faith that forms the most vital element of Protestant orthodoxy, whether against Romanism, Ritualism, or Rationalism. It is not orthodox but unorthodox Protestantism that refuses to find in Scripture its supreme authority and infallible guide. Unorthodox Protestantism came to flower in the late Professor Sabatier's position, to which, as is well known, that of the New Theology is closely akin. When men give up belief in Scripture as supreme, scarcely any limit can be put to their aberrations, whether in the direction of Rome or of Rationalism; and it is surely very striking that Mr. Campbell pours scorn on those who are opposing sacerdotalism as men who are waging an utterly futile warfare. From his point of view this is doubtless true, because sacerdotalism has not a few points of contact with the New Theology, even though the two are diametrically opposed in other respects; and the fact that Mr. Campbell finds it necessary to denounce Evangelicalism is really a testimony to its power and permanence.

We make bold to say that the three points which Bishop Gore has charged against Protestant orthodoxy as defects are among the strongholds of Christianity, and form the only safeguard against the New Theology, whencesoever it comes. The doctrine of the transcendence of God is the chief means of arriving at and retaining an adequate view of sin. The Protestant doctrine of Scripture is the one safeguard against

error, whether it be the error of regarding Church authority as supreme, or the error of making personal intuitions the test of truth. Insistence on the supremacy of Scripture is the one way of preserving the deposit of Christian truth, uncorrupted by traditional excess or unmutilated by rationalistic defect. The Protestant doctrine of the Atonement is the central feature of the New Testament Gospel, and is that which makes it a Gospel as contrasted with a mysticism which occupies itself either with a glorified humanity in Sacraments or with an ideal Christ evolved out of human consciousness.

Bishop Gore, in the address referred to, went on to state what he believed to be the position of the Church of England in relation to the New Theology. This, however, needs separate consideration, which must be deferred until next month.



"The Manufacture of Paupers."¹

BY THE REV. W. E. CHADWICK, B.D., B.Sc.

THIS is a most useful little book, one to be warmly commended to those who work among the poor. It is full of warning and instruction greatly needed at the present time, and its teaching is based upon thoroughly adequate knowledge. Most of the chapters appeared as articles anonymously in the *Spectator* last summer. They attracted considerable attention, for it was easy to see they were the work of experts in the subjects with which they dealt. Now the various contributions are signed, and when we find that they are by such well-known authorities as Sir Arthur Clay, Sir William Chance, Sir Edward Brabrook, Mr. Bailward, and Mr. Thomas Mackay, we are not in the least surprised.

The chief object of the book is to explain and counteract certain tendencies in Poor Law administration which during the last few years have been growing rapidly stronger. In itself the law of 1834—the one in force to-day—is generally admirable, and where, and so long as it has been administered strictly according to the spirit of those who framed it, pauperism has rapidly diminished. But, unfortunately, certain of the recommendations of some members of the Commission which preceded it were not adopted—that is, so far as provisions for its administration were concerned. The final

¹ "The Manufacture of Paupers." A Protest and a Policy. With an Introduction by J. St. Loe Strachey, Editor of the *Spectator*. London: John Murray, 1907.