

THE FUNDAMENTALS AND THEIR PLACE
IN MODERN PROTESTANT CHURCH HISTORY.

Volume One

THE FUNDAMENTALS AND THEIR PLACE
IN MODERN PROTESTANT CHURCH HISTORY

being a Thesis presented by

CHARLES GREENWOOD THORNE, Jr.

to

TRINITY COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

in application for the degree of

Doctor in Philosophy. (*M.Litt awarded*)

Declaration.

I hereby declare that the following Thesis is based on the results of research carried out solely by myself, that it is my own composition, and that it has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree in this or any other university.

C. G. Thorne, Jr.

Charles Greenwood Thorne, Jr.

Curriculum Vitae.

Graduated from Haverford College (Haverford, Pennsylvania) in 1959 with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in History and Latin.

Read History in Old College, University of Edinburgh in summer of 1960. Certificate.

Graduated from the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) in 1962 with the degree of Master of Arts in Mediaeval History.

Graduated from the University of St. Andrews (St. Mary's College) in 1965 with the higher degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in Mediaeval Ecclesiastical History, for a Thesis entitled: Thomas à Kempis and the Mystical Movement.

Member of the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, in 1963-64, while a research student in St. Andrews.

Lecturer in History, University College, University of Western Ontario (London, Canada) from 1964 to 1966.

Research student in Trinity College, University of Dublin, from 1966 to 1968. Easter Term of 1967 spent in residence in the University of Cambridge.

Read Theology in Mansfield College, University of Oxford, in summer of 1967. Certificate.

Assistant Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Conwell School of Theology (Philadelphia) for 1968-69.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME ONE.

Preface.		i
Chapter One.	The Shift from God to Man: Trends <u>The Fundamentals</u> Opposed.	1
Chapter Two.	The Seed-bed of <u>The Fundamentals</u> : The Rise of Evangelical Defenses.	46
Chapter Three.	Challenge and Response: The Raison d'Etire of <u>The Fundamentals</u> .	92
Chapter Four.	<u>The Fundamentals</u> as a Theology of the Christian Faith and Life.	187
Chapter Five.	The Conclusion.	305

PREFACE.

Behind any piece of research must be one or more serious reasons for its existence, which give that work its driving force as well as fulfill the intentions of its author. One evening in the dead of a Canadian winter, I was reading some nineteenth-century theological history, when I stumbled upon a reference to The Fundamentals, then completely unknown to me. After some investigation, I found myself genuinely interested in this collection, both for the history that had produced it as well as for what it had to say itself. A proper blending of two principal concerns of mine, history and theology. What is more, ecclesiastical history being my specialty within the study of history, I have for some time felt a great need to do some formal work in the modern church, having for a few years now been at work in the Middle Ages and especially its ecclesiastical affairs. Thus, as an ecclesiastical historian, if I may, and a concerned churchman, I decided that here was the perfect occasion for moving to the modern church, for academic and personal strengthening. And that has been achieved. Furthermore, this subject is an instance in evangelical history, for which I have some sympathy. To be led into modern ecclesiastical history through this door, and thereby face that vastly complex arena of events, was appealing.

This ultimately led to the resignation of my lectureship in mediaeval history, with the keenest anticipation for Dublin. It was my growing interest in the eighteenth cen-

tury, with its unusually rich culture, that took me to its greatest surviving capital, together with the glory of Trinity College itself, whose reputation and facilities are constant reminders of true understated greatness. There I lived and worked for two years, even to having the privilege of residence within its quadrangles. It could not have been an happier or more productive life, on every count. Should I have to rationalize my being there, as anywhere, it is a fact that Ireland itself was not involved in this ecclesiastical uproar, except vicariously; and, to live in the peace which it had then and has now only sharpened the focus for the centers in Germany, Britain, and America, with which I had to be concerned. Ireland is a magnificent place for gaining historical perspective.

Very many persons and places have figured in my execution of this task, but by some distance my principal debt is to my supervisor in Trinity College, the Reverend Professor H. F. Woodhouse, Regius Professor of Divinity. Unsparring of himself and his time he has been, together with providing many opportunities for conversation and fun. To him, I am most grateful for permission to spend terms first in Cambridge and then in Oxford, in pursuit of my research. In every way he has given me the total independence which I wanted and respected.

For all the others, their names are too numerous to mention, as they range from historians and theologians in Britain and America, to relations and friends of the authors

of The Fundamentals themselves. Moreover, all of them have shown genuine enthusiasm for the project, and have been only too willing to discuss points in their domain. To each one I am truly grateful.

Concerning the places, mention must be made of the major libraries that have contributed no end of sources. Most especially the library of Trinity College, which fed me nobly; and then, the libraries of the universities of Cambridge, Oxford, St. Andrews, Pennsylvania, and Princeton. The libraries of Tyndale House, Cambridge and Princeton Theological Seminary were invaluable, whose facilities I enjoyed for long periods of time. Finally, to the innumerable libraries and their staffs of ecclesiastical denominations, foundations, and historical societies, together with public and private libraries, and other archival depositories, go my deep thanks and appreciation. The always cheerful help which all of these provided, whether in person or through detailed correspondence, is heart-warming indeed.

The study itself should need no formal introduction, as the chapters do that in turn for their contents. The story moves progressively from its setting to its enactment. If it provides for the reader the information and understanding that it has by now done for the writer, it has not failed. In no way has this been an effort, rather, a thoroughgoing pleasure, and always amidst circumstances that have brought true inspiration and happiness.

CHAPTER ONE.

THE SHIFT FROM GOD TO MAN:

TRENDS THE FUNDAMENTALS OPPOSED.

The study of History as a formal academic discipline is an illumination of the past, with a genuine concern to ascertain what took place and why, in order to explain the situation at hand. In the words of Friedrich von Schlegel: "The historian is a prophet with his face turned backwards." Ecclesiastical history, in order to do justice to its own realm, must observe all history, sacred and profane. Only then can the church and its auxiliaries be properly understood in the world, where they were meant to be.

The series of twelve small books which were published privately in Chicago between 1909 and 1915, entitled The Fundamentals, consist of ninety individual essays written by sixty-four authors from America, Britain, Canada, and Europe. They hold a significant place in modern Protestant church history, and this study will demonstrate that according to their context and message. They were nobly defending evangelical or orthodox Christianity, wherein the highest claims for Holy Scripture and man's response thereto were unflinching. However, in this concern they were standing increasingly alone from the mid-nineteenth century on, that famous era of Victorian Christianity, and there are a series of reasons for this. The writers of The Fundamentals believed they could do no other, that the Bible and

its faith were a sacred trust from God to be accepted as given, while fully aware of the erosions of time here, and they supported their position admirably whatever the opposition.

To examine these documents themselves is only a part of the total task, albeit the major part. They could never be understood properly apart from their environment, and it is that that must first be exposed, the unfolding of a long and varied series of events of which their authors were fully aware and to which they spoke. The Fundamentals are indeed a classic example of a forthright response to history. Because the national settings which led to their publication are Britain, the undisputed guide to English-speaking Christianity, America, evangelicalism's largest claim, and Germany, the theological world in microcosm, the first duty is to point up those factors in those places which produced major trends The Fundamentals opposed. Having done that, notice must then be given to the formal opposition that arose in the name of evangelical defenses. Hence, chapters one and two respectively. Only then are The Fundamentals ready to be examined themselves, having been produced from the seed-bed of events in chapter two in answer to the factors noted in chapter one. Chapters three and four, then, will set forth the outcome in the essays themselves, in terms of a response to a challenge, and a theology.

The basic chronological limits for this study are 1850 to the Great War, however extensions on either side

there must be, as will be noted accordingly. In a way, America was the home of The Fundamentals, as there the majority of its writers lived and worked. Nevertheless, the American ecclesiastical scene in the nineteenth century is very much an outgrowth of what took place in Great Britain. It is the intellectual and theological history of the latter, then, that will be treated first, with America itself following on. Attention will then shift to Germany, where the new theological thinking was being born, and its development in Britain and America will also be noted. In this way, the trends which The Fundamentals opposed will have been shown according to their natural development.

Outside Germany in the nineteenth century, where theology was so much a laboratory science, Great Britain was the center of the Protestant world intellectually. Here both evangelicals and liberals had a considerable history behind them, and both had to answer in the light of the world's as well as Britain's most notable intellectual strides. The age was truly one of inquiry, iconoclasm, and total social concern, and theology was expected to meet whatever was asked of it. The old view that theology held the highest judgment was no longer accurate, for things intellectual, in the secular sense, and things theological were much intertwined.¹ For example, and there are many, 1859 brought, with Darwin's Origin of the Species, the beginning of a long and arduous struggle between theology and natural scientific evidence specifically, and no scientific

discipline of any kind was to be excluded. Immediately, theology addressed the situation by publishing Essays and Reviews in 1860, which was written primarily to prevent any kind of rupture between the thinking of the church and the world, and thereby keep the church in Britain within the support of the nation's thinkers.² Nevertheless, this was the beginning of liberal, as opposed to evangelical, theology taking hold officially. Essays and Reviews read as if to say that Darwin and company had produced nothing that Christianity could not contain, to which the evangelical response was immediate.³ Of course, this was far from the first major attack on the evangelical position, but its widespread dismissal of biblical authority, the key issue on which all other reasoning turned, was the most disturbing. That alone constituted a prime trend to which The Fundamentals, as representative of the evangelicals, were opposed. With Essays and Reviews, academic debate for English-speaking Christianity had begun. This applied really to Britain and America, both of whom were deeply influenced, and willingly, by German theology. While it was a courageous statement it forgot dogmatic history, and in attempting to agree easily with the new secular thinking, it often made Christianity nothing more than an ethical system.⁴ The greatest pity was that past heterodoxy was now becoming present orthodoxy. Two of the writers had even been tried by the Court of Arches, but were acquitted despite their views on inspiration.

In the years following the Oxford Movement, secular thinking was dominated by Bentham, Mill, and George Grote, all of whom saw the church as a source of evil and the chief obstacle to progress. In this time prior to Darwin, the church, in Britain certainly, clung more than ever to its authority: evangelicals to the Bible, Anglo-Catholics to the church, and liberals to the vindication of any seeming truth. Few churchmen, if any, honestly doubted the authority of Scripture, whether high, low, or broad church, for then their distinctions were based mainly on patterns of worship. It took not Lyell's Principles of Geology (1830) to change that, but the one-time theological student, Darwin. With bishops and professors now joining the heretofore enemies of the Faith, laymen were perplexed and their beliefs were sorely tried. While some like Matthew Arnold gave up Christianity as a "fond but beautiful dream", others began to sign over to strange cults and sects, such as Theosophy, Spiritualism, and Christian Science. It must be said equally, however, that the widely liberal, even anti-supernatural, school of Strauss and Baur in Germany was countered by the relatively conservative scholarship in Britain of the Cambridge trio of Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort. Yet, while they did much to bridge the gulf between science and religion, and faith and criticism, they were still not fully in the company of evangelical scholarship. Puritanism, broadly based, was clearly losing its hold as Victorian life matured. Church attendance did not fall off

appreciably, but the ongoing work of biblical criticism was no help to the majority of Christians.⁵ Moorman says, quite naturally, that by 1900 all serious scholars had accepted without hesitation the results of higher criticism. Certainly, the history of ideas and theology in nineteenth-century Britain is crowded by their advances.⁶

As doctrinal Christianity was so much in question, the socially concerned wing of the church took the opportunity to stake its claims. Taking the name of Christian socialists, they attacked the iron law of competition as a lie and strove to replace it with the principle of cooperation.⁷ They worked with the Chartists and the Trade Unions, and also founded the Working Men's College in London. Yet, as important as their practical work was, none of that was as dangerous as their revolutionary conception of what ought to be the relationship between general Christianity, the Church of England in particular, and the secular order of society. There was a social revolution in what they said, more drastic than any to which Kingsley or Maurice would have assented.⁸ Christian socialism wherever it appeared was essentially secular in design, with presuppositions and emphases which could only evoke disapproval from the evangelicals. Another instance of wanting to ignore the biblical claim, as social concern therein went beyond man's deeds.

In 1887, in a sermon four years after Marx's death, Thomas Hancock used a phrase which was a true indictment of religion in later Victorian England: "The banner of

Christ in the hands of the Socialists."⁹ Social criticism came from such divines as Maurice, Kingsley, Westcott, Stuart Headlam, Scott Holland, Gore, James Adderley, Conrad Noel, and William Temple, with the result that the church did create social betterment.¹⁰ The founding of Oxford House in 1885 under Adderley was a direct outcome of that, which was an example for many missions and settlements, where the working classes and public school and university men were brought together. This emphasis resulted in the clergy, both in England and Scotland, being brought into contact with life at every level, by the end of the Victorian period. Whatever way the church might have been going theologically then, it was much aware and alive socially. Nevertheless, evangelicals, and certainly the authors of The Fundamentals, believed they were right in not engaging to such an extent in purely social efforts. They were committed to the priority of the classical idea of conversion, whereupon all wider changes would occur in due course.

On conversion, Francis Newman and later William James divided Christians only into "once-born" and "twice-born" types, which also represents, respectively, a notable difference between Roman and Protestant Christianity.¹¹ From the Enlightenment through the nineteenth century these terms were used in many ways, but always they carried a theological identity. To grow up naturally in a nominally Christian environment is one matter, but to come to grips with the gospel message, personally, leading to a true conversion is

quite another. It was a live issue which low and high churchmen took fairly seriously, not to mention the evangelicals as such, but, which broad churchmen, and their numbers were vigorously rising, virtually ignored.¹² To the committed broad churchman of the nineteenth century, there were grave misgivings about the virgin birth, incarnation, crucifixion, atonement, and Scripture itself. Because of the skepticism of the day, that branch of the church was growing. Their sermons were full of literary and social references and not of doctrinal or evangelical truths.¹³ On the church's mission fields they were noticeably absent, but not so with high and low churchmen, evangelicals and Nonconformists. In the attempts of Matthew Arnold, Kingsley, Maurice, and many others to combine the higher criticism with the new social concern, the broad church position was inevitable. Their Erastianism, vague theological concerns, and lack of a creed to preach were well on the way to forming a British Evangelische Kirche.

The British evangelical scene, amid these forces that were most often in opposition, produced some scholarship as counter-action but not nearly enough. They had their great clerics in Charles Simeon, Daniel Wilson, and William Burghon, and outstanding laymen in William Wilberforce and the Clapham Sect, T. F. Buxton, and Lord Shaftesbury, but they got little or no promotion in the church.¹⁴ Doctrinally, they clung to a form of Calvinism, and to counteract the rationalism and ritualism they founded two

theological colleges.¹⁵ More and more they had to face up to their opponents' inquiries, and because of that their theology was more widely written.¹⁶ Evangelicals were faced equally with the rise of cults and sects, whose aims were negative and even whimsical. They were too exclusively intellectual and worldly in proposition, seeing no sense of the wonder and mystery in life. Even the social claims, that all levels of society must count, were better met, spiritually, by the evangelicals, whose Salvation Army enabled the least to be ministered to and with a solid, positive gospel. While the liberals did destroy some falsehoods and administer social services, they also destroyed countless biblical truths. They were preoccupied with re-writing Christian theology, not from a biblical base, but to accommodate the world's knowledge. This led them to gross untruths, despair, and admitted puzzlement as to why the Faith no longer appealed.

There was some shift in emphasis in British liberal theology between Essays and Reviews and Lux Mundi in 1889. This can be seen in the latter's treatment of the moral character of faith; the moral, spiritual, and historical meaning of prophecy, inspiration, the atonement in relation to sin and sacrifice, and the incarnation to Christian dogma; sacraments, ethics and such.¹⁷ Still, the trends which The Fundamentals opposed were as pronounced. Indeed, what had been so violently opposed in Essays and Reviews had become much more acceptable with Lux Mundi, as theology

had now been exposed to the new thinking for nearly thirty years. It was not long thereafter until the third collection of essays, Foundations (1912), came forward, yet another product of Oxford men which led to further controversy.¹⁸

All three of these publications demonstrate so unequivocally just how secular thought from Darwin on, in philosophy, economics, or pure science, for example, was influencing theology. Its doctrine was bound to suffer and did, for there was no absolute standard. The supernatural was gradually discarded and replaced by what was verifiable by man.

* This was an indictment primarily on the Church of England, but there were many such tendencies in the Church of Scotland, witness 1843, and among the Nonconformists.¹⁹ Evangelicals gave the term modernism to these unorthodox views, which has had similar usage ever since, even for Roman Catholics. In fact, modernism did not begin in Romanism under Leo XIII, but had been a reality in Protestantism since the 1860s.

In his Noble lectures at Harvard (1925-26), H. D. A. Major took the view that in England modernism and liberalism were bound together, but not always identical.²⁰ The former was the enrichment of the latter. Further, modernism was the more mature, twentieth-century form of nineteenth-century liberalism, and always far from orthodoxy.²¹ Speaking in unintelligible generalities, he claimed that the long effort to update the church, its theology and service, was part of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, then

became liberalism in the nineteenth and modernism in the twentieth.²² The modernist wanted the traditionalist to alter his doctrine of God and thus make Him the God of emergent evolution; to forget the doctrine of everlasting punishment and the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; to re-fashion the idea of original sin and reconstruct what is meant by the second coming and judgment; and, to scrap the notions of the inspiration, inerrancy, and infallibility of the Bible.²³ Yet, modernism did make too much of the existential meaning of the Faith, at the expense of all the obedience demanded by the historically orthodox truths. It did not want to admit to anything specific, hence its view of the creeds.²⁴ For modernism, then, there is a mighty use of J. H. Newman's phrase "To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often." It claimed fully to be in harmony with evolution, and its growth in British Christianity was constant.²⁵ Christianity was not to be adapted to but adaptable. The religious press and the theological colleges were modernism's most serious threats, admittedly. A party ideology, it did put down a large root in British thought, but as such its life was determined.²⁶

The theological currents that were running in Britain between 1850 and 1914 extended in many directions.²⁷ After the turn of the century, the British church was gaining a great sense of unity, in terms both of denominations and the secular and sacred.²⁸ The major intellectual trends set in motion by Darwin, together with the theological responses

beginning with Essays and Reviews, all continued with vigour and showed no sign of ending. G. B. Shaw gave these new views approval in his works, such as Back to Methuselah, as did the established church in creating Hensley Henson as Bishop of Hereford in 1918, even though his doctrine was openly questionable.²⁹ However, the new emphases took their toll among all sections of the church. Evangelicals tended to weaken slightly, though not admittedly, tractarians became more Anglo-Catholic, and liberals, while searching, spoke freely and boldly. The Victorian era loved comforts, encouraged humanitarianism, and, like the thirteenth century, possessed many great men, whether poets, scholars, statesmen, or churchmen. It was a time of vast experimentation, a constant search and struggle for new freedom, with a responsibility for their results.³⁰ However, by 1901, the entire European political scene had been robbed of its leaders. With Bismarck's fall and Victoria's death, power fell to three inept hands: William II of Germany, Francis Joseph of Austria, and Nicholas II of Russia. As Elizabeth I was followed by the Stuarts and Civil War, and Anne by the drudgery of the Georges and the Napoleonic wars, so was Victoria by the Great War. Furthermore, the end of that age, in Christian terms, brought a renewed desire for orthodoxy.³¹ Now there appeared two religious tendencies: the centrifugal, which pointed to the individual, and the centripetal, to the organized church. All of these many trends, and the full implication of their ramifications, were con-

sidered by The Fundamentals as not only dangerous and unhealthy, but also, and more importantly, as arrant denials of true Christianity by true biblical standards. Without doubt, the intellectual and theological history of nineteenth-century, principally Victorian Britain underlines so clearly that general shift from God's standard to man's. In that pattern America was to follow as well.

In exactly the same period in America, intellectual and theological factors may seem more complex and to have caused greater change. Very possibly, as in those years America was moving from childhood to full adulthood in most all its major institutions, as seen in the "dignity of man" ideal.³² Youth and immaturity, relative to Britain, caused America to flounder more than, and the chart of events is more varied as they extend right across the continent.

The Civil War was a watershed between the old and new America. With evolution came a new history, of which biblical higher criticism and a capitalist philosophy were equally products. For long in American religion there seemed to be no proper doctrine of the church, but 1865 even saw that taking shape.³³ There was the vivid contrast of the sects, such as Mormons, Millerites, and Spiritualists, with the systematized urban revivals of Moody and Finney. These did much to develop the widespread Sunday School and other such movements, and encourage not simply a nominal faith but a vigorous evangelical Protestantism.³⁴

A vast immigration brought a great mixture to the

American scene, as well as difficulties culturally and religiously. The Church of Rome now also brought America great unrest.³⁵ Methodists, Baptists, and Lutherans, in that order, comprised the largest Protestant groups, and there were numerous others, including Jews and Orthodox, and non-Christian faiths. Protestantism after the Civil War was vigorous and confronting life at every level.³⁶ The period 1830-1860 saw evangelical Protestantism at its height, for until 1860 evangelicals had control of the religious scene in America.³⁷ Reconstruction ploughed even deeper the chasm between North and South. It is true that liberalism was first in the North, but conservative reaction there was often as strong as in the South, as much in urban centers as rural areas. As in Britain, religious people wanted to leaven society with religion, whatever their theological position.³⁸ Then, with the post-War scene came a new set of circumstances which caused a long period of strife and bigotry. By then, any formal study of American religion required two separate inquiries: the history of the church in America, and, the history of the sociological phenomena of religion in American culture. Conservatives were defending while liberals were surrendering their traditions.³⁹ As for the Roman church, it became after 1865 less apologetic and less concerned with survival. It began to dream of penetrating American life, the first large step being the parochial school system begun in 1884.⁴⁰

Post-Civil War industrialization gave Catholicism its

new urban character, and as places of work forced the immigrants to accept each other, the church followed too.⁴¹ American Catholicism was not active in the social gospel movement, as they were able to separate their ever-increasing network of social enterprises from their theology as such.⁴² They feared and protected against the spread of Marxist socialism both in Europe and the American secret societies, just as Americans did the Catholics through the American Protective Association.⁴³ The dawn of realism in later nineteenth-century literature, evolution, and biblical higher criticism were not really felt by the Catholic mind. Instead, Leo XIII's encyclical Aeterni patris of 1879 was encouraging the revival of the study of scholastic philosophy. There were few notable Catholics in the arts, nor was their educational leadership distinguished, even by the end of the century.⁴⁴ However, no other religious body better withstood the strain of the Civil War and its aftermath, nor displayed more generosity in its many services. Evangelical Protestantism feared Romanism greatly and with much reason, as The Fundamentals indicate. When Pius X issued his Sapienti consilio, there was the hard proof that its future in America would be strong, and that meant a threat to the reformed faith.⁴⁵

Romanism was just one important fear, for with Reconstruction came a new intellectual, urban, and industrial environment that was not to be mistaken. The Atlantic Monthly in 1872 reported that natural selection had very

nearly won the day in America, as it already had in Germany and Britain. Science was now read in place of poetry and fiction. Comparative religions were being studied, and psychology and sociology got some status as proper studies.⁴⁶ Behind all this was the eternal question of biblical authority, and how much control was that to have, if any. The displacing of that authority within the religious world came from two sources, primarily: pastors already at work, who could not ignore the new thinking which they had to account for before congregations, and, the theological seminaries themselves, many of whose staff had studied abroad and were thus advancing a scientific liberalism.⁴⁷ Indeed, the mediaeval principle that theology was queen of the sciences was dead. Interest was in visible man and not invisible God. After Darwin and Reconstruction, progress and freedom, whatever they were to mean, were the concern as man himself was to develop that in his own terms. This amounted to a religion of humanity, wherein Unitarianism, the Free Religious Association, and the Ethical Culture societies figured prominently. Revivalism and traditional Calvinism were heavily criticized, for personal salvation seemed less important than greater social well-being. Individualism was giving way to brotherhood, much as industrial man superseded the private craftsman. The current view was that as theology released itself from orthodoxy, then the gap between the sacred and secular would be lessened. Within a generation, Darwinism developed from a shocking piece of

atheism to a principal justification for existing society, and worthy of pulpit exposition. Industry favoured this and labour benefitted, once profit-sharing plans were introduced by social gossellers like Washington Gladden. Undoubtedly, Episcopalians were the first major denomination to give welcome to such proposals, with Congregationalists being next, though Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists fell far behind.⁴⁸

Just as industrialism urbanized Romanism, it also raised many social issues which orthodox Christianity was deemed no longer able to answer. There had to be a new kind of gospel, a social one. The 1870s and 1880s in America saw bitter industrial strife and Christianity was expected to have a practical rather than just a theological remedy.⁴⁹ Churches were receiving large gifts from capitalists which carried long implications. In 1889 a small group met in Boston calling themselves Christian socialists, after their British counterparts, and declared that business was becoming dangerously plutocratic and that Christ's teachings must be applied.⁵⁰ The social gospel theology had been born.

The American social gospel movement, about which more will be said in chapter four, was very much pioneered and led by the clergyman, Josiah Strong, for over thirty years.⁵¹ By the end of the century, courses in Christian sociology or social service were being offered in many of the seminaries.

Before the War nearly all religious bodies had adopted social creeds of some kind as well, and in 1908 the Federal Council of Churches presented its own formulation which was highly influential. Religious conservatism was deeply shaken by the social crisis and development of rival doctrines, but orthodoxy did not lose its grip. Social Christianity was winningly expressed in sermons, editorials, public gatherings, and novels, even though its shortcomings of super-optimism and vagueness were recognized. It did attack the undiluted individualism which America knew so well.⁵²

In addition to the major trends already discussed, church unity and the rise of the sects clearly gave rise to The Fundamentals. To take church unity first, at the turn of the nineteenth century many in the American church believed the millennium was near, though they did not necessarily hold the extreme supernaturalism of the premillennial view. The theme was then prevalent that as the West goes so goes America, and as America goes so goes the world. America not only inherited its many ecclesiastical divisions through immigration from Europe, but also its own revivalism had created further division. In fact, the early nineteenth century saw American denominations taking the form and reaching essentially the statistical proportions which they were to retain for more than a century.⁵³ Doctrinal agreement, ecclesiastical polity, and the attitude to missions often distinguished one denomination from another, but this did not preclude many denominations cooperating in specific

efforts.⁵⁴ The plans for church unity seriously encroached upon individual denominational rights. Particularity was minimized and community stressed. This did much to under-value doctrinal and other differences among denominations, even though purposely. The greater the number of people and ideas involved, the more general and compromising the result becomes, which is the reason for denominations in the first place. Fundamental to the move to church unity was the new position of social Christianity. As so many denominations came more and more to accept its message, if only in part, it seemed proper to unite in that common interest.

That came in 1908 with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, conceived as a federation of the national bodies of the various churches who wished to join, and it grew to be the largest church federation in the world.⁵⁵ From this organization came the leadership not only for the social gospel movement in all its facets, but also the newer ecumenical interest. This massive effort for church unity legislated a theology and spirituality that was not carefully biblical, for now the church was transferring its concern from the spiritual business of converting man proper to the secular business of converting man's institutions.⁵⁶ While feelings ran high on the matter, at the highest levels there was never any final judgment that the Federal Council and such moves were wrong, and that only the evangelicals, The Fundamentals, and its circle were the true remnant. Rather, it was viewed as a

great pity that now had occurred, even on an official national level, a major trend away from what once had been a personal saving faith to what now had become an institutional, social message. That was the strong objection, whatever evangelical links therewith there might have been. The result was the proof. In 1905, when unity negotiations had begun, the world was also witnessing some notable accomplishments.⁵⁷ It seemed only appropriate that the Christian message should approve and aid these things, rather than judge and restrain them. Even though church unity began in America, it would not be long until that idea would carry its representatives to Edinburgh (1910), Lausanne (1927), and Oxford (1937). The defenders of orthodoxy were not really concerned with denominations or unity as such, but with doctrine and the devotion that would result. Between 1850 and 1914 biblical orthodoxy was witnessing one compromise after another, often making its own position appear spineless. There was such strength in these rising organizations and the voice of evangelical opposition was trying to sound forth. The Fundamentals were its corresponding strength.

Secondly, there were the sects or cults, those groups which proclaimed a religious system that was not finally Christian whatever the similarities. For purposes here, these can be divided into two categories: those The Fundamentals attack directly: Mormonism, Spiritualism, Millennial Dawn, and Christian Science; and, those that are at

best implicitly related thereto: New Thought, Transcendentalism, Theosophy, Seventh-Day Adventism, Swedenborgianism, Unitarianism, and the Unity School of Christianity. The sects tried to appeal where the organized church was silent: healing in Christian Science, life with the dead in Spiritualism, sexuality in Mormonism, economic justice in New Thought, philosophical monotheism in Theosophy, and the heavenly kingdom in Millennial Dawn, for example. All these and others had a frank supernaturalism about them, and widely advertised themselves with fervant missionary zeal through printing and personal visitation. Their very existence said loudly that something had gone wrong in the church, for it was in the second half of the nineteenth century that they appeared.⁵⁸ Not all the sects required an exclusive membership, as New Thought, for example, wanted people to be regular church members while practising New Thought as well, which was a reaction to nineteenth-century materialism.⁵⁹ All the sects had a national machinery, complete with officials, publications, and property, and their existence was to be permanent.

The free religious movement, which included Transcendentalism, Spiritualism, and the Free Religious Association itself, aimed to dispense with dogma though still preserve the ethical value of religion. It was further responsible for transforming Unitarianism from a Christocentric religion to a pragmatic, humanistic theism.⁶⁰ Adherents to these or any of the sects were most difficult to evangelize,

for they had left the Christian faith for something better, each sect having its own system of self-salvation. The well-informed sectists, or cultists as the term means the same, are aware of the multiplicity of doctrines in Protestantism, which to combat is a theological speciality, so that they rejoice in what they have rejected.⁶¹ Their growth has been called "the unpaid bill of the Churches", and they have all the characteristics of the "churches of the disinherited".⁶² The uncertain and compromising character of the American churches allowed them to arise, and it is to be noted that sects were born in America. Indeed, it is for the same kinds of reasons that the orthodox wing of the church, such as The Fundamentals, opposed the new liberalism and its fruits that the cults emerged. The church essentially had nothing to fear from their zeal and competition, but everything to fear from its own internal confusion and external dishonesty.

Also for America was beginning the great problem of theological heresy within the seminaries, and then in the churches. The sheer fact of heresy trials, which were numerous, made very evident just how far the Faith was being affected by these shifts from God to man. The principal issue was as always the authority of the Bible, and in these proceedings the strength and capability of the conservative church showed itself well. Trials were held in most of the major denominations, while the Lutherans maintained then the most solidly unbroken orthodox front. By

contrast, Baptists and Congregationalists could hold whatever views they liked, as their own polity could not control beyond the individual congregation. Even the Southern Baptists witnessed trials, as heresy-hunting was the order of the day. Ordinary church members were seldom caught up in these procedures, but the entire affair was keenly watched and was a matter of national interest.⁶³

More positively, rescue missions were established for slum work, and the Y. M. C. A./ Y. W. C. A. and Sunday School moved forward. The institutional church was begun in America to minister to people throughout the week in a variety of ways.⁶⁴ Also, the American missionary efforts flourished at home and abroad, which rose to a climax ca. 1830 and then again after Edinburgh 1910.⁶⁵ In both instances, there was much to be said for the view that God had prospered America so that it might carry forward His gospel, which many believed and acted upon. It was not until after the Great War, and especially after the second, that the changing theology at home was reflected abroad in the missionary program.

To observe most realistically the theological trends and their effects in American church life in these years, the archetype is the northern Presbyterian church. The union in 1870 of Old and New School Presbyterians, the Princeton theology, differences over the Westminster Confession, heresy trials, and the 1929 Princeton-Westminster split, all these are manifestations of the burning issues. That church, too,

enjoyed its period of calm between 1904 and 1922, and it was much in the center of the Fundamentalism that followed. It was engaged actually in battles which The Fundamentals observed and understood.⁶⁶

In much the same way the Briggs trial was archetypal. It was America's louder and more indicative action than was Scotland's over William Robertson Smith, and maybe even the Church of England's over Bishop Colenso. In Briggs can be seen the pattern, though very new in his day, that was to emerge for many American theological students. German biblical scholarship deeply interested him and he studied theology in Berlin after first being educated in America. When he returned from Europe in 1869, he brought with him the seeds of the higher critical learning, which, after a short pastorate, he carried into formal academic teaching and writing.⁶⁷ Standing at the threshold of so many of the events that precipitated the writing of The Fundamentals, he was finally an epitome of what was bound to happen, and did, and how America was to deal with it. That his case caused more commotion than anything abroad says something in itself.⁶⁸

The proofs are many that between 1850 and 1914 there took place in Britain, and especially in America, a new Copernican revolution of which Darwin, and more subtly Marx were the chiefs. The essential unity of evangelicalism in mid-century America became a multiplicity as a result of these intellectual and hence theological factors. With the

industrial revolution and urban development, ascension in world power and great growth in population, religious and cultural pluralism became a reality. Still, it was also the time of great preachers, such as Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips Brooks, De Witt Talmadge and Russell Conwell, and "the nation hung on their words and doted on their persons". Ministry then meant preaching primarily, and Forsyth's warning, that a pulpit with only a man and no doctrine in it ultimately meant nothing, was timely.⁶⁹ The eternal question of the refinements of modernity -- adapting the gospel to the present situation, and contemporaneity -- adapting the present situation to the gospel, demanded an answer now. There was also in nineteenth-century America, as there had been earlier, a marked pietism that was born out of an indigenous Protestantism. Examples of this are: the Jacksonian pietists who crushed the monster bank to destroy monopolies; the progressives who attacked vested interests, the demons of Wall Street, and the soulless corporations; the supporters of Bryan and prohibition; the divided Civil War loyalties; the republican Mugwumps who campaigned in the 1880s against the corruptions of President Grant; and, Theodore Roosevelt's remark in 1912 about the Bull Moose party, "We stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord."⁷⁰ Once any of these ideas were effected theology was automatically implicated. The question then was not whether theology would react, but how and according to what standard.

When considering the intellectual and theological history of Britain and America between 1850 and 1914, the lines of pursuit are very much parallel. The one great difference was that the British people at large were not nearly as bound collectively to some form of evangelical religion as were their American counterparts. Britain's proximity to and involvement with the Continent accounted for much of that, when compared to America's isolation regardless of her vast immigrations. Intellectually, both Britain and America were rather self-sufficient. However, theologically, the direction and substance came from Germany. There was the fountain from which Britain drank deeply, while America owed a double debt, though a much greater one to Germany than to Britain. The theological development was naturally influenced by a variety of intellectual currents, and as the climate grew increasingly irreverent from the Enlightenment through to the Origin, the movement of theology from right to center and on to the radical left did so with reason. It is only proper, therefore, that the final portion of this chapter should concern itself with nineteenth-century theology as such in Germany, Britain, and America, and in that order as it was the natural development. This will then complete the outline, and only that, showing that dramatic shift from God to man which did occur so stunningly then. These theological developments can finally only be added to the list of trends which The Fundamentals opposed, which they did as spokesmen for

the evangelical school.

The Reformation action of "cuius regio, eius religio" was far from always being in the best ecclesiastical interest, as the territorial system was responsible for much of the impotence of German evangelicalism in all directions. The government had a Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs who controlled the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council (Oberkirchenrat), and while that Council could and did outlaw unorthodox views, it was virtually powerless when the university divinity faculties had only a minority of orthodox staff.⁷¹ Since the Aufklärung, Germany enjoyed an academic freedom, especially in the divinity faculties, far greater than existed in Britain or America. The opposite was true for the German pastor, who was usually appointed by a lay patron. He was of much lower social status than his British or American counterpart and equalled only a fourth-class salaried official. This meant that certainly for the nineteenth century, German ecclesiastical life was in the dead hand of territorial bureaucracies, where laymen and theology could be dismissed at will.⁷² Indeed, this Byzantine situation at work in Germany permitted much of the counter, negative theological forces to exist. Further, as the church became so secularized the way was being prepared for Nazi usurpation. While there was, from Hegel's time, an increasing emphasis on liberal scholarship, the work of others like Professors F. A. G. Tholuck, whose evangelical outlook and concern for personal evangelism come forth in his large

Theology of Germany, and Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, who reworked verbal inspiration with especial attention to Old Testament prophecy, stood equal in learning to the best, but they came at the end of the pietist and evangelically dogmatic era. What followed in the name of higher criticism was much different, and often carried on as though theology had only then begun seriously.

The Kulturkampf was such a central concern that its principles got much implicit notice from the new theology. Social action itself ran from the extremes of the Rerum Novarum to current Marxist socialism. When all the implications of this came down to the scene in America, the theological explosion of the 1920s would almost certainly have come earlier were it not for the War. The score or more of Protestant university faculties in Germany probably contained a larger company of competent theological scholars than all the world together. They had far more academic freedom, were not bound to church regulations as they certainly were in Britain and America, and were ferociously thorough over each other's work. 1870 to 1914 in German theology was unquestionably the golden age of all theological scholarship in modern church history, even though some creative originality was lacking. In Bismarck's age, however, there were no successors to secular thinkers like Hegel, Kant, and Schelling; industrialism and power politics had taken their toll. This meant that the great encyclopaedias of theological scholarship were among the fit symbols

of that age.⁷³

The actual drama of German theological scholarship in the nineteenth century is inordinately complex, for both the scholars and the ideas are so numerous. Scientific criticism of the Bible was certainly not new, but heretofore had usually been done either by opponents of Christianity or minority leaders in the church. With the rise to importance of German universities, biblical study left the control of the church and moved to this far more secular environment. This was somewhat akin to the twelfth century, when biblical study was transferred from the cloister to the rising university, though the accompanying spiritual emphasis then was now considerably lessened. Not spiritual but philosophical presuppositions invariably guided present biblical interpretation, and Schleiermacher was largely responsible for insisting that the Bible be treated as any other book.⁷⁴

F. C. Baur of Tübingen, in his historical reconstruction of Christianity, contributed extensively to the chain of radical thinking, which by late Victorian standards in some cases seemed mild, because of even more bold departures.⁷⁵

He founded the Tübingen school, which was to German theology what Oxford and Cambridge were to British, and Union, if any, was to American. There Strauss insisted that Christ was nothing more than a human ideal, while J. T. Beck, a more influential teacher, upheld the inspiration of the Bible's writers and insisted that it contained Heilsgeschichte.⁷⁶ There was always some conservative scholarship in

those years in Germany, which got a thorough hearing from pastors but scarcely from theologians.

The excellence of theological work by the mid-nineteenth century was due to earlier achievements, the standard already having been set in textual, lexicographical, and linguistic fields on which the study of doctrine was then based. Dutch scholars moved beyond the Tübingen school, even to affirming the Pauline letters as second century fabrications, while the French and the English either accepted or rejected it.⁷⁷ Albrecht Ritschl, as Baur's most brilliant pupil, became the influential theologian of the 1870s and 1880s, having turned from New Testament studies and early church history to systematic theology, and with that made Göttingen a center. Adolf Harnack illustrated Ritschl's conception of Christianity in his History of Dogma (1886-9), which further established the historical approach to the Bible. Old Testament scholarship among the Germans was notable even though scientific knowledge of Israel's history came late. The competent studies in the history of Christianity were awaiting that, back of which was the analytical work of Astruc, Eichhorn, de Wette, and Ewald. A great advance came in 1865 when Graf published his essays on the historical books of the Old Testament, which was carried further by Wellhausen who studied the Pentateuch in terms of four sources (J, E, D, and P).⁷⁸ Behind both men was the work of Heinrich Ewald, who unveiled the sublimity of Hebrew literary genius. Now the literary basis

for the study of the history and religion of Israel was solidly laid. All this was then to be popularized, being ably done in Britain by W. Robertson Smith and S. R. Driver, and also in America. Conservatives everywhere were deeply troubled and the proportion of essays on these matters in The Fundamentals amply demonstrates that. Not only were such extreme views undermining Scripture, but also the seeming authority they carried caused doubt and unbelief on every level.

Even in New Testament studies, which were now slight compared to those of the Old, the Tübingen school had made some first efforts. As early as the 1860s a series of lives of Jesus had been produced, with the Ritschlian emphasis on discovering the historical humanity rather than any concern for dogmatic formulations about Him. Here began the attempts to get behind the Christ of the creeds to the Jesus of history.⁷⁹ An increasing number of German scholars, especially, doubted whether the Jesus of history could ever be distilled from the biblical Christ; whether history could ever uncover more than a religious genius and prophet; and, whether anything more than a moral certainty or high probability could be achieved.⁸⁰ Then in the 1880s came a great interest in the history of religion (Religionsgeschichte), for which archaeology, epigraphy, anthropology, and ethnology were necessary. This movement centered at Göttingen with Ritschl's colleague, Lagarde, a kind of religious prophet as well as an Orientalist, while Gunkel and

Bossuet popularized it. Once again, this effort sought to break down the authority of the Bible and church tradition, as the Bible was now placed historically alongside the religions and their books of the ancient Near East.⁸¹ With the 1890s came some renewed but radical thinking in eschatology, a subject then very much at the center of British and American evangelicalism, as witnessed by The Fundamentals.

The Germans exhibited three tendencies in their study of Christianity in this period: the desire for a system if not a systematic theology, independent critical scholarship particularly in the linguistic, textual, and literary fields, and a positive response to social influences.⁸² With Schleiermacher systematic theology began properly in Germany, and from that studies in philology arose. Parallel with the former was the appearance of historical studies, principally the writing of theological or dogmatic history, and both these subjects constituted a large portion of the German scholarship of that time. Schleiermacher saw the individual person as a precious materialization of the divine spirit. He rejected the Enlightenment's political philosophy and believed the state to be always the servant of the church. The Prussian situation only strengthened his correlating the progress of German culture with Protestantism.⁸³ As early as 1799, in his speeches on religion, he noted those themes which are essential to all biblical study, and which later became so central in theological controversy.⁸⁴ What Schleiermacher did for systematic theology,

Harnack and Troeltsch did for historical theology, making the German contribution an especially rich one.

Adolf Harnack's Das Wesen des Christentums shows him at his height, where in these Berlin lectures he stresses the moral side of Christianity to the exclusion of the doctrinal, thereby weaving together much that had been developed by his colleagues throughout the land. Forces such as the neo-confessionalism of Dorpat and Erlangen, with its ecclesiological passion and ecclesiastical suzerainty, cultural concerns, Baur and Tübingen, and Ritschl all influenced him as a person and an historian.⁸⁵ He had to speak to culture as well as defend the Faith by historical investigation, which he vowed early to do. In Ritschlian liberalism, he had found a way to speak both to culture and the church. While the War shattered his dreams of progress and dated his work, he was still able to pass on to the layman especially a vivid portrayal of what Christianity was about. He presented always that philosophical and yet practical explanation that appealed widely to non-theologians.⁸⁶ In this way he made history unlock theology.

With Troeltsch came a revival of interest in natural religion, and he was the chief systematic thinker of the history of religions school. He was the fullest heir to Schleiermacher's legacy, and, seeing Christianity as a religion of personality, he was a major force in early twentieth-century Christian thought.⁸⁷ The ideas generated by German romanticism, which opposed rationalism and "all

the clumsy miracle apologetic", he saw as the starting point for German history and theology in the nineteenth century.⁸⁸ His greatest work was the Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, which, as with all his works, made no pretence of an extensive acquaintance with the sources.⁸⁹ His thesis grew out of using the best dozen or so books, which meant that having missed many details his conclusions might well have to be changed. He was interested in the broad sweep of church history, and in the lessons that could wisely be drawn. Both he and Harnack were historians committed to higher criticism, in whose work can be found an iconoclasm, perspective, summary, and even a prophecy that so characterized theology then. Troeltsch was much influenced by Max Weber, and thus thought in terms of a sociology of religion which his work bears out. This was something new for ecclesiastical history, but so in line with theological newness generally.

Max Weber himself brought as much a new turn to religion and society as Schleiermacher did to systematic theology and Harnack and Troeltsch to historical theology and church history. He followed closely the progress of biblical theology and church history in the German divinity faculties. The relationship between the individual and the church and state dominated his thinking.⁹⁰ Catholicism for him was a great threat and yet he denounced Bismarck in the Kulturkampf. Calvinism provided for him a decisive influence in the development of modern capitalism, but he did not

say that Calvinism engendered capitalism for that spirit was alive much earlier. As with Troeltsch, he never validated his argument with appropriate religious and economic details, and yet there was much in what he said.⁹¹ As a sociologist and an historian, and fully sympathetic to reformed theology, Weber was attempting to speak to a religious world that was only too willing to replace God with man. He regarded Calvin as having provided an orthodoxy with the widest implications for all of life. To bring anew that theological system amidst the higher critical atmosphere was to cause either a sudden reconsideration or dismissal. In the academic arena, it was a jolting evangelical reminder made not by a theologian, but certainly a scholar. It could not and did not go unnoticed.

The theological developments which occurred in Germany, as here presented only in outline, point up only too well the immense amount of new thinking which Britain and America had to do, regardless of what they ultimately accepted or rejected. The same liberal emphasis was abroad in Catholicism as well, though most of modernism's efforts there were officially banned. With the War, the consequent deflation and economic distress, and the Bolshevik revolution, European Protestantism was to take yet another turn. Spengler's mighty Decline of the West was only one sign of the general collapse of cultural foundations, and theology was to change in relation. The Germanic mind continued in high gear, and the sheer force and volume of its nineteenth-

century theological work, principally, was to have a protracted immediate and echoing effect.⁹²

That effect was deeply felt in British theology. Since the Deist controversy nothing affected fundamental Christian truths there until the following mid-century. Once the new secular learning appeared, with all its suspicion and shock, a reckoning with theology could not be bypassed.⁹³ In consequence, British theology was reconsidered and often rewritten in the light of German theology and its own indigenous intellectual advances.

Though coming later, F. D. Maurice was the Schleiermacher for Britain, having a systematic theology that was grounded in historical theology. He was the fountainhead for the social reform movements in the Church of England, because by wrestling with Comte, Mill, and Marx he was convinced that Christianity did have a solution to social problems, thus antedating the social gospel.⁹⁴ English Christian socialism owed a debt to Maurice and his followers for providing a theological base. By later century, Shaftesbury's personal example, Maurice's prophetic power, Barnett's creative suggestiveness, and Kingsley's passion for goodness made an undeniable impact for the cause.

Breaking new ground, though in a different way from Maurice, was John William Colenso, first Bishop of Natal, who dealt more with specific traditional doctrines such as the atonement and eternal punishment. For his views he was excommunicated, though he finally triumphed. His case

seriously raised the question whether the Archbishop of Canterbury had authority over bishops, and also, whether the Thirty-nine Articles were not indecisive, denying more than they affirmed. That he was South Africa's first missionary carried many implications for the missionary enterprise, as he was but the promise of many others to come.⁹⁵ The dismissal of Maurice from his chair at London and the humiliation of Colenso were the first successes in a series of attacks on English divines who were notably liberal. Utilitarian philosophers or German-trained metaphysicians were much better armed foes of biblical orthodoxy than were the crude old-fashioned deists whom Christian apologists were accustomed to attack. The radical thinking that had already begun with Maurice and Colenso was to get much worse by 1900.⁹⁶

In the production of theological scholarship, Britain's contribution was impressive. H. H. Milman, Robertson Smith, A. B. Davidson, S. R. Driver, T. K. Cheyne, and R. H. Kennett, to name but a few, were at the forefront of higher criticism there. W. R. Cassel's Supernatural Religion brought the Tübingen school to Britain's attention, while Liddon's Bampton lectures (1867), The Divinity of Our Lord, used every argument to restate traditional beliefs. Britain's answer to Baur and Strauss came with Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort.⁹⁷ The latter two were a link with the older school of Coleridge and Maurice, and the work of all three was carried on by Swete and Stanton at Cambridge and

Sanday at Oxford. Future emphasis was to be more on the interpretation than authenticity of the Bible, and Oxford and Cambridge continued to be the primary centers. In biblical studies the advance was notable. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible began appearing in 1859; the first volume of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible came in 1898; Encyclopaedia Biblica was published between 1899 and 1903; Studia Biblica was begun in Oxford in 1885, and the more ambitious Texts and Studies appeared at Cambridge in 1891. Also, periodicals were being published, such as The Expositor, The Expository Times, and The Journal of Theological Studies (1899). In Old Testament, Driver succeeded Pusey at Oxford and was a proponent of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. In New Testament textual criticism, Westcott and Hort took a kind of German leadership. Topical studies were much in vogue as well: patristics with J. H. Newman, Maurice, and Scott Holland; the atonement in Rashdall's Bampton lectures (1915), The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, R. W. Dale's The Atonement (1875), P. T. Forsyth's The Person and Place of Jesus Christ (1909), and McLeod Campbell's The Nature of the Atonement (1856); together with other works on miracles, eternal punishment, the eucharist, and ecclesiology.⁹⁸

In addition to so many first-rank individual scholarly works, British theology also gave rise to two further group publications similar to Essays and Reviews, but circumstantially more quietly received. They were Lux Mundi in 1889 and Foundations in 1912, about which brief mention was made

earlier but more comment must be made here. Lux Mundi was a "series of studies in the religion of the incarnation", and in the preface's words was "to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems". Its authors loved the world and sought to redeem all of it, with the aid of evolution and higher criticism. Liddon and many with him felt it was yet another selling out to German criticism.⁹⁹ Foundations attempted to put forward a theology that would be backed by science, philosophy, and scholarship generally.¹⁰⁰ This volume also grew out of an Oxford friendship, whose seven authors discussed their essays together and intended them to be read together so as to express a corporate mind. Both works were written for a wide readership and never presumed to offer a complete theology. Altogether they form a kind of trilogy, with a common theology, aim, and type of author, and they are a definite landmark in British liberal theology.

Undoubtedly, Victorian Britain, especially England, had inherited much of the evangelical tradition, but soon that was changed. This did mean, however, that many of those who were formerly put off by the Faith now had less hostility to it, because its interference was comparatively so slight.¹⁰¹ The nineteenth century intellectually was less creative and more reflective, desperately wanting to understand, explain, and defend. Religion was a live issue even for the majority of educated men, and few were willing to depart from Christianity's morality, if from its doctrine.¹⁰²

For Britain, it can be said that then the free churches were much less affected than the national churches: the corporate life of the chapel and its outstanding preacher were less easy to attack than were official documents.¹⁰³ The chapel seemed satisfied and did not want to fear dogmatic religion, while the church thought it irresponsible not to do so, even at the risk of being truly à la mode. Those who did not fathom the new thinking went ultimately to Rome, Fundamentalism, or indifference.¹⁰⁴ Evangelicals still believed that what man needed was not current knowledge so much as forgiveness and salvation. Before 1860 doubt was growing in the Victorian soul, and Darwin was but a symbol, finally, of that loss of assurance. Somehow man still needed a movement bigger than himself, and because of that Darwin substituted biological science and intellectual enquiry for religious faith. Nevertheless, to many Victorians both within and outside Britain, evangelical religion was the authentic voice of the Reformation, with all its biblical piety, and was still the sharpest arrow to pierce the soul of the heathen.¹⁰⁵ Between 1850 and 1914, liberalism was in power because it had official intellectual backing, even though the actual head-count of evangelicals was infinitely greater. The same held true for America.

American theology now was comparatively young and immature, and apart from the individual scholars or theologians mentioned earlier in connection with its intellectual and theological history, it is only important here to dis-

cuss two indigenous and distinctive American theologies, those of Mercersburg and Princeton. In 1871, J. A. Dorner wrote that America was merely on the threshold of its theological existence, but that Protestantism's future much depended on it now that slavery was abolished; therefore, denominations would give themselves to the study of scientific theology in order to understand what it was the Germans were saying.¹⁰⁶ Interesting it is to note that in another ten years (1880), the Calvinistic New England theology controlled the major theological strongholds; but, within fifteen years later those teachers had been replaced by others, who believed too much had happened since Schleiermacher and Darwin to hold to reformed theology.¹⁰⁷ The new theological emphasis responded similarly in America as elsewhere. It was too optimistic, overemphasized the incarnation, did not take sin seriously, and exalted human nature rather than God's sovereignty. Liberalism had patently erred when in emphasizing God's love it forgot His justice, and magnifying His gentleness forgot His sternness, to say nothing of the attitude to personal conversion.¹⁰⁸ * Yet, it was at such a time that St. Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, the epistle which divided the early church, converted Augustine, enlightened Luther, converted Wesley, and with Barth's commentary thereon precipitated a whole new theological era after the Great War. In America in those years, both sides of this illustration were represented formally by a native theology: Mercersburg, the object of

Paul's theology, and Princeton, the theology of Paul himself.

The Mercersburg theology was the result of the work of John Williamson Nevin and Philip Schaff, who developed the seminary for the German Reformed Church in America.¹⁰⁹ They shared the same convictions and sought an ecumenical rather than a sectarian approach, although with many high-church tendencies which automatically brought them disfavour. They swung deliberately from a revivalist to an eucharistic emphasis, their theology being a chapter in American idealism.¹¹⁰ Schaff spoke out against supernaturalistic orthodoxy and the subjectivity of evangelicalism. Nevin wanted to save the pulpit from rampant revivalism and make the Lord's table central to worship, as a symbol of total congregational participation, which was a notable Scotch-Irish Presbyterian contribution to the German Reformed tradition. This view of Nevin's accounts for Schaff's congeniality, having taken place in highly sectarian circumstances, when there was no ecumenical movement and Romanism was tantamount to "Babylon" and the "great whore" of Revelation.¹¹¹ They were both mediationalists trying to reconcile Protestant and Catholic churches, the substance of their dogmas with science, and religion with culture, all of which caused their own doctrines to be attacked. They were not reviving a former theology but presenting an eclectic one, knowing full well what they were about in the light of their knowledge of historical theology.¹¹² They stressed the Christological

not bibliological, incarnational, evolutionary, and ecumenical, while openly and frequently admitting to their influences from and sympathies with German theology.¹¹³ They had a noticeable spiritual fervour and a kingdom of God idea that was doctrinal, but to lose the balance of their theology could mean going either to Rome or Oxford. As a result of the brutal realism brought by the Civil War and the Franco-Prussian War, the ecumenical hopes of Mercersburg were shattered and much of its aggressiveness lost. Its place, if any, was with the high-church Lutherans and the Oxford Movement, and its scholarly interest in Reformation studies did aid American evangelical theology. The greatest scandal of Mercersburg was that it attempted to relate itself to Catholicism, practically and historically. No price was too great for them to pay if true ecumenism could be realized.¹¹⁴

The long list of events, intellectually and theological-ly, that occurred after 1850 compelled some theologians not only to resist these trends, but also to offer an equally reasoned but orthodox response. Such was the Princeton theology, founded at Princeton Seminary by Archibald Alexander, given its most complete formulation by Charles Hodge in his Systematic Theology, and later refined and defended by A. A. Hodge, B. B. Warfield, and J. G. Machen. It essentially began with the Seminary's founding in 1812, and Machen even took it with him to Westminster Seminary in 1929. It has not been Princeton Seminary's theology always; more correctly, it got its name from the professors there

who held it. In no way was it ignorant of current scholarship, but simply chose to defend orthodoxy at all costs, principally the doctrine of biblical authority from which all else followed. The Princeton theology was very much a contemporary Westminster Confession.¹¹⁵ Then, as now, many persons, organizations, seminaries, and Bible institutes have found in this theology an absolute claim for full biblical trustworthiness. Much of the argument running throughout The Fundamentals is based on Princeton. For evangelical theology totally, the Princeton theology was an asset, having been formulated and kept going by such eminently learned men, who were in the forefront of theological scholarship. It set forth so valiantly just those views which were so much under attack, and declared positively for the very pivotal points of any theological system. To say the least, the hearty continuance of this position amidst all theological storm, however sharp the opposition, speaks for its even classic value.¹¹⁶ As liberal theology on all fronts changed, moving either more to the left or right within its own spectrum, Princeton essentially remained the same, only to tighten its argument wherever needed to keep its response current. It might have seemed scholastic and theoretical, but it was thoroughly biblical, and its full belief in a sovereign God was everywhere evident.¹¹⁷ While the New England Calvinism of Hopkins, Dwight, and Taylor began to crumble after 150 years in the face of higher criticism, the Princeton theology showed no signs of faltering and

still has not.

The history of the nineteenth century up to the Great War, intellectually and theologically, amply illustrates that there were countless trends that caused a definite shift from the things of God to those of man. For the Protestant world, save the Continent, Britain led the way. America was very much in her shadow culturally and theologically. Germany, with its ecclesiastically-detached theological system, comparatively, was interested in new solutions to old problems and in that claimed to be scientific. Truth was the goal, and in this context that meant whatever man could test to his own satisfaction. A direct God-given revelation, as with the Bible, was now suspect. While that shift may seem convincing or due, it never went unopposed theologically. The evangelical defense and response to be found in the Princeton theology was not only a magnificent beginning, but also a symbol of so much more to come. All of that was to form the seed-bed from which The Fundamentals came.

CHAPTER TWO.

THE SEED-BED OF THE FUNDAMENTALS:

THE RISE OF EVANGELICAL DEFENSES.

The events which comprised the seed-bed of The Fundamentals are as numerous and varied as the oppositional trends themselves. They include those in British evangelical history between 1850 and 1914, as well as some before, with special note of the Oxford Movement, together with the concurrent American development. Here a comment on Fundamentalism has been included in order to make the necessary distinctions and thus place The Fundamentals in their proper setting.

The pre-1800 British ecclesiastical scene figures here principally because of the Westminster efforts and the eighteenth-century evangelical contribution. *All of the authors of The Fundamentals, without question, found strength in and supported the Westminster Confession, which itself was produced mostly by parish clergy who were much aware of the violent political change, calamitous war, and deep despair and anxiety of that time. That Confession was written in the best reformed tradition, and its catechisms are laudable for the exactness of their definitions of faith and the loftiness of their ethical precepts. It was an honest statement of pure biblical faith, equally as concerned about doctrinal orthodoxy as were The Fundamentals, and an obvious though implicit strength for them.¹ For both, the

concern was with practical Christianity, e.g. faith, repentance, assurance, prayer, joy, peace, and conduct, and the Confession nobly declared, "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men." With the liberties that Westminster brought, the Bible once again became that uncontrollable, incalculable, disruptive force which often left the priestly hierarchy powerless. This was the Puritanism to which innumerable acknowledged debts were to be made in the future, and subsequent literature depended on it.²

Joseph Milner's History of the Church of Christ, widely known at the time and having contributed to the conversion of several members of Parliament, was something of an evangelical household word and part of the seed-bed. Milner (1744-97) was revolted by the profanity of the Enlightenment and this work was published amidst the first alarms of the French Revolution. While it had many faults professionally, it did educate evangelicals through affirming the historicity of their beliefs, together with providing them with a kind of philosophy of history. Further, his work helped to form the evangelical party in the early nineteenth century, after its long period of non-organization and burst of self-confidence in the 1790s.³ Milner's was but one example of the literature that displayed both the sober goodwill and deep devotion so characteristic of that side of Georgian religion. It was then, too, that the hymn came into much use, being called "the poor man's poetry",

which made the eighteenth the "century of divine songs". In less strictly biblical ways, religion enriched literature much before 1850, with the popular journals abounding in lay sermons and moral discourses.⁴ Both the hymns and the journals were to remain an essential outlet for the gospel, and The Fundamentals' authors were nurtured in both. In all of this John Wesley epitomized the best of the early evangelical efforts, through the singleness of his purpose, majesty of his message, and the purity of his own soul and life.⁵ His work and all that it represented was the pre-1850 seed-bed in British evangelical history of which The Fundamentals were so fully conscious.

The 1850-1914 period therein is very much the second flowering season of an already healthy plant, while for America it is only the first. From the 1780s until well into the nineteenth century, England's Age of Elegance was equally a nightmare of depravity, sin, and infidelity. Yet, it was at that time that Hanoverian England saw the official rise of the evangelicals, having begun with the converted African slave trader, John Newton, the newly converted William Wilberforce, and the subsequent Clapham Sect.⁶ Now there were to be two distinct forces at work in the established church: the ecclesiastical establishment that was not so-called evangelical in that sense, and, the evangelicals themselves. The latter were not opposed to property, vested interests, or the privilege of the great, but they were concerned that all facets of life lead to genuine

spiritual growth and glory. The evangelicals' growth as a party from the early nineteenth century was dramatic. They made the English public very conscious of proper living, and they also made only too clear just what sin was.⁷ There was understandably a devotional sterility in the Georgian church before evangelicalism came. They emphasized the full work of Christ, which itself had been slurred over by the Latitudinarians who held that all men were equally right in whatever they believed, thus making them theological utilitarians and their position a form of Deism.⁸ Doctrinal definition was paramount together with a devotional working-out of that doctrine, which made the evangelicals long famous for their categorical thinking.⁹ One result of the French Revolution was that it increased the seriousness of life and morals among the English aristocracy, to which the evangelicals greatly contributed. But they, too, had their blind spots, certainly on the social issues, which may be one of the reasons why the Oxford Movement, ecclesiastical as it was, had a greater direct effect on British church and national life than did evangelicalism in the later nineteenth century.¹⁰

From their formal inception, then, the evangelicals directed their efforts not to any one group but to everyone. Their message is enshrined in homiletical and devotional literature, as they produced few volumes of systematic theology or original contributions to philosophical learning. In this, their ancestry to The Fundamentals is all the

more real. They had authority unequivocally and there was no "perhaps" in anything they said. They held firmly to the sixth article of the established church.¹¹ The evangelicals brought new dignity through the sincerity of their worship, a raised standard of church music through congregational singing, and an unanimity on major doctrinal issues despite Calvinist and Arminian views. They enjoyed the approval of Cambridge much as the regulars did of Oxford, both parties having been concretely represented historically in this way.¹²

Concerning the sacraments, they recognized baptism and communion as the only two, believing also that the unworthy recipient receives the gift not at all. On baptismal regeneration they were divided, and communion they saw foremost as a common meal with the Lord.¹³ Confirmation was for them a lesser sacrament, though they thought highly of it because it signified for the believer, through the laying on of apostolic hands, the receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts VIII: 15ff.; XIX: 6). Even with all their numerous contributions there was much criticism, feeling that to so much of life they did not relate, with which fact many contemporary evangelicals agreed.¹⁴ Nevertheless, their interests were far from parochial, and through a rapidly growing missionary program the evangelicals showed a new and very deep concern for mankind in all parts of the world. The British themselves founded many societies, including the Church Missionary Society (1799), Religious

Tract Society (1799), London Missionary Society (1795), Baptist Missionary Society (1792), British and Foreign Bible Society (1804), and the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (1809). Some of these proved difficult to reconcile with the normal Anglican government, while others proceeded on sectional and partisan lines. But, all these forces were truly indicative of a zeal and a claim that, fully imbued with the Reformation faith as restated by Westminster, set out to win the world for Christ, and literally that.¹⁵

The proofs, then, are many that the pre-1850 evangelical scene in Britain was already a very healthy one, with all that continuing uninterruptedly to the Great War. In the 1850-1914 years, specifically, stand two great events which have an equally close bearing on the American evangelical scene: the Second Evangelical Awakening and the Keswick Convention. Both of these in fact had American counterparts, the former having actually come to Britain from Canada and America, and the latter being first British with a later American copy.

The so-called Second Evangelical Awakening had very much the same positive effects for Britain as did the First under Whitefield and the Wesleys. The background to the Second is significant. Between 1845 and 1855 religious life in America was on the decline while prosperity and population were increasing. Then in 1857 came a commercial panic with vast unemployment. In that same year a religious re-

vival had occurred in Hamilton, Ontario which then moved into America proper with enormous results for evangelical Christianity. By 1859 this had reached the British Isles, affecting every county in Ulster, Scotland, Wales, and England. This not only added over one million members to evangelical churches, but also brought genuine social uplift and new impetus to home and foreign missionary activity. This Second Awakening properly refers to the period 1859-1865.¹⁶ It took two forms, reviving of Christians and converting of outsiders, having begun with a few small prayer meetings that soon developed into large formal ones. All types of people were converted, from the most mature minds to small children, with Dr. Barnardo, Alexander Whyte, Hugh Price Hughes, and Bishop Handley Moule being among them. The revival was not supported by Roman Catholics, Anglo-Catholics, or Unitarians, and was most intense among the Calvinistic denominations in Ulster, Scotland, and Wales, with Plymouth Brethren and Quakers also participating. Theologically, it restated the Reformation - Westminster - First Awakening tenets, emphasizing a conservative view of Scripture as well as a conservative eschatology, which was epitomized in The Fundamentals.¹⁷ This Awakening induced a renewed and greater interest in hymns, re-introducing the earlier ones as well as those of the current American revival, and thus made hymnody a very important part of British evangelicalism.¹⁸

The Second Awakening was much in the mainstream of British Christianity, and the fifty years that followed it,

up to the Great War, saw a period of expansion for the church, the total results being in every way comparable to the First Awakening.¹⁹ The Salvation Army was the only new group that grew out of it, which, unlike the First, produced no cleavages among Christians and even healed many evangelical splits. The linkage of prominent revivalist personalities in both Britain and America from the First through the Second to the War is remarkable. That is, Charles G. Finney was born a year after John Wesley's death (1792), having participated in the Second in both lands; with his death in 1860 came the birth of Rodney (Gipsy) Smith, who lived to see the resurgence of evangelism in the 1940s. The greatest single institutional legacy of the Second Awakening for The Fundamentals was the Keswick Convention, which was founded by men who were deeply transformed by individuals and groups that got their initial inspiration therefrom.

Keswick's founder, Canon T. D. Harford-Battersby, was reared in wealth and evangelical piety. When a student at Oxford he became an Anglo-Catholic, but it was at the Oxford Conference of 1874, which had Awakening links, that he experienced a dynamic conversion. That conference was formally called the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, and holiness became and remains the Keswick theme.²⁰ Keswick created no new school of theology or sect. It existed for the sole purpose of helping men to be holy in the fullest Christian sense, and many of its attendants were believers and Christian workers who came there for

refreshment and rededication. Neither was it geared to give yearly religious injections nor to stimulate temporarily, rather, to lead people to Christ permanently and to feed them in that life. In its week-long yearly meetings it became quickly an international crossroads for evangelical Christians and many of its leaders were authors of The Fundamentals.²¹ Its post-War convention in 1919 had a worldwide impact because of its real part in founding the Inter-Varsity Fellowship.²²

Keswick's message sought always to be completely faithful to Bible teaching, so as to promote genuinely holy, Christ-centered living and thus recover an "oft-forgotten, oft-misunderstood, oft-misapplied but blessed and living truth".²³ The pan-denominational fact of its speakers added greatly to its strength, and in encouraging missionary work it never failed. Not only was it evangelistic but it also deepened Christian experience; it was famous for changing professed Christians into persons of full Christian action. The messages were direct and simply intelligible, preceded always by careful Bible readings with many personal testimonies often being given. Keswick has always been able successfully to blend every kind of Protestant adaptation of the Faith, while at the same time its motto -- All One in Christ Jesus -- had no strictly ecumenical implication whatever. There was real evidence that many of its speakers were aware of and grappling with the higher criticism, but the total biblical involvement there could always be seen

in its hymns, which emphasized surrender, trust, cleansing, and the Lord's return.²⁴ The pentecostal experiences, minus the tongues, of the early church were seriously advanced, and it also kept abreast of all current events, sacred and secular, and has continued to do so.²⁵ As the higher criticism made itself felt even after the War, Keswick "maintained a Christian gold-standard of sterling value in an age of depreciation". With its solidly biblical convention addresses, influence on youth, nightly Open Airs with tales of conversion, and the great missionary involvement, Keswick can be considered a major factor in world Christianity.²⁶ In sum, it is fair to say that Keswick very much crystallized what happened in the Second Awakening. What is more, it promulgated the evangelical faith, whatever the cost, in public conferences equally as did The Fundamentals in print, and the actual connections between the two are very strong indeed.

Apart from and in addition to these two major events in British evangelical history (1850-1914), many resultant outgrowths were evident there alone, to say nothing of the influences on America and elsewhere. Christian Unions were begun at Oxford and Cambridge, which spread to other universities there and in America. In 1882 Moody was persuaded to speak at Cambridge, out of which came the Cambridge Seven who went to China as missionaries, and also the Mount Hermon conferences. Not only Keswick and the Welsh and other revivals of 1904-1905 onward, but also the American

Student Volunteer Movement and Christian Endeavour, together with great missionary advances in China and Japan in the 1880s, all these proceeded directly from the Awakening.²⁷ With it all was an era of social peace, as the Pax Britannica from Waterloo (1815) until 1914 coincided with this great century of evangelical advance. Then it was that Britain led the world industrially and her navy ruled the Seven Seas, whose empire was the largest man had ever known with the benefits outweighing the injustices. And large numbers of Christian missionaries were following her flag. Untold good was being dispensed to so much of society because of evangelical quickening and in the name of a redeeming gospel.

Finally, there remains one further factor which figured much in British, as well as American, evangelical history from long before 1850 until 1914, that of prophecy, and again The Fundamentals attest to that strongly. In England the study of prophecy received fresh impetus from the French Revolution, whose drastic changes seemed a clear unfolding of the world's history as noted in Daniel. Naturally, prophecy was nothing new, but from the early church on it was called out most often during periods of great change. Most especially, when Protestants, whose realm it really was, saw always the Church of Rome as the man of sin, the anti-Christ, or the apocalyptic harlot. With the passing of Napoleon elaborate prophecies were written through that century and into the twentieth, much of which was incited by

the post-1850 intellectual and theological developments.²⁸ Prophetic study was far more practical than theoretical, insisting that one should always be ready for the end-time. Without doubt, Patrick Fairbairn (1805-74) was the greatest British student of prophecy, whose work was the fruit of more than a quarter-century of inquiry into the interpretation of the symbolic and prophetic portions of Scripture. In his holding fully to all biblical prophecies for Israel and the church,* together with his premillennial and dispensational theology, he was much in the stream of a large segment of Victorian evangelicalism, especially as that manifested itself in The Fundamentals and America.²⁹ Certainly a sense of the prophetic was to be seen both in the timely work and inward understanding of such noted churchmen as Dean Burgon, as a scholar, and Charles Haddon Spurgeon, as a preacher, both of whom defended the Faith so well in the light of biblical prophetic unfolding.³⁰

With all the tensions and opposition, the closing years of the Victorian era up to the Great War found the evangelicals in Great Britain stronger than at any other time.³¹ As their special contribution to religious life, they taught the basic need of personal conversion through evangelization, the primary importance of home and foreign missions, and the centrality of an authoritative Bible. They allowed nothing to come between themselves and Jesus Christ, for redemption meant that face to face encounter constantly with Him. As one of three church parties ulti-

mately, their closer affinity was with high rather than broad churchmen, as the emphasis of the former on the church and the sacraments had a much closer biblical relation than did the latter's comparatively free thinking and talk about the universal fatherhood of God.³² British evangelical history before 1850, as well as thereafter, is filled with examples of their having risen to the occasion, all of which went far to substantiate the claim that because of their fervour, solidarity, and genuine contribution to theological learning, to say nothing of personal spirituality, ecclesiastically speaking mid-Victorian Britain's coat of arms was something more substantial than "an interrogation mark rampant over two bishops dormant".

Concurrent with the evangelical development was the Oxford Movement, with which there were certain quite natural affinities as well as some real reactions. Altogether these factors, coupled with the American development, made for a rich seed-bed from which the ripened fruit of The Fundamentals came. While the Oxford Movement has no specific bearing on these documents as such, nevertheless it did sufficiently enrich British Christian spirituality, and evangelical intercourse therewith was only natural. Like evangelicalism, it was a reaction in part to the broad church and liberalism, only in the opposite direction. The result was that the Oxford Movement was much responsible for many purely ecclesiastical developments in the Victorian church. Even if, then, this topic falls outside the

chronology for this study technically, it does figure and its omission might be even more noticeable.

The most important denominator for both the Oxford Movement and evangelicalism was their primary interest in personal spirituality. The difference was that the former insisted this was best achieved through the institution, whereas the latter talked of a personal relationship with Christ only. It was the church and not the existing social order that the Oxford Movement defended, dogma and not metaphysics on which they relied, and in the church and its sacraments as godly extensions that they found the core of vital Christianity. This emphasis with its elaborate ecclesiology provided a sharp contrast to the evangelicals' grace-centered Christianity. Their solid defense of a divinely given body, order, and faith all making up the church expressed that the incarnation was at the heart of their system, for admittedly both the Enlightenment's rationalism and the evangelicals' individualism caused them unrest.³³

Theirs was not a theory worked out by cloistered scholars aloof from the affairs of the contemporary world, rather a workable ideal for churchmen who knew their patristics, scholastics, and Anglican divinity and noted therein that historic coupling of personal piety and institutional religion. The nineteenth-century currents of romanticism, liberalism, nationalism, and industrialism all suggested both the individual and the corporate. The tractarians' claim for catholicity and apostolicity, as they urged the

authority of society in religion just as others wanted the authority of the state in politics, was much in line with that. These men were called tractarians because they were publicists and pamphleteers rather than strictly theologians, but with genuine scholarly capacities. They had a theological understanding of church history as the story of Christ's continuous work among men.³⁴

Historians of the Oxford Movement largely agree that it really sprang from nothing specific, even though it was a reaction to the Enlightenment and also evangelicalism.³⁵ Both the tractarians and evangelicals paradoxically represented a kinship as well as a polarity, but always on the orthodox side. The high churchmanship of the tractarians was not quite identifiable with what Anglicanism had long seen, nor was that difference attributable to any one cause. Theirs was a movement that sprang from men's souls and not ecclesiastical expediency. Again, the matter of biblical authority entered, but for the tractarians mostly there was something less than plenary allegiance because of not holding to plenary infallibility, which caused a major difference with the evangelicals doctrinally; but, in their spiritual emphasis there were many links between them.³⁶ The ninety tracts themselves set forth the Movement's claims and gave it substance, with Newman's Tract 90 being the epitome in many ways.³⁷ In Newman himself is to be found that genuine connection between the Oxford Movement and the evangelical development. For while he would have found too narrow The

Fundamentals' claims, he would have shared entirely their concern for spiritual regeneration, social reforms, and careful doctrinal formulation.³⁸ In the tracts themselves the conservative element is strongly marked, wherein are to be found extracts from other Anglican divines of like mind, proofs that the Movement's doctrines are those also of the Book of Common Prayer, and exhortations for fasting, frequent communion, and an unchanged liturgy.³⁹

As the evangelicals proclaimed the direct divine encounter, the tractarians insisted on augmenting that with sacred tradition. The difference between them being that for the former John XIV: 6 was absolute in itself, while the latter would have added the qualification "through the church", as they saw much value in the temporal significations of that heavenly life. The Oxford Movement at first could claim an alliance with the evangelicals in finding liberalism as misguided and wrong, but as it aged its theology shifted whereby it claimed a connection with the Lux Mundi efforts. Had the tractarians held to their original concerns for spiritual regeneration, even though in a much more ecclesiastical frame, rather than a gradual moving to a rich liturgy that was non-missionary and not supported by biblical orthodoxy, their Romish tendencies would have been less noticed and their efforts more evangelically approved. For after all, the Oxford Movement was begun, as was the evangelical, because of philosophical and spiritual reactions, with the intention of producing a kind of litur-

gical evangelicalism. However, its attitude to biblical authority and other such cardinal issues soon found it in the liberal tradition, and this together with its Romanism made it doubly objectionable, not only on the British but also the American scene, where the Protestant Episcopal church largely took on that tendency. Thus, in the historical view, the Oxford Movement was initially both a credit and a liability for evangelical history, though ultimately the latter. Nevertheless, it did present an evangelical form of spirituality through its ecclesiastical emphasis that was kindred. In its pristine state and as Newman originally would have had it, the Oxford Movement would have definitely been part of the seed-bed for The Fundamentals, though indirectly; but as it turned out it was another tendency to be opposed.⁴⁰

To leave the British scene for the corresponding development in America, the main lines of such there can be reduced to four: the American Protestant ministry generally; revivalism; revivalists and related institutions; and, prophecy and dispensationalism as special American theological interests.

Even to make a few general historical remarks about the Protestant ministry in America is very difficult, because of the diversity and fragmentation of organized Christianity there due largely to "transplantation through immigration". By 1850 there was a noticeable change right across denominations from a primarily ritualistic and

sacerdotal faith to a much freer one, which predominated and much affected the whole conception of the ministry. In many ways the soul preceded the mind, as pietism superseded rationalism, and, in the usual three parts of the sermon, the application ran much ahead of the textual exegesis and laying down of doctrine. As America grew to extraordinary strength throughout the nineteenth century there was complete separation of church and state. The evangelicalism that caught fire and became so much a part of, perhaps even to being a synonym for, American Christianity, enabled the multi-denominational church there to triumph amidst the regnant individualism. Evangelicalism was more than suited for this situation, but it flourished not for social but only for religious reasons.⁴¹ It is fair to say that America, from 1850 on, had not only an evangelical history comparable to Britain's, but also she was, so to speak, evangelical as a nation, so much so that The Fundamentals were not just a party view but rather more representative. The ministry in America could not be thought of apart from revivalism, with D. L. Moody as the archetype.⁴² The liberal wing that did exist, which had intellectual strength and numbers but nothing like the same proportions, was very much concerned with what the evangelicals bypassed, and got the occasional associate member as with Henry Ward Beecher, who frankly moved away from the evangelical position of his famous father.⁴³ Among secular intellectuals of the period evangelicalism was generally not honoured, and by the turn

of the century higher criticism was rampant. Still, the evangelical faith with its ethic and simplicity won the heart of religious, pre-1914 America, in a way that was healthy and often illuminating. By no means was it like the narrow, anti-intellectual brand called Fundamentalism that emerged after the War.⁴⁴

Throughout every area of American Christianity between 1850 and 1914 there was a compelling social concern to which evangelicals responded nobly, though with personal conversion being always their first aim. The Sunday School, Y. M. / W. C. A., Salvation Army, institutional church, and missionary efforts of every kind, at home and abroad, were highly effective organizations, many being transplants from Britain, where first the gospel itself was preached and lives changed with planned social services that followed. It was the other side of the social gospel movement.⁴⁵ In the 1880s and 1890s American evangelicals began five organizations to focus religion on social life, from which sprang new avenues of involvement with representation from The Fundamentals in the forefront.⁴⁶ One of the most lasting enterprises of this period was the missionary one, which was epitomized in the Student Volunteer Movement.⁴⁷ Evangelization was never just a local concept with evangelicals and their missionary concern and prowess in these years was limitless. From America alone came the majority of missionaries and more than half the financial support for all Protestant missionary efforts everywhere. Also to be

noticed was the employment of many women ministers in the churches, deaconesses who directed Christian education and served in other capacities on large city church staffs. After the Civil War, the church was the one institution the Negro was permitted to take charge of himself and the Negro ministry grew because of that with some important results. However, for all these opportunities there loomed the immense problem of proper religious and theological training. For while seminaries were increasingly affected by the shifting emphases, the newly created Bible schools were neither intended as nor equipped to be substitutes as their own preparations had recognized limits. By 1914 the clergy's salaries were lessening as were the academic standards in the seminaries. Ministers were badly needed, and the time had come when those of greater capacity had to be encouraged to enter the profession, as increasingly those of lesser quality were being trained.⁴⁸ Somehow a most precious, beautifully simple, and ever accurate clock was being wound down.

Between 1865 and 1900 evangelicals particularly had much Christianized their social attitudes and concerns, almost to the point that every human need had a corresponding religious society. But the message of salvation stood at the center and their methods were in no way to be confused with the liberals' social gospel. There was even a fear that piety was being subordinated to charity, that ideals were being lost in mechanics, and that the church was

being secularized. Yet, true propriety had not gone misunderstood by the world when a sociologist remarked that the church was not primarily an organ of philanthropy but the preparer of the soil from which it springs. There is no denying that evangelicalism was continually meeting fierce opposition, but at the same time it responded admirably as The Fundamentals will show.⁴⁹

These years, 1800-1914, Latourette calls the great Christian century because of the sheer extension of the Faith. The church was at the center almost unavoidably, and between 1900 and 1915 the fruit was still properly ripe so as not to fall. Perhaps, too, Bryan, Roosevelt, and Wilson were the secular Moody and Finney, as the crusades for varying kinds of righteousness had no small link with this vital evangelicalism.⁵⁰ But with 1914 came a drastic change in interests as the years of transition had ended with the frontier gone, Arizona and New Mexico having got their statehood in 1912. Also, the great tide of immigration was cut off then when the German armies went into Belgium and France. The agrarian democracy of earlier years was now becoming only a memory, for the economic effect of the War was to hasten the maturity of urban America. With all this came many entirely new religious problems and solutions, which is another subject altogether. Nevertheless, the evangelical history of America from 1850 to 1914 in terms of the general response of the ministry shows an activity that sought diligently to meet real needs. By 1850 America had found her feet and by

1914 she had come of age absolutely. It was a time of great strengthening when the evangelicals themselves brought the gospel of total personal revival to all sorts of conditions and men. Revivalism as a philosophy of religion was very much at the core of America's life and progress, touching every segment therein, during these years.

Historically, American revivalism began with the Great Awakening in the early eighteenth century, followed by a second in 1800, and something similar beginning with Finney, and from these many of the evangelical societies mentioned earlier arose.⁵¹ Always, revivalism in America has been closely linked with social, political, and economic developments, while intellectuals have carefully questioned it continuously since the Civil War.⁵² Perhaps the genius of revivalism for America has been in its innocent though serious approach to the ills of the culture at any one moment, and thereby trying to adjust the theological, ethical, and institutional structure of Protestantism accordingly. Evangelical theology was admirably adaptable to the American doctrines of self-reliant individualism, progress, and perfectibility, which the revivalists realized and acted upon, however superficial their efforts may finally be judged. They were able to speak to life as they found it, translate it into theological terms, and give religion immediacy and vitality. The clergy endorsed them for the most part because of the renewal brought, however short-lived, which led to vigorous church life. Too often, though, re-

vivalism turned heart religion into anti-intellectualism, humility into self-righteousness, emotion into rationality, and piety into religiosity or hypocritical posturing.⁵³

There is something in the view that much of revivalism was escapist because it ignored the social complexity of evil, and shallowly optimistic because it assumed that evangelization was the simple cure for all contemporary problems.

Their sometimes grandiose thinking, that a tidal wave of religion was about to inundate America as her form of democracy was about to cover the earth, in the end might well have made men conform rather than reform.⁵⁴

In a very learned way, R. A. Knox considers revivalism as one form of enthusiasm that has many dangers, as it can range from a calculated doctrinalism to pentecostalism. While he saw evangelicalism as having properly given birth "to an admirable progeny of social reform" in the nineteenth century, for him the true revival in this period was the Oxford Movement, "whose whole programme was a return from the charismatic to the institutional".⁵⁵ Simultaneously there developed perfectionism, which began in Methodism and then became an outright evangelical cause with Keswick's holiness emphasis, growing up against a background of free Protestantism that had not the authority to rebuke it, theology to interpret it, or machinery to regulate it. And revivalism was at the center of its development. Knox labelled this as "an exaggeration, a caricature of the Evangelical standpoint". Furthermore, he claimed that when

perfectionism in evangelicalism had been abused, it led and would lead to difficulties similar to the early church's spirit of prophecy leading to Montanism, or later, Catholic mysticism's leading to Quietism in the seventeenth century because of abuse.⁵⁶ With the many developments that revivalism engendered, its contribution to the missionary movement must be noted finally.

At the heart of revivalism is that slogan "saved to serve", and many of the persons who there met Christ as a result surrendered themselves to total Christian service. For many that meant going far away to completely pagan situations, which Mott and Speer much encouraged with evangelical churches giving full support. This missionary motive itself matured, for while the primary task was the salvation of souls the missionaries also hoped to aid the entire cultural development of their people, politically, socially, and economically. It is true that business men saw the missionaries as the key to foreign trade, as "salesmen for the manufactures of Christendom", and they supported their work accordingly. Because of this and other factors, the turn of the century saw the necessary beginning of a formal theology of missions. By 1914 evangelicals in the main agreed that the missionary emphasis had changed from the individual to society, with the conversion of the heathen being a means to an end, yet with individual salvation as the essential beginning. This represented very much Robert Speer's thinking. This added humanitarian approach

drew large support also from the secular community, while fully realizing the religious priorities, and that made a considerable difference in planning because of additional resources. Clearly, revivalism, especially with Moody, was the source of this eventually enormous interdenominational work of the church, and the biblical concern for souls was the top priority with a total environmental renewal following on. Revivalism as a fact and a philosophy perhaps saw its most demonstrable effects in missionary work, primarily because the revivalist personalities involved and the products of their work saw that to be the present meaning of Mark XVI: 15.⁵⁷

The revivalists personally, their contributions, and the institutions which began as a result of their work were well-known, nationally and internationally. These deeply interested the writers of The Fundamentals, some of whom were actually involved, and are much a part of their seed-bed. Of all the revivalists, Moody, Sunday, and Torrey are the most relevant here. Dwight Lyman Moody (1837-1899) was the shoe store clerk who when converted gave his all for the gospel, maintaining his business for a short time only to leave it for a full-time ministry. Entirely self-taught with an always current interest in world events, Moody for thirty-five years preached across America and in the British Isles, in all the great pulpits, public theatres, and before students at Oxford and Cambridge and innumerable other institutions. He expounded Scripture exclusively and brought

his congregation very much together through much singing and prayer. His mission was chiefly to America and for that task he founded a school for boys (Mt. Hermon) and one for girls (Northfield), which were also great conference centers, an institute for Bible training, and a church. In a sense he had fulfilled an unusually complete nondenominational ministry.⁵⁸ The Northfield conferences were very much a part of the Bible conference movement which nobly defended orthodoxy, and there international peoples gathered, and still do, many of whom were associated with The Fundamentals. And peculiar to Northfield was the range of theological stances represented, for there George Adam Smith and G. Campbell Morgan were equally at home.⁵⁹ In a way the Chicago (later named Moody) Bible Institute which Moody founded was the complement to Northfield, for in the light of Marxist influence, great industrial strikes, and the lower classes outside the church, the Institute was to train Christian workers for city mission work in America.⁶⁰ Moody's contribution was in every way unique for he made the revivalist philosophy a way of life; what he proclaimed he institutionalized.

William Ashley (Billy) Sunday was a student of Finney and Moody, and a firm believer in the divine potential of the individual and the manifest destiny of the nation, shrinking all theology to a single sentence: "With Christ you are saved; without him you are lost." Like Moody, he devoted at least one sermon in each campaign to the imminent,

bodily second coming of Christ, with the premillennial view. He talked of "hitting the sawdust trail", which meant heaven-bound conversion, and his athletic prowess made him a physical marvel in the pulpit, together with his aphorisms and fame among all ranks. His education was very poor but he would face up to any subject, always believing that the Bible had the answer, and he could claim more converts than Moody, Whitefield, or Finney. Sunday was a mystery as to the impact he had on all types of people at a time of blatant worldly wisdom, conspicuous prosperity, fashionable churchliness, and much advanced theology, none of which he knew. He was the proof of and possessed only the gospel claim.⁶¹

The third and last revivalist to be considered here is Reuben A. Torrey, who, together with Charles M. Alexander, his song-leader, began a twentieth-century great awakening in 1901 in Japan, coming across to Britain in 1905 by way of campaigns in China, Australia, and India with huge successes. Torrey was trained in arts and divinity at Yale, with further theological study in Leipzig and Erlangen, and his spirituality and biblical faith never wavered while he was totally aware of current opinion. His entire life was given to evangelical causes, of which his contribution to and editorship of The Fundamentals was a part. Finney, Moody, and Müller were his great spiritual heroes and like them he was deeply given to prayer and Bible study, while witnessing wherever he saw a need. He preached an absolutely puritanical way of life, as well as highly topically, and, of all

the evangelists, he was by far the best trained academically as well as having an high social position.⁶²

In these three men alone can be seen something of the scope and character of the revivalists generally, with the poles represented by Torrey and Sunday, while Moody ran the gamut with his many foundations. Because of their common aim there were no true differences among them, although each used his gifts as he found them. They made an important contribution themselves, with the aid of other institutions that were created out of and for revivalism. Of these, four stand out as having aided most the American evangelical cause, the Sunday School, Y. M. C. A., Tract Society, and the Bible institute.

An English foundation under Robert Raikes originally, the Sunday School was part of colonial America, having reached its full development after 1865. It first began in order to instruct the more unfortunate children to read and write, and soon it became geared to biblical instruction with a complete graded curriculum. Thus, it went from an independent movement to being a generally recognized department of the church, with classes for all ages including the elderly. The American Sunday School Union (1824) was an evangelical foundation and until the Great War the Sunday Schools were considered to be evangelical regardless of the church to which they were attached. In this great enterprise the entire evangelical company came together, from evangelists to scholars, in order to provide Christian guidance and

learning, in which sense it was the best Christian program in existence.⁶³

The Young Men's Christian Association (Y. M. C. A.), founded in London in 1844 by twelve salesmen in a dry goods store, was an exceptional lay expression of dynamic Christian concern for young men adrift in the city. It stood in the stream of the earliest disciples, the lay brotherhoods of the Middle Ages, and numerous groups of pious youths who in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries came together for deeply religious purposes. The Y. M. C. A. counteracted vice, alcoholism, delinquency, crime, and many of the evils of urban life. It was concerned with the moral, mental, and physical salvation chiefly of young men. Like its revivalist root, it was uninterested in theology and essentially above denominationalism. Indeed, it became the institutionalization of the layman's rejection of all forms of ecclesiasticism. From the outset there were signs of the American Y. M. C. A. being much more a social center than was its British counterpart, and by 1914 this was definitely so. Nevertheless, it was a great force of revival among the middle and working classes in those years of increasing infidelity.⁶⁴

Founded in New York in 1825, the American Tract Society was an amalgamation of several evangelical tract societies, whose editorial board was multi-denominational, with a large force of colporteurs who distributed the tracts and preached as well. The tracts were written largely by

prominent Christians and supplemented religious reading especially in rural areas. The Society was avowedly anti-slavery and much persecuted for that, while its salesman techniques were copied commercially. With these tracts the wandering evangelist was equipped and the printed word was often forced onto the illiterate, which had positive results in several ways. However, some saw in its work the shaping of American thought into "fundamentalist Protestant patterns".⁶⁵

The final offspring of revivalism was the Bible institute, which has often borne the brunt of academic criticism when its original purpose has been overlooked. Its presence in Europe antedates the American ones of which Moody was the founder (1886), with lay Christian work being their sole aim. They were post-high school schools which granted a diploma as a restricted professional qualification. They answered a need and well, and what grew up after 1918 as Christian colleges, awarding formal degrees, was an adaptation of the original plan which often disgraced classical academic learning, and rightly so, as the original ones never pretended to cultivate that. A large portion of evangelical preachers, missionaries, and lay workers were graduates of these institutes, and their programs of training for mission work in America principally were significant. Undoubtedly, Dr. James M. Gray, as president of Moody Bible Institute, was the dean of Bible institute leaders, for his writing, preaching, and teaching brought him into civic as

well as church activities, and his mark was deeply impressed on evangelical America as one of its leading exponents representing so many facets.⁶⁶

In conclusion, revivalism was not only a form of worship but also brought with it effective and lasting institutions to carry on what it had begun. Revivalism brought the layman into his own and released him from a strict ecclesiastical system. It brought organized religion both to a new spiritual awakening and to a full-fledged democracy within the church, for it was in those years that "ministry" was made most elastic, when commitment was the only professional requirement for service.

Finally, closely linked with revivalism, as part of its theological presuppositions, are the two theological doctrines of prophecy and dispensationalism, themselves very much related to and feeding heavily evangelical theology in America. So much so that in this America stood rather alone, as this was not really a British inheritance though several there accepted its precepts as is seen, for example, in the British authors of The Fundamentals. Both these doctrines are a central thread therein and will be discussed more fully in relation to them later.

In brief, prophecy became popular as biblical skepticism and infidelity increased, with the first International Prophetic Conference having taken place in New York in 1878, being endorsed by leading churchmen and laymen from many denominations, from which many others followed

later. The central fact around which prophecy worked was Christ's second coming, which automatically related it to dispensationalism or premillennialism.⁶⁷ The greatest prophetic scholar of the period was Arno Clemens Gaebelein, who claimed that "Prophecy is history prewritten", that the greater part of the Bible is prophecy, and that current conditions were to be expected in that light. He even went so far as to say that Christians who deny prophecy reveal a serious lack in their spiritual condition. For him Daniel and Revelation more than substantiated the seriousness of prophetic study, as they so directly connect with the Lord's certain but unknowable return which must be prepared for.⁶⁸ This itself was the concern of premillennialism.

Premillennialism or dispensationalism (in this context only, these being synonymous) is a biblically based doctrine but one which is not necessarily cardinal, and there is always much dispute about it among evangelicals. Nevertheless, it is an eschatological concern which grew out of the study of prophecy and its interaction with revivalism was prompted by a belief that the end-time was near. With John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) and the Plymouth Brethren dispensationalism came to the fore, but it was also the concern of the early church.⁶⁹ Premillennialism holds that worldly conditions will grow progressively worse before Christ comes for His thousand-year reign, but this in no way means that evangelism must not continue for that is the church's primary concern. Revivalism, prophecy, and pre-

millennialism are inextricably bound up in theory, though belief in the first does not lead automatically to the other two, while the reverse is true. Premillennialism did present an intelligible explanation for the state of the world, including the Darwinian revolution, that was in line with the evangelical view altogether. But, being eschatological and at best not absolute, as there were also amillennialists and post-millennialists within the evangelical fold, it lacked doctrinal finality and therefore was not accepted as part of the canon. However, it did gain wide acceptance and had many leading exponents, several of whom were the authors of The Fundamentals.⁷⁰ It was actually C. I. Scofield and his Reference Bible that brought premillennialism to a popular level.

Scofield, in company with A. C. Gaebelein, A. J. Gordon, James H. Brookes and others, always insisted that premillennialism was a natural outcome of orthodox biblical interpretation. Accordingly, they worked out the doctrine systematically and the Bible conferences in which they participated so fully promulgated that. In 1909, after immense scholarship, Scofield published the Scofield Reference Bible, which was a carefully annotated edition of the Bible based on orthodox as well as premillennial theology. The editorial committee which he chaired had several men of The Fundamentals on it, and he himself was in touch with front-rank biblical scholars both in America and abroad so as to make his work

as conclusive as possible.⁷¹ It was designed for scholars, ministers, and laymen and succeeded in fulfilling that nearly impossible goal, so much so that a completely revised edition, taking into account modern scholarship since 1909, has just appeared.⁷² When the original edition came out there was peace and prosperity, international understanding was being cultivated, and even certain intellectuals felt that the gospel leaven was leavening all nations, that any kind of war was impossible. Many millions endorsed this but the Scofield committee could not agree. They sounded an alarm before 1914, not as prophets in any way but only as sane and spiritual exponents of sacred prophecy.

Thus, as revivalism in its many forms was the keynote of American evangelical history between 1850 and 1914, it asserted in a religious way that famous American ideal of individualism for all men whatever their station, to whom the gospel applied in all its fullness and particularity. To believe the Bible in its entirety, while aware of the counter arguments, was Christian propriety, and to make that doctrine equally devotion was Christian virtue. America was founded for religious freedom and religious belief and piety were her inheritance. This was to continue despite Darwin or the higher critics and revivalism totally was the insurance of that fact. In this development it is only natural that America differed from Britain, for in many ways what could be said there about a church party could be said in America about the nation.

Later, America was surrounded on so many fronts by a climate of opinion called Fundamentalism, which as a mentality and way of life grew out of a most narrow biblical understanding or lack of it. Simply as a term itself its coinage was post-War, and ever since then it has brought opprobrium and horror to those committed to an enlightened orthodoxy, or evangelicalism. However wrongly, it is to the Bible Conference movement that reference is always made for the origin of Fundamentalism, and for two reasons alone: the "five fundamentals" and in turn The Fundamentals themselves for supporting those. Both of these have had to suffer long because of their names, for they were absolutely dedicated to the fundamentals of historic Christianity within a context that was not. And more especially, they have had to suffer for all that went wrong in Fundamentalism itself which was certainly not their contribution or intention. An excellent example this is of why parents cannot and must not be responsible for their children, legally, after a certain age. Proper breeding by no means assures proper understanding or action later on. Parents The Fundamentals were, but childless in the next generation.

After 1865 a nationwide interest in Bible study had begun, as evangelical leaders were distressingly vocal about the higher criticism. The first Bible study meeting took place in the summer of 1875 near Chicago, when Nathaniel West, James H. Brookes, W. J. Erdman, and H. M. Parsons met together, out of which came the Bible conferences. Others

followed at Swampscott, Massachusetts and at Watkins Glen and Clifton Springs, New York, and kept mostly to the New England region. Niagara, Ontario was long the center for these (1883-1897), and it was there that the so-called "five fundamentals" were formulated in 1895. They were: inerrancy of Scripture, Christ's deity and virgin birth, His substitutionary atonement, His bodily resurrection, and His second coming physically. These were formulated never for cultist or obscurantist reasons, as so many have later thought, but only to restate the biblical claims themselves, which higher criticism and others had devalued if not discarded. It was simply an effort to revive orthodox theology and to that aim The Fundamentals contributed. It should also be noted that the American evangelicals who were so loyal and exhaustive in this reconstruction were very much of the same mould as their British counterparts, save for a greater dispensational interest.⁷³ However, Britain was spared the fundamentalist controversy of the post-War period which America so severely suffered.⁷⁴ While that controversy can be understood, it did not enjoy the quality of defense or possess the enlightened and scholarly mentality of the pre-War effort. Moreover, having run most of its course through the second War, the damage it caused American evangelicalism, as it was revived after 1950, is beyond measure.

To a great extent, The Fundamentals were the crowning achievement of American evangelicalism of that period, certainly, and what they said, which the next two chapters

will show, will more than prove that. They were written very much in the mainstream of nineteenth-century thought and as a response to it, and their writers were to some considerable extent non-American. Their effort and aim was far removed from denominationalism of any kind, but was a practical and partly academic one in the interests of total biblical allegiance. Clearly, The Fundamentals were the Essays and Reviews, Lux Mundi, or Foundations for the other side of the debate, which by their own admission was the representative voice of American and British evangelicals. There can be no denial that after the War, when the controversy arose in the 1920s, these were again needed by the church, especially as the War itself had also changed the intellectual climate. Yet, in many ways, that situation was not up to using The Fundamentals as they had been intended, and such misuse clouded their original purpose. The Fundamentals were never written for political reasons, nor were they to be regarded as a complete theology for one theological position only. They were written to keep the faithful from drifting to unbelief, by presenting the other reasoned side to a reasoned but less-than-supernatural, even agnostic, theology.

Doubtless the Niagara "fundamentals" readily lent themselves to use and abuse, making the issues concrete and brief by which one could be typed rather accurately. Indeed, the northern Presbyterian General Assembly in 1910 set forth five doctrines to which ministerial candidates had to sub-

scribe and they closely resembled Niagara's. These were nothing new except to insure that cardinal points were not mistaken in an age of dubiety and latitudinarianism. However, the difference between these two standards was the implicit premillennialism in the former which would not survive a tenacious Calvinism.⁷⁵ Here then is another theological distinction that separates The Fundamentals from the later development. The 1850-1914 evangelicals thought increasingly of the end-time, the immediate fulfillment of prophecy, while the post-War controversy did not. In addition, the latter had left behind the good manners both of debate and an open mind for bellicosity and bigotry that could conceivably be interminable. Really, a situation generally analogous to the fourth- and twelfth-century church.

Even though the termination date for this study is 1914-15, the final year of publication of The Fundamentals, it is most essential to take notice of the pre- and post-War climate in terms of how biblical orthodoxy was defended. Even when the ends appeared to be the same the means varied enormously. It is clearly outside the purpose and requirements of this study to comment with any specificity whatever on the post-War development. However, with some knowledge of that, it would not be inappropriate to say without documentation that for the pre-War development, The Fundamentals, as the principal evangelical effort, had a tone, quality of argument, breadth of view, scholarly preparation, major insights, control of the opposition, and understanding of

the issues which had no equal then or later, until mid-century. Intellectually and spiritually the authors of The Fundamentals met and set an high standard of achievement. Evangelicals then, as always, needed their best men to answer their opposition, whose training was equally as high and often higher. After the War noticeably lesser men and minds took up the cause which at once broke the tradition. There was particular truth then for the claim that the lower the intelligence and training the more the adherents to orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy has been often branded as biblical literalism, but the critics seldom give a precise definition of literalism, nor do they explain what they mean by the Bible as the Word of God. If orthodoxy is literalism because it honours the rights of language in Scripture, it is in excellent company for so do Christ and the apostles. Nor can the cause of higher criticism be rescued by contending that biblical revelation is personal encounter with Christ, and valid whether or not the Bible is truthful. This contention is not only void of proof but also reduces Christian commitment to a variety of religious experience at best. Orthodoxy teaches that only propositional revelation, as is found in the Bible, can clarify exactly the state of a sinner before an holy God. Christ taught that the plan of salvation was mediated to the church through inspired prophets and apostles, the Bible. Without that and fully believing it, religion becomes an exercise in personal feeling, whereby

the religious experience of an animist has the same rights as that of a Christian.⁷⁶ The Fundamentals were so concerned to make this clear for they carried the double burden of preserving both doctrine and devotion which were and must be kept together. In fact, they were not interested in stressing only doctrine, which was not so after the War and thus another very real difference. A constant fundamentalist failing has been the pursuit of doctrine for its own sake, often without any genuine understanding of what was being claimed. Also, it was not minority views but the lack of truth that distressed them, again not the case with fundamentalists where there was even a political struggle to win.⁷⁷

To date, however scholars have viewed Fundamentalism, they have all tacitly assumed that theologically and dogmatically there was no real distinction between that and what preceded it. That has now been shown to be erroneous. A sensible recent explanation holds that the pre-War position consisted of two newly-formed nineteenth-century theologies, the Princeton theology and dispensationalism, which while not fully compatible did manage to maintain a united front against the new criticism through the War.⁷⁸ In the most reduced terms, it can in fact be said that these two systems did make up American evangelicalism. There can be no further doubt that The Fundamentals themselves, which contain these two theologies, with an highly reasoned system accompanying each through Warfield and Scofield respectively, together with others, have bequeathed a great legacy. In

fact, by the sheer force of history these writings stood ready to carry on in the post-War development. However, rather than being used they were often abused, as were many other works, for many years thereafter as the situation only worsened, whether the Scopes trial in 1925, further Presbyterian splits in the thirties, or more bigoted theological debate in the forties. The inheritance was not appreciated, save for very few exceptions, and regress rather than progress for what had been a vital and intelligent evangelicalism was the case.

For some time there was a lack of opposition to this militant Fundamentalism because biblically it had an indisputable answer. But as it went on and showed its unreasonableness on so many counts the opposition came quickly. Fundamentalism demonstrated clearly a need for security, violence in thought and action, abusive personal attacks on those who disagreed, ignorance even to a form of illiteracy, anti-intellectualism, egotism, and much sentimentality.⁷⁹ The same could not be said of pre-War evangelicalism. The struggle raged most in the sophisticated North, while in the South and West it had not nearly so refined an enlistment.

The opening of the Great War marked a natural end to the higher critical scholarship in Germany, Britain, and America, which was not to resume until the thirties. After 1948 came an unexpected shift in events with Karl Barth's Commentary on Romans in 1919 in Germany, and then later in 1931 in Britain with Hoskyns and Davey's The Riddle of the

New Testament. This gave encouragement to the conservatives. Nevertheless, the work which the fundamentalists carried on had ceased being that magnificent effort of the English-speaking world collectively, as was The Fundamentals, and instead became completely American which soon caused isolation. Their plea for orthodoxy had a nationalism and particularity about it that made it inbred and even redundant. It had become largely a family feud. Also, vast denominational interests had set in, and efforts had become parochial and not at all ecumenical. Until 1914 the theological tradition of the West had a massive inter-relatedness about it, but afterward there was very much the feeling of worlds within worlds.⁸⁰ Fundamentalism had lost the sense of humanity, tactics, and proportion that had reigned so elegantly earlier, which could not help but damage the reputation of The Fundamentals itself. There can be no doubt, however, that its own pages proved that it represented so faithfully the other side of that most polished theological coin.

Those decades between the Wars saw Fundamentalism hard at work and growing in America. But, with the passing of the first half of the century, there came the return with great vigour of the former evangelicalism. Britain, by contrast, continued very much in the same earlier tradition because of having no interruptions. This revived evangelicalism has continued to grow, and alongside it Fundamentalism is much in the decline, though still very strong in certain

small pockets. This, of course, is another subject in itself. In all historical honesty it must be admitted that in the Great War years there were two events that did blot the copy-book of the tradition surrounding The Fundamentals. In 1916 at the Montrose, Pennsylvania Bible conference it was decided that if the evangelicals were to withstand their opposition successfully, a national organization would be necessary. This led to a similar conference in 1919 at Moody Bible Institute where the World's Christian Fundamentals Association was founded, which had a plan for purging schools, seminaries, and pulpits of heretics, eventually enlisting the services of William Jennings Bryan. To say that this was done in the name of The Fundamentals would seem baffling, but it cannot be fully denied, especially in view of the circumstances. Furthermore, it must now be said that no claim could ever be made that the worlds of The Fundamentals and Fundamentalism proper never mingled, for such could not be farther from the truth. There was and was bound to be mutual sympathy on many things, even to the involvement of the same people, for ideas and not goods were at stake. However, it was the consideration and implementation of all the factors heretofore mentioned, and more, that ultimately brought the divide.⁸¹

It would be possible, if hard pressed, to say that Fundamentalism was a reinterpretation of The Fundamentals in the post-War ecclesiastical situation, which will both not deny any link and yet allow for no end of dissimilarity.

Still, this can be dangerous, because Fundamentalism was a cast of mind in addition to, though growing from, its theological outlook, and even that was much different from The Fundamentals as history can now confirm. Naturally, there are real similarities between a few of the essays and their authors in The Fundamentals and the kind of attitude expressed in Fundamentalism. But, it is the total achievement and effect that is here being considered at all times. Fundamentalism was suspicious of evangelicals as too liberal, too ready to understand their opposition, and that has continued. The Fundamentals, their authors, and the entire evangelical school of the 1850-1914 period got a most respectable hearing in their own time and equally from many of their distinguished opponents, many of whom were in academic life, held great pulpits, and had responsible positions in their respective professions. Collectively, they were in no sense an organization, aside from the interests and dedication that brought them together. This was not true of Fundamentalism, where a growing machinery existed. The Bible conferences and a few societies and associations were the extent of evangelical organization before the War, and even they were not at all binding. As a result, the pre-War evangelicals were as free and open in their own terms as were their opponents. While the business of both was thoroughly serious, it was generated by an honest, profound love of the truth, and not out of the pressure of fear which figured so much thereafter. There was something inexplicably

and wonderfully academic and practical about theology then, in the sense that it was not organized apart from denominational loyalties. This was not the case with the fundamentalists, who, though concerned to preserve orthodoxy within the denominations, tended as well to encourage inter-denominational groups and even churches. This was in no way a proper ecumenical move, but an effort to bring together, for their own advantage and protection, all of like mind because of an admitted fear of so much of the established church. And that situation grew and became increasingly unhealthy. Fundamentalism was thoroughly an Americanism while The Fundamentals were not.

It is proper that this chapter should open and close with historical events outside the period directly under consideration. *Just as the British evangelical scene cannot be focused properly without reference to the Westminster Assembly, so the American evangelical scene must be taken beyond the Great War itself, otherwise Fundamentalism can never be seen correctly as something very much its own. It has been suggested, and not unwisely, that this period of great evangelical reformulation and thrust, with its tremendous insistence on biblical authority absolutely and a genuine experience of spiritual conversion, was very much suited to the individualistic, laissez-faire, Anglo-Saxon and American way of life. Perhaps it was very much a religion for the British and American social and economic ethic of the nineteenth century, with its emphasis on thrift,

piety, and sobriety.⁸² Such a statement can only be made in retrospect, but there is real truth in it. Nevertheless, whether for evangelicals or liberals, that was an age of intense honesty. So much so, that subsequent theology can scarcely go on for long without a reference to that period, which faced up to academic and practical questions in all channels of the Faith most courageously. The enormous differences which existed for so long were always healthy. The liberal who presupposed nothing, facing the evangelical who honestly took the Bible as final, created an atmosphere of religious and theological discovery that history has had no difficulty in finding. The opposition was vigorous and learned which demanded nothing less of the evangelicals themselves. They responded nobly and in those years were written many of the classic evangelical treatises on the higher criticism and numerous other related subjects. This is not true later on, for by then the spiritual and intellectual responses, theologically, had already been made. With the extreme tensions and stupidities which Fundamentalism caused, much energy was again misspent in causing unnecessary alignments and literature, which in themselves created in some instances as much unrest as the actual theological issues originally.

Now that the theological and non-theological opponents, as well as the theological defenses of The Fundamentals have been presented, these writings themselves must be unfolded in the light of their own response to that challenge.

CHAPTER THREE.

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE: THE RAISON D'ETRE OF THE FUNDAMENTALS.

In English-speaking Christendom an half-century had passed between the first widespread formal publication of the new theological thought in Essays and Reviews, and all that followed, and the equivalent statement from evangelicals in The Fundamentals. But, clearly, with that a proper response had been made to the challenge, for no writings had a more specific purpose behind them than these, the circumstances for which chapters one and two have set forth. Now for The Fundamentals themselves.

Their conception was as spiritual as their contents, the genuine answer to prayer of two men completely unknown to one another in Chicago and Los Angeles, A. C. Dixon and Lyman Stewart respectively, who were keenly aware of the spiritual errors and needs of their day. Dixon especially was disturbed about the new thinking and the sects which had resultantly arisen, and nearly every Saturday afternoon for two and a half years he met for prayer with ten other men on these matters. In the summer of 1909 he was called to the West Coast for a series of preaching engagements and there came to know Lyman Stewart, and his elder brother Milton, of the Union Oil Company of California, who regarded their wealth as a stewardship of God. Milton Stewart was chiefly interested in missionary work in China, while both

brothers had founded the Los Angeles Bible Institute where R. A. Torrey was dean. It was Lyman who heard Dixon preach, on which occasion he had replied publicly to an ultra-liberal professor from the University of Chicago about the Faith. The meeting between Lyman Stewart and Dixon that ensued was the foundation of The Fundamentals.¹

In actual fact, this project was Lyman Stewart's alone from start to finish. He finally suggested that twelve volumes be published which would contain all the foundational principles of Christianity, together with references to current critical scholarship thereon; but, he felt unable to choose the contributors for such a series and Dixon was the first he had found to whom he wanted to entrust that responsibility.² Stewart's intention was that a volume would appear every two or three months but instead it took five years. Dixon refused to accept a salary for this and none of the writers were paid. The three hundred thousand dollars' worth of securities given by the Stewarts was used solely for their publication and distribution. Similarly, the Testimony Publishing Company was established in Chicago solely for their publication and was dissolved as soon as the twelfth volume was in print. Chicago was the center of the operation and when it closed the records were moved to the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. There the periodical The King's Business was published with Torrey as editor, designedly to carry on the work and message of The Fundamentals as future issues arose.³

Over the six-year period (1909-15) the project had three editors. Dixon did the first five volumes before going as pastor to Spurgeon's Tabernacle in London. Louis Meyer, a Christian Jew who was working among the Jews under the auspices of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, brought out the next five when his health failed. R. A. Torrey, then dean of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, edited the final two. The editors worked together with a committee who together chose the writers. On that original committee were Dixon, Meyer, and Torrey, and Mr. Henry P. Crowell, Mr. Thomas S. Smith, Mr. D. W. Potter, and the Revd. Elmore Harris. Later the following were added: Professors Joseph Kyle and Charles R. Erdman, Mr. Delavan L. Pierson (son of A. T. Pierson), and the Revds. L. W. Munhall, T. C. Horton, H. C. Mabie, and John Balcom Shaw, all of whom served without remuneration. The twelve volumes contain ninety articles by sixty-four different authors and cover a wide range of subjects, but nowhere can it be ascertained as to how the articles finally were chosen or even the writers themselves.⁴

The original plan which Lyman Stewart and Dixon conceived was to have twenty volumes that would discuss the higher criticism and the evolutionary hypothesis. Each volume was also to contain one anti-cult article, but this proved difficult because of the written bias shown towards individuals involved in the cults. Many personal testimonies were hoped for with only a few being included finally. Yet,

there was success in having authors from both major and minor denominations, and interestingly the nationality breakdown for the authors is: American (40); British (17); Canadian (6); and German (1). The number of volumes was reduced from twenty to twelve, and as the War came on the securities for this had diminished in value making only twelve feasible anyway. The Foreword to the first volume states that these were "sent to every pastor, evangelist, missionary, theological professor, theological student, Sunday school superintendent, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. secretary in the English speaking world, so far as the addresses of all these can be obtained". That same Foreword goes on to say that "Two intelligent, consecrated Christian laymen bear the expense, because they believe that the time has come when a new statement of the fundamentals of Christianity should be made." With the publication of the second volume came a demand for it from the laity for which a minimal charge was made. In the third volume the Foreword notes that more than ten thousand letters of appreciation had come in from all parts of the world, and, that the adverse criticisms were also welcomed as they showed that the books were "read by some who need the truth they contain, and their criticism will attract the attention of others". With the third volume some 250,000 persons in religious work were receiving a free copy and were to receive the entire set. With volume four the letters of appreciation had more than doubled and with the fifth volume 25,000 more

copies were being produced. Extracts of the appreciation-correspondence are published in the volumes, as is a "publisher's notice" requesting that all mailing details be kept accurate so as to avoid duplications.

In the twelfth volume is a summary "statement by the two laymen" discussing the total work and explaining that the long period over which the project was extended was due mainly to the realization on securities. Over 2,500,000 copies of the twelve volumes were published and circulated at once, and the call for back volumes was so insistent as to make necessary a reprinting of over 250,000 additional copies. Approximately one-third of the total printing went to countries outside America and one-half of that total went to various parts of Great Britain. The majority of the Protestant missionaries of the world received them, the total mailing list comprising 100,000 addresses of Christian workers who requested them. Altogether some 200,000 letters were received from this project and many requested that it be continued. The King's Business as the official organ of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (B. I. O. L. A.) was the vehicle for that, and one free issue was sent to each subscriber of The Fundamentals. The Testimony Publishing Company was completely free from any commercialism. Together with the Stewart endowment it was surrounded by a great Circle of Prayer which was a positive force by the time of volume six, which all readers and believers were asked to join. The business manager himself, Thomas E. Stephens,

apart from a three or four page treatment in only a handful of books, with one very short chapter being an exception, nothing exists. Moreover, none of these begin to put these essays within the framework of the complicated history that bore them, which, as a contribution to scholarship to say nothing of the extension of knowledge, is as important as examining what they are saying in themselves. The Fundamentals were written purely as an answer to historical circumstances and they beckon the services of the historian more than the theologian. How tragically sad that to date they have not received fair consideration from either. And, finally, when they have been recognized invariably it has been within the full-blown fundamentalist context as an antecedent or cause thereof. In absolute terms they were a nineteenth-century effort and only by partial extension did they fan the flames of the debates in the 1920s. The genuine analogy to this mistreatment is to consider all reforming religious events of the fifteenth century as leading to the Reformation. That and the official fundamentalist controversy held the same chronological place in relation to those earlier efforts. Such argument distorts the true historical pattern, imposes scholarly design, and does not permit the thoroughly natural situations which occasioned them to speak for themselves. The task here has been and continues to be to treat The Fundamentals both in the light of what produced them and what they said as a result, all of which is legitimately ascertainable and to date has not been done. To

view them as the seeds for Fundamentalism is to capitalize falsely on their name, and, what is more, to fail to discern what they are really saying.⁶

Lastly, it must be noted that The Fundamentals have followed no prescribed order. No one volume holds to a specific theme save for the twelfth, which concerns evangelism mostly, and there is no real balance between the intrinsic size of a subject and the actual proportion of the total ninety essays given it. Nowhere is there any indication that an outline of subjects was drawn with a corresponding determination of its proportionate coverage. Rather, the plan seems to have been to say something about all the major themes of the period, which has been done successfully even though in some instances too scantily. While always the essays were to be written so as to be intelligible to many levels, it is interesting to note that the first six books are, inadvertently, rather more demanding intellectually than the other six.⁷ These essays have responded to the challenge presented by scholarship, science, and the cults and they have also provided an informed theology of the Christian faith and life. They have not only destroyed but also constructed.

Because there was no basic design to which these writings were fitted, other than simply an attempt to cover the necessary ground, the systematic ordering of them has many possibilities. Those works which have mentioned The Fundamentals in some detail have each presented their own

plan and no one would or could claim finality.⁸ The categorization to be used herein differs widely from the others and seems the most reasonable in the light of the study totally. Of the ninety essays altogether, forty-one will be treated in this chapter and the remaining forty-nine in chapter four. This means that in presenting this collection as essentially addressing two central themes, condemning error and extending truth, there will be a balance that was unconsciously sought initially. The theme of this chapter, challenge and response, will have four divisions: the authority and centrality of the Bible (fifteen essays); higher criticism (sixteen essays); Darwinism (four essays); and the sects (six essays). As for the theology of the Christian faith and life, the subject of chapter four, there will also be four divisions: the fact of man (ten essays); the remedy (twenty-two essays); the result (sixteen essays); and the error (one essay). It must also be noted that the authors themselves of these essays have received very little official biographical attention. Two or three of the most famous ones have official biographies, but the rest, whether they are well known or not, though still often distinguished, have remained in comparative obscurity. For that reason, an Appendix has been written to provide detailed biographies of each of the sixty-four authors, which information was gathered from innumerable sources: printed books and manuscripts, archives, and voluminous personal correspondence, including that with surviving relations, close friends, and associates.⁹

This then brings the study of the entire subject to a much truer completion, especially when Lyman Stewart and the editors knew and approved each author personally.

It needs also to be pointed out before these essays themselves are discussed that as their contents are unfolded there will be no attempt whatever to assess the rightness or wrongness of their statements or arguments, especially in this present chapter when they are attacking complex subjects which themselves have a specialized body of knowledge. Rather, the essence of what the essays say will be set forth in order to illumine the larger topic at hand, and in so doing the theological content will be used always to address the historical situation.

Absolutely fundamental to The Fundamentals is the proposition of the authority and centrality of the Bible, and it is only proper that this be the opening topic. Even though fifteen of the ninety essays speak to this directly, there is scarcely any essay which does not somewhere mention the authority of Scripture, in order both to assert the need for and truth of this fact as well as to reinforce whatever is being said with the Bible.¹⁰ After all, the nineteenth-century theological controversy turned primarily on the question of the Bible's authority, and this matter was certainly the most crucial one for the writers of The Fundamentals. Whether the subject be the Bible itself, higher criticism, Mormonism, or a phase of the devotional life, the place and weight of Scripture had first to be settled as the

superstructure would reflect always its foundation. Indeed, an insight into the non-order of these essays can be based on this point alone, for those which deal specifically with this question are scattered throughout and not set forth at the outset as might logically be expected.¹¹ According to the scheme used herein, Books IX and XII technically do not treat this topic, and yet one of the intrinsic beauties of this collection is that any one essay, for the most part, can be read and the central message of the Faith with its basic propositions will be found. Especially is this true for these dealing with biblical authority, for in the whole reassessment of theology then that came in for the heaviest attack. It is always to be remembered that these essays were written for a common readership, with the view that even if only one or a few of them were read never would the essential gospel message be missing. This means that there is much reduplication in emphasis and fact, and, that when attempting to categorize for purposes of examination many times the differentiations are very thin. Still, a breakdown there must be, however artificial at times it might seem.

As it was Lyman Stewart's intention to have personal testimonies counting as full-fledged essays themselves, the first essay to deal primarily with authority is Howard Kelly's "A Personal Testimony" (I: 7). Here, as with so many of the essays and their authors, the high accomplishments of the writer lend much weight to his statements. Kelly says that one of the strongest reasons for believing

the Bible absolutely is that unlike any other book it presents a diagnosis of man's spiritual condition which convinced him as a physician. At once he found therein the wretchedness of sinful man and the unending love of the sanctifying Christ, which for him cancelled all the arguments against plenary authority from mortal men.¹² In the Bible he found spiritual food which did transform one's life through correcting evils, purifying affections, and producing honest desires. With the Bible as the central fact of life because of its revelations, he found life a magnificent and understandable whole with God and His Word binding it at both the beginning and end.

In a novel way one essay takes the form not of a single writer's work but of composite "Tributes to Christ and the Bible by Brainy Men not Known as Active Christians" (II: 7).¹³ How justified the use of these quotations is could be open to much question, as in no way are these writers committed to this view of biblical authority and centrality. Twenty great names are represented: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Webster, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Napoleon Bonaparte, Goethe, Thomas Carlyle, James Anthony Froude, Dickens, Shakespeare, Byron, Matthew Arnold, Diderot, Professor Huxley, J. S. Mill, Rousseau, Pecaute, Ernest Renan, Disraeli, and Professor Hegard of Copenhagen. After their quotations are set out, there follows a short editorial comment which cites the Bible's own claims to authority as well as defends inspiration.¹⁴ While there is

no admission as such, it can be deduced that these statements have been presented to add a thoroughly worldly reverence and intellectual tone, that the representation would be more complete and the otherwise unconvinced might ponder here if nowhere else. The sheer presence of this underlines very much the editorial intention to appeal to all ranks of men.

At best these "tributes" represent what can well be described as humanist Christianity, which could impress one who would fail to read beneath the surface, but might well irritate both the informed unbeliever as well as the serious Christian. While the statements made exalt the Bible and the godhead, they invite a scrutiny that in the end could be disastrous. The most thoroughly Christian and even evangelical of the statements are those of Dickens and Shakespeare, in both instances having been taken from their wills.¹⁵ The rest demonstrate underneath a view of Scripture and the Faith that would not in the end be acceptable to what is here being defended. It is true that superficially they read well and for the vast majority would have a positive effect. But this could easily be one of the least attractive parts of the collection simply because of this kind of dishonesty. It is the only one of its kind.

The pendulum swings to transparent honesty in James M. Gray's "The Inspiration of the Bible -- Definition, Extent and Proof" (III: 1). Seeing it as the most vital factor for authority, he claims that inspiration is not

revelation, or illumination, or human genius, but refers always to the biblical writings themselves and not the writers. The question of whether the Bible is the Word of God or only contains that Word, on which topic Barth originally had so much to say and the United Presbyterian Church U. S. A. recently drafted anew its Confession of 1967, Gray firmly comes out for the former. He holds that God caused every word in the Bible to be recorded, true or false, and whether they are the words of Satan, false prophets, or enemies of Christ, these are still God's words, "not in the sense that He uttered them, but that He caused them to be recorded, infallibly and inerrantly recorded, for our profit".¹⁶ Inspiration includes all details of the biblical books, the form and substance as well as the word and thought. While Gray asserts this himself, admitting that as the verbal theory of inspiration it has many vehement opponents, it stands essentially as the view that all the authors would in some way hold. Proof for this view of inspiration is given, including arguments for both Testaments and the words themselves, based on what the Bible teaches about itself. The difficulties of such a position he discusses with equal openness.

The whole matter of inspiration meant much to Gray and he commanded not only a clarity for his own position and others in agreement, but also a considerable knowledge of the scholarship on the subject.¹⁷ With all the reverence for academic inquiry and explanation, the final secret of

his devotion to the Bible, his belief in its absolute authority and therefore centrality based upon its inspiration, hinged on his supreme devotion to the God of that Bible.

Because Gray and those whom he mentions had met Christ at so deep a level, it followed that they believed Him so completely as revealed in His Word; a genuine and sufficiently common historic virtue which they continued and could explain.¹⁸

Gray's is one of four essays that addresses authority and centrality through inspiration. W. G. Moorehead's "The Moral Glory of Jesus Christ A Proof of Inspiration" (III: 2) continues that by stressing His humanity through His being the pattern-man for all men by possessing unselfishness and dignity, superiority to the judgment and intercession of men, sinlessness, and omnipotence and omniscience. In this way he wants the reader to understand that Christ's moral glory as set forth in the gospels is not simply the product of an human mind, for such could not have devised so great a figure. Inspiration from God to the writers themselves has produced this record of a Christ Who is pure perfection and highest virtue. As Moorehead puts it, "In Jesus there is the most perfect balance, the most amazing equipoise of every faculty and grace and duty and power." Such an expression reveals a complete devotion to the biblical record itself as well as the Person behind it. He can give only two explanations for the biblical account of Christ: either the evangelists had Him before them or they wrote about Him by inspiration. He agrees with the truth of Theodore Parker's

words: "It would have taken a Jesus to forge a Jesus." The apocryphal gospels are so out of tune with the true ones and the numerous nineteenth-century lives of Jesus, including the best of them, are weak and mundane when compared to the biblical account.¹⁹

With the presentation of Christ's moral glory in the four gospels coming chiefly through inspiration, Moorehead asserts that every rule of right reason leads to conceding the inspiration of the rest of the New Testament. By believing the patristic axiom that "The New Testament lies hid in the Old, and the Old stands revealed in the New", he includes finally all of the Bible. For him the long tradition of scholarship that holds to inspiration is convincing, and he refers to those other "Christians at least in name" who are in faculties of divinity as bringing great destruction in their easy denials.

Equally as spiritual but less scholarly is L. W. Munhall's "Inspiration" (VII: 2), as he admittedly did not command the learning of Gray and Moorehead who spent most of their lives in academic settings. Munhall's approach is very much that of an evangelist and he begins dogmatically by saying, "The Bible is inspired. It is therefore God's Word." He, too, finds support in the 1893 Presbyterian statement and proceeds to quote contemporaries such as A. A. Hodge, Warfield, Gaussen, Westcott, and Burgon, together with several of the fathers (Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Augustine) in support of plenary inspira-

tion. For him the crowning demonstration of verbal inspiration is the way in which the Old Testament is quoted in the New. He also presents internal proofs, which he calls the Bible's direct, inferential, and resultant testimonies to its inspiration, and cites the biblical references. The singularly impressive fact of Munhall's presentation is his fluency with the classical statements on the subject, ancient or modern. His is not a victory by a carefully worked out argument, but by a compressed and forceful presentation of the great defenders of biblical inspiration, ultimately relying on what Scripture says about itself in this regard, especially the words of St. Paul, "Every Scripture is God-breathed."

The last of the essays on inspiration is A. T. Pier-son's "The Testimony of the Organic Unity of the Bible to Its Inspiration" (VII: 4), wherein he stakes his claim on the architectural plan of both Testaments, their inter-dependence and mutual fulfillment, and "diversity in unity, and unity in diversity". He attributes the entire plan to the harmony of a Supreme Intelligence, finding this unity structural, historic, dispensational, prophetic, personal, symbolic, didactic, scientific, and organic, and each claim is illustrated. Of all the claims, the reference to the Bible's dispensational unity is most characteristic of Pier-son's thinking. As there are seven dispensations and each one is marked by seven features, he held that life is now in the final dispensation awaiting the Lord's return.²⁰ All

these nine laws of unity are applied to Scripture finally, to show that each biblical book is necessary to the whole with all parts complementing each other. Pierson saw in the Bible a mirror, seed, and sword to the human situation.

To present some comment on the subject of inspiration was proper both on the part of editor and essayist, for it was one of the most controversial issues of its day and continues to be.²¹ From these arguments presented it followed that the Bible contained the supreme authority as God's Word and therefore must be central to the Christian life. That this was presented by Gray, Moorehead, Munhall, and Pierson means that it was competently done as they had an high interest therein to which their writings testify. Nevertheless, the question will always remain why Warfield did not contribute to this for he was certainly the leading scholar on the subject for evangelical theology.²² Questions like this could be raised in many instances, whether of commission or omission, for not always did the best mind prepare the statement, but there is no answer.²³ Nevertheless, the work was carefully done in the face of the high skepticism and criticism which so often wanted to ignore the issue. As with the one personal testimony and the essay of various quotations, these essays on inspiration dealt with the Bible as a whole in attempting to stress its authority and centrality.

To turn to the Old Testament alone, two writers use the book of Genesis and a third Christ's own regard for the

Old Testament in order to reinforce biblical truth. James Orr's "The Early Narratives of Genesis" (VI: 6) takes the first eleven chapters and raises the question as to what interest religious faith has in the doctrine of creation, which he answers by saying that that doctrine is the guarantee for the dependence of all things on God, "that everything in nature and Providence is at His disposal", that nothing is independent of Him. The descriptions of paradise, the fall, and the flood he affirms as truth, and then says that because the Bible does not teach modern science that is no justification for saying it contradicts it.²⁴ These early chapters are a necessity, for if the story of the fall were not at the very beginning of the Bible, then the moral state of the world which it pictures would have no meaning. What happens in Genesis I to XI sets the stage for the entirety of Scripture, without which the law and gospel would have been meaningless. Orr also has confronted the usual argument for two creation stories by saying that the second says nothing of creation as such, but deals simply with man and God's dealings with him when first created, and thus everything in the narrative is regarded and grouped accordingly. In that analysis alone he won a victory, for that has always been a major target for criticism, and his explanation is intelligible to all. Throughout he refers to the chief critics on his subject and gives his reply, which at once breeds confidence in his scholarly familiarity as well as his ability to defend the orthodox view so learn-

edly.

The concluding paragraph in this essay is just that, for Orr has aired the points of debate and presented both sides of the case, whereupon he firmly states that the narratives of creation, the fall, and the flood are not myths but facts which enshrine the knowledge or memory of real transactions, written "under divine guidance". He presses for their truth and authority by saying that therein lies the foundation of all else in the Bible. Immediately, confidence emerges because of the commanding presentation which attracts both the simple and the learned. His handling of biblical and scholarly sources brings a conclusion which hails absolutely total biblical authority with ease. What Orr has said of these few chapters in support of their full truth and authority not only augurs well for the rest of Scripture, but also brings the conservative evangelical position to a place of scholarly prominence which so many of its efforts had failed to do. To say no to strict biblical authority on what Orr has provided would take some doing.

Virtually the same theme is to be found in Dyson Hague's "The Doctrinal Value of the First Chapters of Genesis" (VIII: 6), though not as succinctly put and with more illustrations. He, too, sees the opening of Genesis as "the satisfactory explanation of all the sin and misery and contradiction now in this world, and the reason of the scheme of redemption". Just as the last chapters of Revelation reveal the consummation of all things, so also the first

chapters of Genesis reveal the origins and reasons for man and his fallen nature, and both ends are necessary. A syllogistic explanation is presented for the authority of Genesis, and by extension for the entire Bible, followed later by an outline of what these early chapters say and imply, which is helpful to the non-specialist.²⁵ Anthropology figures here and representative authorities are referred to, together with a careful quoting of Scripture in reply. As with so many evangelical scholars, the doctrinal foundation for the Faith to be found in early Genesis, the unity of the human race, man's fall, and the need for redemption, is a basic truth upon which to claim authority. This can be then set in contrast to the attempts to mythologize the supernatural in the Old Testament, to say nothing of the New. Hauge ends by referring to eminent scientists at home and abroad who hold that Scripture in all its details "contradicts no received result of science, but anticipates many of its discoveries", and he then summarily quotes John V: 45, 46.

The authority of the Old Testament is crystallized in Christ's own attitude to it, which William Caven discusses in "The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament" (IV: 2). This is done in two parts: showing His references to the Old Testament, which is a distinct matter from what the evangelists say of it, and, assessing the meaning or value of such a testimony. It can be said that He does not question the genuineness of any book therein and does

distinctly assign those parts of Scripture to the proper names they bear. The Psalms and Isaiah are quoted by Him and nowhere does He indicate that any of its parts are not authentic, rather He accepts them all as being from God. As the Old Testament on many occasions forewarns of His coming, for this and other reasons it is an integral part of the New and vice versa. Caven is quick to note the three New Testament passages in which the Lord refers to the origin and infallibility of Scripture, as yet further proof of its divine authority.²⁶ So, too, with the sheer fact of Christ Himself who fulfilled all the Old Testament prophecies made about Him, which for Caven both testifies to the inter-relationship between the Testaments and speaks clearly for the inspiration of the Old Testament narrative. The Lord's remarks in Matthew V: 17, 18 and Luke XVI: 31 refer to His own relation to the Old Testament economy and issue the highest praise to these more ancient Scriptures.

As for the value of Christ's testimony, Caven refers to biblical scholarship's two chief ways for invalidating His testimony to the Old Testament: that Jesus had no knowledge beyond that of His contemporaries about Scripture's origin and literary characteristics, and, the theory of accommodation, that He spoke of it only to follow current opinion. Caven answers this by saying that any such allegations immediately reduce His place as Lord, Teacher of the church, or whatever, and also censure His discharge of His prophetic office. But never does Caven want honest scholarly

criticism thwarted for that is a moral weakness.²⁷ The object in this essay has been to show that Christ regarded the entire Old Testament as "divine, authoritative, infallible", without trying in advance "to bind up the interpreter to an unintelligent literalism in exegesis...".²⁸ As Caven presented the case for the Old Testament totally, the New Testament was represented in part with a statement on "The Internal Evidence of the Fourth Gospel" (X: 2) by G. Osborne Troop.

In a word, this essay is an "appreciation" of John's gospel, both for what it records about the Saviour and its relation to all of Scripture, here claimed as the primus inter pares. It is realized fully that criticism has made this book the "storm center" of the New Testament, because of its highest claims for Christ, His deity and perfect humanity. Key verses and chapters are cited and commented on, but without scholarly references, giving very much the feeling that the battle with criticism was over and nothing need be said about this book except for what it alone says about its Lord. The opening lines are linked with those of Genesis, it claims that with the incarnation Christ did not become a man but Man, it spells out the resurrection promises, and in all it was written by "the disciple whom Jesus loved", an eye-witness of the living and dying Lord. There is no argument here and Troop himself states that what he says may "appear to be mere unsupported statements" at once to be dismissed by the scientific reader. He then adds that the

appeal of this article is to the "instinct of the 'one flock' of the 'one Shepherd'".²⁹ That this is said so directly and unashamedly, especially in the light of orthodoxy's defense, demonstrates all the more the pure love of Scripture, which is so intense that no questions of it are asked because it is presupposed divine. Having said that is to discount man's opinions in the end. With Troop, as with many other writers herein, this attitude is purely natural and in no way antagonistic.

G. S. Bishop's "The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves" (VII: 3) speaks to the authority of the entire Bible. Its immortality as proved by history, its own standards for claiming an inspired authority, its "transcendent doctrine" that deals with infinite guilt, infinite holiness, and infinite atonement, and its own direct assertion of divinity, all plead for and confirm an unquestionable authority. There is an heavy emphasis on its inspiration too, "inspiration is the essence of authority", and, that it is the Word of God and not merely contains it, claiming that it in fact comes from God because it says so itself.³⁰ The evidence for the emphases herein comes from what Scripture says about itself, rather than from scholarship, and with considered justification.

The same note is to be found in A. C. Dixon's "The Scriptures" (V: 2), where he says that "the Bible is literature written by the command of God" under His guidance and preserved by His providential care. The claim is made

that all Scripture is God-breathed, that the writings as well as the writers were inspired; yet, even though there was the one Author over all each writer had his own style and in no sense was he an automaton. Thoughts on a biblical use of the Bible, a biblical method of Bible study, which include Luther's analogy that he studied the Bible as he gathered apples, and a biblical motive for Bible study are set forth. The imperative is always "Search the Scriptures" as they are proof finally that only in them is to be found the most important authority for life. Practical advice on how to approach the Bible, use it, and profit from it, with references to Moody and Spurgeon who were models for Dixon, is given with the hope that people will begin to live in the Word.

A long and most sincere testimony to "Life in the Word" (V: 1) is Philip Mauro's contribution to the subject of authority, and he begins by noting the "determined and widespread effort to set aside entirely the authority of the Bible". Here is displayed a supreme respect and love for Scripture as twelve of its qualities are discussed: that it lives for all time, gives definition to life, is perennially fresh, never becomes obsolete, is the ground for all science, is indestructible, detects and discerns man's deepest needs, expects growth, and is life-giving, life-sustaining, and life-transforming. The remaining point, that of the "translatability of Scripture", is perhaps the most provoking, for Mauro claims that in its perfection and universality the

Bible can thrive in any language with nothing lost in the translation, unlike men's books when often the greater the literary value the greater its loss in translation.³¹ Again, the basis from which the author speaks is not scholarly evidences but his own conviction about the thorough truthfulness of the Bible, once and for all delivered, together with occasional references to famous minds which have both endorsed and rejected its claims. Vividly there is presented the contrast between what the world offers and God, the physical and the spiritual, with the unique quality of the Bible being its utterly transforming message. What is said is carefully though not excessively documented biblically.

George F. Pentecost's "What the Bible Contains for the Believer" (X: 10) approaches authority and centrality in terms of how the Bible prepares for salvation, contains in itself the absolute guarantee of the inheritance in Christ, cultures the Christian life, is the Christian's armory, the map and chart for the Christian pilgrimage, and reveals things to come. The refinements of an absolute belief in Scripture are emphasized, noting the difference between a superficial belief in the authority of the Bible as such but not in individual parts, especially when they indict. That is, to believe it but never put oneself into a practical and saving relation to it; to see Christ as the Saviour of the world rather than of a specific man. The pattern which Pentecost uses is one of crescendo, beginning with the Bible's essential task of instructing in the way of

salvation, then relating itself to all of life in space and time, and ending with its prophecies.³² Whether in Daniel or Revelation it is this spiritual announcement of things to come that brings an eternal finality to the Christian message.

The final essay under this heading deals precisely and at length with the argument from prophecy for biblical authority, by the most eminent scholar of prophetic study in that period, Arno C. Gaebelin -- "Fulfilled Prophecy A Potent Argument for the Bible" (XI: 4). Here is the claim that the Bible is "the only book in the world which contains predictions", that it is pre-eminently a book of prophecy whose predictions are declared to be the utterances of Jehovah which therefore make the Bible a supernatural book. The denial of the Bible as the inspired Word of God has severely cut the interest in prophecy as well as other areas of biblical study.³³ In fact, the higher criticism denied the possibility of prophecy. Gaebelin has concentrated in this essay principally on Old Testament prophecy: the Messianic prophecies, the Jews and their future, other nations with whom Israel came in contact, and the prophecies of Daniel. His understanding of Daniel has long been acknowledged and he sees the ninth chapter as the greatest prophecy in that book.³⁴ But it is the eleventh chapter in Daniel which has largely been fulfilled historically, whose accuracy has caused many critics to say that Daniel never wrote these, and Gaebelin gives eight pages to

displaying the evidence by citing the individual prophecies and their fulfillments. He ends by noting that there are New Testament prophecies which are now in the process of fulfillment, having already discussed the fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament. He then adds that there are many unfulfilled ones still left in Scripture, already several thousand years old, which God will complete in His time.³⁵

Bearing in mind again that there was no over-all plan for this collection, save that pressing issues of the day were to be discussed, it works out that in these fifteen essays three hundred of the fifteen hundred pages total have addressed this subject of authority and centrality. In view of this subject being hinted at in one form or other in the other seventy-five essays, because by nature they have to declare whether something is right or wrong according to their presupposition, the Bible, it becomes more than evident just how forcefully the new thinking in all fields came down on biblical authority. So the proportion is a fitting one.

Within this group the existing breakdown has unity and variety: one personal testimony and one set of tributes, four essays on inspiration, five on the Testaments' own witness, three on the Bible as a whole, and one on prophecy. Another interesting point of layout mentioned earlier, which can also be used to support the argument for no design, is that these essays on such a basic topic do not come at the beginning or together. Rather, they are scattered throughout

every book save two, IX and XII, with the weight of them in the center ones. That there was no planned order originally, and hence that these are spread throughout, does not in the least lessen their primary place as both a collective and individual effort. They are part of a definite corporate plan and while the loss of one or two would make no noticeable difference collectively, each one's contribution casts an extension of light on the subject. Their variation in conception and presentation, from the simple to the scholarly but always written out of deep faith and conviction, together with their inevitable repetition build a multi-faceted whole when seen totally and in perspective. Now the biblical assertions have been made and the assumptions can be drawn, from which the attacks on the subjects in conflict with that authoritative Word can logically and rightfully be made.

The Fundamentals, though they do not say so precisely nor reveal it organizationally, were written not only as a defense of orthodoxy, but also as an open attack on a series of isms which were greatly undermining that orthodoxy. Of these eight isms the subject of the higher criticism is central and represents by far the greatest proportion of essays. The much feared subject of socialism, and its religious manifestation in the social gospel, has technically only one essay representing it, though as a theme it has many references throughout. Indeed, it was the higher criticism, as discussed in chapter one, that set in motion much of the consequent theological development, and sixteen

of the ninety essays concern it directly. Again, there is no method in the arrangement and five of the books have no essays addressing the subject specifically.³⁶

The essays dealing with higher criticism can be placed under three headings: the science of criticism, criticism and the Bible, and the triumph of the Bible over criticism. Beginning with the science of criticism, Dyson Hague has contributed thirty-five pages on "The History of the Higher Criticism" (I: 6), including a three-page appendix listing works by orthodox writers, some of whom were capable scholars, for the reader to consult "to strengthen his position as a simple believer in the Bible".³⁷ The subject is suitably handled by one who lectured for a time in liturgics and ecclesiology. He begins by differentiating lower and higher criticism, the philological study of texts and manuscripts in contradistinction to the study of the origins, dates, and authorship of the biblical books. Large questions are raised as to why criticism is identified with unbelief and who originated this work. As are many smaller ones: the discrediting of the Pentateuch which led ultimately to a discredited Old Testament and eventually Bible; the disbelief in final authority and rejection thereof, even Christ's; the meaning of the incarnation in relation to divinity; whether true scholarship left the ranks of conservatives and are they in turn the only ones opposing the new critical methods; and, can Scripture claim to be true as it stands without human analysis and comment. Because of

the many major errors found throughout the Bible by criticism, Hague would see a vastly different theory of inspiration applying and then it could never account for the perfection or inerrancy of the autographs.³⁸ Criticism even said that Christ's own attitude to the Old Testament was no proof of its truth, because He was not a critical scholar and His knowledge as a man was limited.

Instantly, the presuppositional base from which each side was working becomes apparent, to say nothing of the variance in scholarly methods used. Hague has been fair in his representation of the higher critics, having mentioned several of them by name with comments on key points in their thinking so that the reader could see the issues at stake. Despite his own position and feeling toward the opposition, he asserts firmly that every true believer in the Bible must never settle for anything less than "the most fearless search for truth by the highest scholarship". Expertise is never absolute, and Hague continued to argue for the supremacy of God's Word, however much open to debate and possible error, over man's as a response to that call to stand firmly with Christ and His church. He believed that ultimately the deepest research and study would lead to the absoluteness of the Bible as it stands essentially.³⁹

In marked contrast to the balanced and academic presentation of Hague is Philip Mauro's "Modern Philosophy" (II: 5). He is much too sweeping in his denial of philosophy's worth, claiming that, because it is based on a human

system of thought, it is doomed to destruction and should therefore have no intercourse with theological or divine ratiocination. He has the boldness here to say that while philosophy as a tradition is as old as man himself, only once is it named in the Bible.⁴⁰ And always it is to be mistrusted because it extracts a system from what is in the world only. Never does it occur to the author that a legitimate Christian philosophy is possible. He saw philosophy only in terms of theism or atheism, dualism and pantheism or monism and pluralism, and always as perilous and apostate because it is "not according to Christ". Furthermore, philosophy had become a necessary part of university education, which he found an uncontrollable evil.⁴¹ No doubt the present situation in philosophy did cause Mauro much bitterness, primarily to be found in Professor Henry James of Harvard whose Hibbert lectures (1909) at Oxford sounded pluralism. James was most conversant with philosophical study in Britain and America and his findings and personal views, which were highly influential, caused Mauro and many like him grave dismay. Nevertheless, this kind of obscurantism is atypical in these essays.

Philosophy as such is here totally discredited with never an inkling that it can lend strength and goodness to the best in Christian theological thought. While Mauro's position is understandable, in that he wants nothing to destroy biblical truth, his lopsided presentation is very much a caricature and is the right kind of evidence for the

non-conservative school. Philosophy has been and always will be an important tool for theology, and it is a pity that in Mauro's evaluation he has been blinded by present facts even though contrary to the Bible's teaching. He has denounced the discipline and method of philosophy whose precepts have aided equally evangelical as well as liberal thought, and which has been a solid force in the science of criticism to be used for good or evil. Mauro's acceptable conclusion has not been acceptably reached.

This kind of presentation is to be expected in such a collection, but is not as serious a weakness as it might be when the full purpose is considered. Nevertheless, Mauro is the prime example here of anti-intellectualism. The norm is much more that of Dyson Hague or Robert Anderson, whose "Christ and Criticism" (II: 4) is not vituperative and yet does come down on the seeming non-objectiveness of higher criticism itself. Here Anderson points up the difference between genuine and counterfeit criticism. His observation being that so often, especially when non-conservatives are concerned, the scholarship that allows for full biblical trustworthiness is immediately suspect.⁴² For this he cites the Pentateuch, Daniel, and the gospel narratives inasmuch as they display Christ's identification with the Hebrew Scriptures, a fact so often mentioned in these essays. Both Anderson and Hague, in their respective arguments for criticism's lack, refer to the fact of kenosis as the positive assurance of the whole Bible's truth, a return to first

principles which criticism never can overlook.⁴³

The vital issue as Anderson sees it is not the value of the Pentateuch as such, or Daniel, or whatever, but the full deity of Christ, Who is as much at the center of the Old Testament as of the New. The normal question follows, what of divinity in the godhead and the non-divinity or non-absoluteness of their revelation, the Bible. Anderson admits his distress at having to question the findings of many distinguished critics "whose reverence for divine things is beyond reproach". Yet, their "assured results" are mere hypotheses only to be repudiated by others equally as learned, and here he refers strictly to conservative scholars. The effects of the criticism are noted as extremely grave, and Germany, Britain, and America are correctly cited as the places where such dethronement of the Bible and thus of God are most marked. The final appeal is to Christ and not to scholarship of any kind.⁴⁴ Implicit throughout is the belief that Christ and criticism need not be in opposition, once the critic learns that he must research on the premise that from Him alone comes all truth rather than from the fickle propositions of man.

This is also the opening and dominant note of A. W. Pitzer's "The Wisdom of this World" (IX: 3), which is the fourth and last essay specifically on the science of criticism.⁴⁵ Science and faith ultimately know no conflict, which the honest biblicist will realize, and as such research goes on God and His Word will be verified while man and his

will fall to error. The Christian must never view with dismay any researches into nature or discoveries in science, but should hail them as another dimension of God's work. It is when all this is "properly understood and interpreted" that there will be a perfect squaring between what man has found out and God has laid down.⁴⁶ That there is divine and human wisdom has been categorically stated. Pitzer believes that God's wisdom need not be unattainable nor man's ephemeral, for in Christ the two can and should meet making the wisdom of this world part of the divine plan and thus eternal. The demands of many worldly-wise men are for the rejection of religious belief, knowledge, and action, in the name of progress or advanced thinking, leaving man's race a "grave without a resurrection, universe without a God, and sin without a Saviour". With all the advances or reactions of criticism, and its accompanying notion that Scripture becomes more and more man's to control, the ever relevant question must again be asked: whether to preach Christ and Him crucified because He continues to be a stumbling-block to some and foolishness to others, or, shift to worldly wisdom entirely. The answer though obvious has direct reference to the higher criticism, as worldly wisdom which could easily remove the true heartbeat of the Faith while still maintaining the shell.

When arranging the essays in this manner for analysis, Pitzer's thoughts do bring to a natural completion the corporate message of all four essays on the science of criticism.

Within the context of an high view of secular learning and its legitimate inquiry into the sacred, biblical higher criticism has not been denounced in itself, save for Mauro's untypical protestations, but only when it has undermined the essentials of the Faith. Hague and Anderson especially recognize that high-powered criticism is as much the tool for evangelical scholars as for others, but lament that more often the latter receive the hearing because their results and conclusions seem comparatively new and exciting with their departure from and degradation of the biblical claims themselves. It is that kind of higher criticism that has been questioned all along, for while its conclusions seem logical and learned and thus true, they are only temporary and mortal. The problem has been an eternal one because two sets of presuppositions are followed, despite the liberals' claims that they begin from nothing, and the outcomes are as expected. The important question as to why the higher criticism of the evangelical theologians has not made a sufficient impact is a most searching one, whose answer would be a study in itself.

If such a question had an answer the weight of the higher criticism would be not nearly so immense or even embarrassing for evangelicals. Although great advances have been made recently, certainly in the period under discussion the usual tactic was little more than an iron-willed defensiveness with an occasional sensible apologetic. Nevertheless, the faithfulness and nobility in their task was

extraordinary, more especially when throughout that effort they were considered lacking in knowledge and understanding because of their unwavering biblical fidelity. The liberals were forever discounting parts of the Bible which they considered wrong or unnecessary, while the evangelicals were forever proving its total truth in order that nothing be lost.⁴⁷

To these essays on the science of criticism should have been added one by L. W. Munhall himself, whose book, The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics, has very much to say on this subject. He maintained that the unspiritual though scientific critic was likely to be wrong, just because he neglected the Bible's "subtle and transforming power in his heart and life, and depending upon the Holy Spirit who was sent to guide us into all truth to help him..."⁴⁸ Likewise, J. C. Ryle once observed that criticism put countless people off reading their Bibles. Still, the best critics themselves realized that what they were doing was not new; rather, the nineteenth century had only given it popular currency due to Enlightenment pressures, and with its many techniques and results each scholar involved was nearly a law in himself. There is great truth as well as reassurance in Dr. Theodore H. Robinson's remark that if one man believed the Pentateuch to be a single work written by Moses, as a result of serious study, he was just as much an higher critic as Wellhausen.⁴⁹ Such understanding was most unusual at the time and only more recently has it become

acceptable, a fact which The Fundamentals both believed and acted upon. This leads to the second part of this subject, criticism and the Bible, which includes seven essays.

Not that the matter of lower or textual criticism was settled, but the higher criticism went further to discover not merely the "what" but also the "why". Manuscript collation and emendation gave way to purely literary questions of structure, dating, and the authorship of the books. As criticism was concerned primarily with the Old Testament until near the turn of the century, the essays are confined to that. The first essay in this second group, taken in the order of the Old Testament books themselves which they treat, is A. C. Robinson's "Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch Which Are Incompatible with the Graf-Wellhausen Theories of Its Composition" (VII: 7). A very short essay, the three peculiarities are: the absence of the name Jerusalem, the absence of any mention of sacred song from its ritual, and the absence of the divine title "Lord of Hosts". None of these appear in the Pentateuch. Robinson holds that these points are undeniable, and, while he does not say so, he would also hold to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. That it was not "composed, edited, and manipulated, during a period of more than four hundred years, by motley groups and series of writers, of differing views, and various tendencies", but that in fact it was written before the title was invented.⁵⁰

All of this was fully endorsed and treated further by

G. F. Wright in "The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch" (IX: 2).⁵¹ At the end of the essay he defines what he means by Mosaic authorship: not that Moses wrote all the Pentateuch with his own hand, or that there were no editorial additions made after his death; rather, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuchal Code as Napoleon was of the code bearing his name.⁵² Wright has put forward the classical evangelical defense for this, largely by presenting a summary of the work of Harold M. Wiener, an orthodox Jew and barrister, who wrote much on this question. It is argued that the evidence which the critics used was wholly circumstantial, such as, inferences derived from a literary analysis of the documents, and a discredited evolutionary theory on the development of human institutions. After a consideration of the arguments supporting this, coming mostly from textual comparisons, the legal forms and sacrificial system of the Mosaic law are reviewed because of the misunderstanding that has surrounded it. Then, having stated the positive evidence for the Mosaic authorship, he assures that such a defender need not "quail in presence of the critics who deny that authorship and discredit its history".⁵³

The question of the old Mosaic tabernacle is discussed by David Heagle in "The Tabernacle in the Wilderness: Did It Exist?" (IV: 1). It is not just this specific question that he examines, but also the wider implications of the higher criticism, as he subtitled this essay, "A Question Involving the Truth or Falsity of the Entire Higher-Critic

Theory." Heagle points out that this was originally prepared as a booklet and so contained much more material. This fact is significant for the entire collection as many of these essays are abbreviations or extractions and were not written directly for this purpose. Reminding that criticism did not value the Bible any differently than any other writing, he gives an appropriate illustration. That Exodus alone devotes some thirteen chapters to a detailed description of the plan and construction of the tabernacle, to say nothing of Leviticus and Numbers and scattered allusions in both Testaments, with perhaps the most convincing testimony coming from Hebrews, which from a Christian viewpoint gives the typology and religious significance of that building. Yet with all that, criticism has discounted the tabernacle story as a fiction, or more properly as a literary forgery, leaving two distinct views concerning its existence. Not only is it important to discuss these differences, but also it is Heagle's hope to be able to show that the whole argument rests on a mere assumption held by the critics, as opposed to the sheer weight of biblical evidence itself which surely cannot be written off as easily as they would suggest. Further, in their denunciation of the fact of this story, the critics have automatically reduced the stated civilization of Israel, which again is not the biblical view. To deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuchal literature was but the beginning of further denials that ran over into the New Testament as well, all of which was "a mere patch-

work, a disjointed affair, having no more divine authority or inspiration connected with it than any other piece of human literature that has come into being through the law of evolution".⁵⁴

For many pages the discussion is developed, setting forth the critics' views about the tabernacle and exposing their presuppositions, giving extra-biblical evidence for it as well as biblical, such as I Kings and the Chronicles, the Samuels, Judges, Joshua, Jeremiah, and the Psalms, and showing its intimate connection with other biblical history. The critics even went so far as to say that such an incompetent society could never have constructed or transported so great a thing, which again violates the biblical evidence. Biblical and other sources would not convince them, to which Heagle responds with the Saviour's words, "If they believe not Moses and the prophets...". To have based their arguments on the alleged late origin of the Mosaic ritualistic law, rather than the endless biblical and related evidences, seems questionable at least.⁵⁵ While Heagle comes out firmly for the biblical argument he has not done so glibly, nor has he leaned on his basic presuppositions any more than his opponents. A fact which must be realized throughout this entire collection.

To move from the opening books of the Old Testament to the prophets, George L. Robinson comments on dual authorship in "One Isaiah" (VII: 5). He records the observation of Professor A. B. Davidson of New College, Edinburgh, that

for some twenty-five centuries only Isaiah, the son of Amoz, was considered the author of Isaiah. Now that criticism has challenged that, Robinson here considers the work of Koppe, Eichhorn, Ewald, Delitzsch, Cheyne, Glazebrook, and many others. The most recent views are set forth in careful detail with a note on the then present state of the debate, listing the theses of the moderates and radicals as well as those who would defend its unity.⁵⁶ The critics argued that a prophet always spoke out of a definite historical situation to present need, and not from without a context for all time, which postulate underlies their view of all Old Testament prophecy, a principle Robinson acknowledges as sound but says it can be overworked. He would add that not only did the prophets speak directly to their own situation, but also to the generations yet to come, for which Isaiah and others can be cited. Having considered the literary history of the book, certain false presuppositions, and his own personal attitude to criticism and Isaiah, Robinson then gives the arguments in favour of a unified, one-author book, which accounts for the latter half of the essay. He begins that section with a statement that contains an universal principle and which is essentially the attitude of every author whatever his topic in this collection: "It is as unreasonable to expect to be able to prove the unity of Isaiah as to suppose that it has been disproven."

It is the predictive element that is the strongest proof for Isaiah's unity and this point Robinson dwells on

longest, having listed those predictions and their significance.⁵⁷ Especially is this the case with the dual prediction of Cyrus and the Messiah, the former as the human agent of Israel's salvation and the latter the divine. Unless a prediction has definition and goes beyond ordinary means it is valueless. The critics objected because reason is not primary in this, but faith is. Faith and prophecy must be deeply linked. For Robinson the Old Testament is "pre-eminently a book which encourages faith", which is the essence of prophecy and about which Isaiah unitedly speaks. This essay is a thoroughly scholarly piece of work, buttressed by a point of view whose strength lies first in its logic and analysis and only secondly in its emotion.

Directly following Robinson is Joseph D. Wilson's "The Book of Daniel" (VII: 6), which continues the pattern in this arrangement but not necessarily in the original. Again, it is the prophecy that caused the criticism, as the critics believed that the alleged predictions must have been written after the events, and these examples are spelled out. Being convinced that "the attacks of the German scholars would have been innocuous had it not been for their copyists", he goes so far as to say that many of these scholars and theological professors are not necessarily Christians, a remark often implicit but seldom explicit in these writings. He quite understands the origins of the higher criticism in its discovery of some supposed inaccuracies, but it was the trend that it set thereafter, when the "imitation scholars

eagerly sought for more and with the help of imagination have compiled a considerable number ", which brought many unnecessary difficulties and threats that were far more modish than honest.⁵⁸ As he deals with the usual objections to Daniel's truth, Wilson cites archaeological support as well as misrepresentation by the critics, which sometimes revealed a lack of knowledge on their part, especially in relation to Babylonian Aramaic.⁵⁹ Despite all the confusion, as expected Wilson comes out for Daniel's authenticity, claiming it to be the best attested of the Old Testament books. Ezekiel mentioned Daniel as a man, and Zechariah appears to have read him, to say nothing of Christ's having recognized him as a prophet. To make his point all the sharper, Wilson compares Ezekiel with Daniel, and because not a word exists in the Bible to show that he in fact existed, the critics never raised their voice because Ezekiel never plainly predicted the Messiah.

With the higher criticism having been discussed in terms of Old Testament books, in these essays of A. C. Robinson, Wright, Heagle, G. L. Robinson, and Wilson, two essays remain in this group on criticism and the Bible which concern archaeology. Conservatives appealed very much to archaeology as a living testimony to the truth of the Bible's claims, and it was perhaps the strongest weapon they had with which to combat criticism. Their work in archaeology has been considerable and the results important.

In a second essay here, G. F. Wright, " The Testimony

of the Monuments to the Truth of the Scriptures" (II: 1), seeks to show that actual physical remains are proper evidence and must be believed, limiting this to the Old Testament. He begins by confirming Daniel's claim for Belshazzar as the "son of Nebuchadnezzar" and the king of Babylon, because of Rawlinson's 1854 excavations, which for him confirms the historical accuracy of that book. Archaeology has further allowed for the movements of Shalmaneser II to be traced, which appear in an inscription on the celebrated Black Obelisk; unearthed the Moabite Stone which attests to the civilized condition of the Moabites; and, has revealed the campaign of Shishak and the city of Tahpanhes in Egypt, to which the Israelites took flight to escape Nebuchadnezzar, and the city of Pithom whose founder was Rameses II. The Hittite peoples also have come to light as a full-fledged society, which pure ignorance rather than knowledge heretofore led many to discredit. Equally, the tablets at Tel el-Amarna, discovered in 1887, have revealed a collection of official letters sent to the last kings of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, which show how Egyptian power was falling up until Joshua finally took possession of the promised land and then found no resistance. That many of the findings named and commented on so many of the geographical details in the Bible was further cause for believing in its truth. Finally, Wright demonstrates how archaeology has fully substantiated the claims of Genesis XIV, thus negating the views of Wellhausen, Nöldeke, George Adam Smith, and Barton.

In fact, Wright uses archaeology to disprove Smith's view, that it has only yielded a background and atmosphere for the Genesis stories but has not certified its heroes.⁶⁰

With this evidence, Wright remarks that the clear confirmation of so much biblical fact after so many thousand years can only be providential. He adds drama to that truth by saying that in the days when faith waned and its heralds spoke so uncertainly, "the very stones have cried out with a voice that only the deaf could fail to hear". The facts have spoken for themselves, as Wright has merely presented the point under question by the critics and then given the archaeological evidence. Much of that had been discovered, ironically, by an higher critical archaeologist who could do no more than acknowledge what he had found. It is true that Wright could have misused the evidence, but his own scholarly integrity would have prevented that.

M. G. Kyle's "The Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures" (II: 2) is in the same tradition, but concerned only with "recent", i.e. since 1904, evidence: "the testimony of recent discoveries or recent testimony of former discoveries". All this he divides into five sections, beginning with the historical setting of the patriarchal reception in Egypt, about which every suspicion of myth has been erased. The Hittite vindication follows the lines of Wright's remarks, whom Kyle calls the "Trojans of Bible history", as many scholars believed that these people never existed. Two large questions, answered in detail, are raised

concerning the civilization of Palestine: whether the Canaanite culture, as shown by excavations, accords with the story of Israel at the conquest, as stated in Scripture; and, more importantly, what was the source and course of the dominant civilization and its religious culture, as seen in the biblical account, in the millennium both preceding and succeeding the birth of Abraham.

New evidences affecting the history of Palestine and Egypt are put forward briefly, with special relation to the Pentateuch. Wellhausen's view that the Jews only worshipped in Jerusalem is disproved, because of the fact that the Jews had built a temple far away at Syene ca. 407 B.C. and expected approval from Jerusalem to carry on worship there.⁶¹ Lastly, Wright's point is much underlined by Kyle concerning archaeology's great work in identifying so many biblical places, in which he himself had a part when identifying Moab at Luxor in 1908 from an inscription of Rameses II. These identifications were geographical, ethnographical, and historical, and as more and more were completed the hope was that much if not all the biblical narrative would have an archaeological witness. This would make a solid foundation for apologetics.⁶² Kyle believes that in time it is very possible that archaeological evidences will make criticism not only invalid but also useless.

Biblical reliability cannot help but be increased, so much so that Kyle sees not evolution but the Bible as establishing the pattern for the history of civilization.

Archaeology has enabled the biblical narrative more easily to be interpreted at its face value. It is these seven essays that get down to examining specific examples of the higher criticism in relation to the Bible's own report, and, while from the outset it is known that the conclusions will fully support the latter, it is nonetheless reassuring to see that criticism has been respectfully dealt with in some detail. This was representative of the work of conservatives, but must not be confused with the so-called conservative higher criticism.⁶³

In the third and final group five essays address the triumph of the Bible over criticism. Though not intended, there is a balance in the essays of these three divisions with four, seven, and five respectively, the middle one rightly having the most. In "Old Testament Criticism and New Testament Christianity" (VIII: 1) W. H. Griffith Thomas touches on many of the topics already considered by the others, in order to come to some evaluation of the Bible's claim for itself. He has written as a scholar, teacher, and pastor and affirms that the critical method itself is not in question, but the "illegitimate, unscientific, and un-historical use of it". Thomas is of the opinion that historic churchmen also possessed great intellectual power and that these more recent critical views of the Old Testament should in no way lessen the value of some eighteen hundred years of Christian history and experience. Scripture appeals to the conscience, heart, and will, as well as to the mind,

and it is "the spiritual instinct of centuries of Christian experience" that matters supremely. He has dealt with the question of criticism's agreement with the historical position of the Jewish nation, together with trying to ascertain how far the new views of the Old Testament are really established. In addition, he wants to know whether modern criticism's views can be compatible with believing in the Old Testament as a divine revelation. For that will ultimately affect preaching and could rob it of its certitude. Nowhere is he dogmatic, but he is concerned that the historic credibility of that which criticism questions be firmly established, and he believes it certainly can be.

Modern criticism, because it is based on a philosophy of idealism, finds little or no room for supernatural interpositions, and Thomas rightly inquires whether such naturalistic premises do not necessarily lead to naturalistic conclusions. Dr. Green of Princeton has noted that by an happy inconsistency many have held to their old convictions though admitting methods and conclusions which are logically opposed to them. Others have taken on the new thinking and carried it to its logical conclusions.⁶⁴ Archaeology has only supported the biblical claims, as has Christ's own witness to the Old Testament, which criticism cannot overlook.⁶⁵ Thomas rightly raises the question that if on verifiable matters Christ is found not reliable, according to criticism, then why accept His higher teaching where verification is impossible. In conclusion, he lays down five conditions which

he thinks the church would demand before accepting the higher criticism on the Old Testament, which would also apply for the New. Until such time the position will continue to be "the old is better".⁶⁶

In "My Personal Experience With the Higher Criticism" (III: 6), J. J. Reeve has written somewhat uniquely, for this collection, as one who early on had accepted some of the higher critical views, only to reject them later. A theological professor himself, as was Thomas, he spoke to the central issue always facing theological students: how to maintain full biblical fidelity and academic honesty. Reeve believes that the critics' presuppositions and assumptions are the determinants for their viewing the Bible and its religion on the same footing as the world and its phenomena. Their acceptance of evolution would not often, if ever, permit the supernatural or miraculous. Evangelical Christianity and the fruits of the higher criticism do not mix, but this in no way says that the former should not be or is not already engaged in solid critical study itself. Reeve goes so far as to say that all who have experienced personally the power of Christianity cannot fail to find this criticism severely wanting. It is built on hypotheses that change and its methods are arbitrary. In these assertions he does not fail to cite examples, many of which are frequently found in these essays, and they illustrate absolutely the point in question.

The spirit of the higher criticism is decidedly more

secular than sacred; philosophy rather than religion does control; often the presuppositions do not allow the scholarship to be unbiased or scientific; and, their arrant dismissal and ignorance of traditionalism can be perverse.

Philosophy could easily deceive in its denial of absolutes, and for criticism this meant "the Bible itself becomes a plaything for the intellect". Reeve believes it wanted to undermine revelation, the Bible, and evangelical Christianity, and that basically there was prejudice before their so-called unbiased scientism set to work. Even though most of these men owed their own religious life and training almost entirely to the traditional view. There can be no doubt but that the new criticism had quickened Old Testament study, presented a valuable method, many new facts, and a fresh point of view. Nevertheless, its evils carried most of the weight.⁶⁷ Doubtless Reeve's story could be told many times, as the instant flash of the higher criticism's commanding apparatus is impressive. But its conspicuous determination to stamp out so much raised many questions about its academic quality and spirit.

As it happens, these final five essays have all been written by professors of theology. However, F. Bettex represents the least scientific of them. His "The Bible and Modern Criticism" (IV: 3) reveals a total repudiation of criticism and admits none of the intrinsic worthiness of such a method if otherwise based, as do the other writers. He even holds seemingly to the verbal dictation theory which

was an obstacle for these writers.⁶⁸ There is justice in disputing the sovereignty of reason, especially as Renan expressed it, by saying that reason is capable of judging all things but itself judged by nothing. Bettex asserts that reason is incapable of understanding spiritual truth, and hence its disdain for the supernatural, the miraculous and prophetic. Further, he claims that criticism's points are not all new nor do they all agree. He sees that whatever criticism applies to the Old Testament also applies to the New, because they are a unit. Valid points are here forcefully made. Should these new findings be true, then Bettex believes that Christianity as biblically revealed is finished, and only "commonplace teachings of morality" can be offered in its place. But in quick succession he has Scripture address itself to that question, using some seventeen quotations, mostly Pauline, and then concludes by boldly stating that the higher criticism destroys without replacing.⁶⁹ He is not concerned to validate, improve, adapt, or criticize the Bible, but only to believe and act upon it. And he is most concerned about the whole question of eternity, which he finds criticism has neglected.

Much the same kind of discontent about the higher criticism is to be found in Franklin Johnson's "Fallacies of the Higher Criticism" (II: 3), but with a more philosophical rationale behind it. He has provided a clear and comprehensive definition of higher criticism, while striking hard at its "assured results".⁷⁰ He illustrates this by

focusing on the Pentateuch, or rather the Hexateuch. He then makes it clear that Old Testament criticism has implications for the New, having found the latter to be largely untrustworthy as history, doctrine, or ethics, even though a book that has good influence if perhaps little or no divine authority. Johnson warns that the Christian should be aware of the spread of this criticism to the New Testament, which remark reveals his close touch with scholarly development, for in the opening years of the present century that was still a virgin subject comparatively. The picture that criticism drew of not only an erring church, but also an erring Bible and an erring Christ, made many minds wonder just where the truth was after all.

Johnson then proceeds to discuss eight specific fallacies contained in the corporate thinking of the critics: their analysis of the Pentateuch, the theory of evolution when applied to literature and religion, the Bible as a natural book, denial of miracles, denial of archaeology's testimony, dating of the Psalms, non-Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and priestly legislation and the exile.⁷¹ Emphatically, he states that many have tried to accept a part of this system without going to any dangerous extreme, but that has two results. For the committed, there is never any sureness of what to believe or teach, and, for the majority who know not where they stand and are searching for a faith, this will never give an answer. The critics would want exactly that to happen, that truth so-called would

always be in the making; but, evangelicals would ever hold out for a once-and-for-all revelation that is beyond question finally. However, the best of them, like Johnson, would never want to thwart proper scientific study of the Bible, only encourage it. As Johnson sees it there is no middle position intellectually consistent between these two systems, and those who try to create it are ultimately swept to the side of unbelief. He concludes that higher criticism has not and cannot cleanse and renew the Faith, as many Christians had hoped, but will only destroy it.⁷²

The final essay is James Orr's "Holy Scripture and Modern Negations" (IX: 4), which asks if there is a tenable doctrine of Scripture amidst the confusion and agnosticism. That is mandatory if there is to be a repository of God's revelation and an infallible guide to life, making a most clear distinction between an infallible Bible and the church. He appeals to the early church's scholarship and devotion, noting the orthodoxy of both, and then asks why that has gone astray at present. Like Johnson, he supports critical study, but both complain that with the present form it starts from the wrong basis, proceeds by arbitrary methods, and arrives at demonstrably false results. For the critics, Scripture has become fragmentary remains of an ancient literature, to be dissected repeatedly and stripped of its tradition and place. That this process has spread to the New Testament only multiplies the problem and its effects.

Orr wants primarily to construct a satisfactory doc-

trine of Holy Scripture, which will recognize a supernatural revelation of God in its history and religion, and then a truly supernatural inspiration in its very recording. For nothing short of this does Scripture claim for itself, and its internal structure with progressively inter-related parts, ultimately comprising a unity of the whole, could offer or prove nothing else. That it is a "supernatural revelation of what God revealed Himself in word and deed to men in history" seals that prior claim without which it is mortal. His closing subject then is inspiration, on which he and Warfield were the authorities and they had some disagreements. Instantly he reminds of Christ's view thereof, even though He no doubt saw the Old Testament as an imperfect stage of revelation which He came to fulfill and extend.⁷³

But Orr's point, which is common to all evangelicals, is that first the Bible itself claims inspiration for both Testaments, with its structure, completeness, and holiness everywhere attesting to those claims. Which then is to be believed lastly, Scripture or man? These essays have unambiguously and unavoidably, presuppositionally, come out for the former.

It is these sixteen essays that concentrate specifically on the Bible and higher criticism, which together with Darwinism constitute the principal reasons for this collection having been conceived. From these all other aberrations to the Faith, as mentioned herein, have sprung. As with those on authority and centrality, these represent

another sixth of the total number of essays and another fifth in number of pages. When reading through the titles of the essays from book to book, the lack of organization could have caused serious lacunae. But, in fact, organization itself has proved that the most important subjects have been treated and systematically. While there was no original working plan in terms of a unified system from end to end, the editors must certainly have worked from some kind of mental outline at least, otherwise the above statement could not have been made.

The Fundamentals individually and as a collection are committed to an highly conservative theology, which, historically, can claim a great deal of first-rank scholarship. Because of this their claims are no secret, but it is the thinking process involved and the examples used that makes each contribution of value. Repetition there must be in such an effort, but not without usefulness. With these essays on criticism, the disagreement, even vehement opposition, is never based on personality but fact, and the issues usually always center around God's Word and man's researches. What they are saying should be readily understandable, at least historically, for here is the fruit of a tree whose origins and development have a very lengthy past.

It has always to be remembered that in the early years of this debate between liberals and conservatives the heat of the moment often caused each side to react almost

belligerently, often reluctant to listen let alone concede. Higher criticism was too vigorously iconoclastic and evangelicalism too preservationist and that tension kept the relationship nearly always at the boiling point. These theological liberals were like the men of the Renaissance, both having discovered manhood anew with man at the center and his mind the truth-bearer.⁷⁴ It is true that thanks to liberalism the representatives of dialectical theology received a hearing and biological evolution was faced up to by the church. They did all this hoping to keep the gospel timely and appealing to the current generation.⁷⁵ For them the Bible presented more a story of discovery than revelation, and when criticism moved to the New Testament with equal destruction the result was inevitable. The reasoning that prevailed was that truth in these things had to be equally so for the natural scientist as for the preacher. In Protestantism then, the church was gradually replacing the Bible, and naturally so as man's word rather than God's took the lead. And preaching itself often surrendered to and encouraged this.⁷⁶

Perhaps, lastly, it was not from geology or biological evolution, but from the less ostentatious advances in the historical sciences that the Faith received its greatest blow, for the nineteenth century knew only too well the meaning of historical sense.⁷⁷ With the removal of absolute biblical authority and thus contingent beliefs, the higher criticism forced Christians to find a point of contact else-

where, which really meant themselves. This was especially true once criticism moved to the New Testament. The higher criticism tried to discover anew and for its own time what the Bible was in itself with allegedly no preconceptions. The Roman church's subordination of the Bible to the church meant that any change in the former's position would automatically undermine the authority of the latter. In the reformed tradition, any change in the authority of the Bible meant undermining the authority of the Faith. These and many more were the imminent dangers, which the writers of The Fundamentals not only knew but also understood. For them a weakened Bible meant a weakened Lord, the two were inseparably bound. All this they could say chiefly on the strength of Old Testament criticism, as that for the New Testament had in the main come after their time.

To reduce for convenience, it can be said that there were two schools of New Testament criticism resulting over the meaning of Christ. One was the German and continental with Strauss, Baur, and others, who denied the historical reality of all supernatural events in Scripture and elsewhere. The other was the British conservative school, beginning with the Cambridge trio of Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort, and later Sanday at Oxford. They were not at all obscurantist defenders of tradition, though they had a strong conservative bias, but were in the full flower of the critical method. Totally, English which meant Anglican scholarship was much more evangelical, though not in the strictest

sense, than German, which was mainly naturalistic in its assumptions and wanted to isolate the purely human Jesus of liberal theology from the New Testament narratives. What is more, in terms of both Testaments it has been suggested that the higher criticism was a boon rather than a handicap to evangelical Protestantism, relieving it finally of an impossible apologetic burden. It broke down the barriers between religious thought and intellectual life generally and forced a profound re-examination of evangelicalism under the best light which history, philosophy, and science could throw on it. Finally, even if the short range effect of the higher criticism was to accelerate theology's decline into the social gospel, the long range effect was to put the church in a correct relationship to secular society by establishing a moral authority for it.⁷⁸

Such statements can only be made after the full sweep of the higher criticism has been evaluated. However, those essays which do take up New Testament criticism in The Fundamentals are primarily given to Christological discussion. Furthermore, they are concerned to establish a positive theology rather than continue the debate as did the Old Testament ones. For this reason those essays have been left to address the theme of chapter four, the theology of the Christian faith and life. Many of the essays had been written much before the first publication in 1909, and, while by then Old Testament criticism had run its course, sign-posts making known the direction and emphases of New Testament

criticism were appearing. Indeed, the essays which do not relate directly to authority, Old Testament criticism, Darwinism, and the sects are those which when put together do produce some kind of theological system. These comprise over one-half the total number. And they have been written chiefly to present a clear, positive, Bible-believing faith, which criticism never did nor any of the other isms.

The Fundamentals, whether through ideological destruction or theological construction, were written as a counter-attack on eight contemporary isms: higher criticism, Darwinism, Romanism, Spiritualism, Russellism, Eddyism, Mormonism, and socialism, the first two having been considered the most dangerous, and indeed the source for the others. But the arrangement of each of the twelve books does not give a proper distribution. For the higher criticism books ten and twelve have no specific essays thereon, and only four of the ninety essays deal directly with Darwinism, two being in book eight alone. There can be no doubt that Darwin had immeasurably strengthened the hand of higher criticism. Even though the latter had begun earlier than 1850, after the Origin it was confirmed as the only procedure scientifically. In view of the immense difficulties this caused for orthodoxy and evangelicalism, four essays on the subject would seem very slight, though, as with the higher criticism, there are references in many of the others. Nevertheless, there is a notable imbalance here in the number of essays in relation to the importance of the subject, as is the case with

the other isms save for the first. In view of the over-all plan of the collection, it would seem that more essays should have been addressed to these topics and less to the more general subject of Christian faith and life.

Darwin presented an intellectual horror to many minds throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. In his early years he was orthodox in his religious beliefs, honouring "the strict and literal truth of every word in the Bible" though objecting to some Anglican dogma, and went to Cambridge intending to enter the church. After studying natural theology and science the slow breakdown of his faith appeared, until finally he insisted that in science it was both needless and false to introduce the hypothesis of special acts of divine creation to explain the natural order of events. He allowed an implicit theism to remain in his argument because he knew that blind chance was no explanation, and he did not attempt to attack religion in any way with his own theory. His work was a piece of science and not a diatribe.⁷⁹ As was to be expected, his theories were more favourably received by upper than lower classes, high rather than low church people, Unitarians rather than Methodists, and radicals rather than conservatives. Even though the Origin does contain a few references to the Creator, and the final two pages might even be construed as an apology for a more worthy conception of God, he did aim to drive theological talk out of biology forever.

Evolution did little or nothing to provide a positive

alternative for special creation, and as a doctrine it had been held by many before Darwin.⁸⁰ For some years he went unnoticed, but when he was accepted his thesis filtered through all disciplines, so much so that his work has been called a Magna Carta of intellectual liberties. His views were seemingly well-founded, with much new evidence, and the time was ripe to receive them. Evolution was now the club with which to beat the theologian. Sociologically it made enormous gains, as the survival of the fittest appealed to the industrialists and upper classes because this kind of natural law would justify their own grasping practices. Trade was now expanding and the standard of living rising. Evolution at once humiliated man in claiming he was not created by the God of the universe, but rather was the mere descendant of an animal. Yet, at the same time, it put man in control ultimately with no more worry about God interfering. Throughout his entire mature life Darwin had tried always to escape theology and he used science as a means of doing that, even though quite contrary to the classical practice of trying to discover more of God to prove for man what was already divine truth. While public conditions were being bettered at that time anyway, Bertrand Russell is right in observing that evolution was favoured because it offered a philosophy of optimism. What is more, the physical sciences had been advancing, but biology itself had only been amassing facts and needed a bright new idea which Darwin opportunely supplied.⁸¹ Copernicus had shattered

men terribly but Darwin humiliated them still further. Human history and experience now became horizontal rather than vertical.

It is quite just to say that evolution encouraged competition and even gave an evil-doer a respite from his conscience. The unscrupulous behaviour toward a competitor could now be rationalized and evil could be called good. To this evangelicals made loud protests, as they saw much of the social trouble itself stemming from the doctrine of evolution or at least Darwin's version of it. The view that whatever was could not be corrected, that it would only be a matter of time until evolution would sift the good from the bad, was hideously anti-Christian. Marxism owed much to Darwin and it was the logical advancement of that system.⁸² The same can be said for the evolutionary teaching in Hitler and Mussolini. Mein Kampf reflects this very much in its attitude to Communism and the Jews, for pride and excitement and a desire for the impossible are all part of evolution's encouragement, being a substitute god as Darwin had intended. Theologically, on the Continent the Protestant tradition tried to overcome the dangers in Darwinism without rejecting evolution and its attendant idea of progress. In Britain and America the response was very diverse. Certainly for the orthodox everywhere there were immense problems with it.⁸³ The four essays in this collection are a proof of that.

James Orr in "Science and Christian Faith" (IV: 4)

makes it quite clear that at base there is no clash between the two. Rather, as with higher criticism, the attitude was one of Scripture being wrong and man having the replacing answer. No longer was science to accept the miraculous, but that was not entirely new because of criticism's views.⁸⁴

Miracle can only be discussed and understood in terms of a theistic view of the universe, for as long as God must be restricted to the limits which nature sets, then miracle cannot function. And Darwin had to have this settled. Orr talks about the general relation of the Bible to science and says straightforwardly that it does not "profess to anticipate the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries". But in its revelation of God in all His wisdom and control, the Bible can easily assume history's course of events. In discussing the Bible's relation to astronomy and geology, he concludes that there is no conflict if both sides can speak honestly. Having shown that, he moves to the conflict between evolution and creation, his third and final topic in this essay and the one for which the others are preparatory.

A scholarly and illuminating observation he makes when saying that evolution was not yet proved, and that its later ramifications, whether extensions or limitations, would determine for the future its total value as an idea. Furthermore, he urges that Darwinism be not identified with evolution all the way, as the former is a theory of the process of evolution. Evolution was coming to be seen as a

new name for creation, where the creative power works from within rather than externally as before.⁸⁵ Orr is then able to advance the view that there can be a form of evolution which is basically creation, whereby man comes from God's hand, as Creator, "in as morally pure a state, and as capable of sinless development, as Genesis and Paul affirm". While he does not say so, it is obvious that Orr has discounted Darwinism, but not necessarily evolution as he would explain it, even though in most discussions then and now the two are joined. Writing nearer the turn of the century, he believed that "Science itself seems now disposed to take a less materialistic view of the origin and nature of things than it did a decade or two ago, and to interpret the creation more in the light of the Spiritual."⁸⁶ Especially it must not be overlooked how carefully Orr was able to distinguish between evolution and Darwinism, and in so doing did not "throw out the baby with the bath water" as has certainly been the case with post-1918 evangelical opinion. This only reinforces the claim that the intellectual integrity of these writers is something appreciably finer than their later spiritual relations, for whom the very word evolution caused uncontrollable confusion and rage.

What Orr and his colleagues feared most in this new scientific quest was precisely what they feared with the higher criticism: that man in his seeming expertise would begin to fashion God as he had hitherto fashioned His Word. For, certainly, once Darwinism took hold the final quarter

of the century witnessed just that. This was hailed by the academic community as being the only academic thing to do; but to that section even of the academic community that was committed to a supernatural faith this was a great threat.⁸⁷ The greatest upset occurred in America where history has amply demonstrated that the new evolutionary thinking was more feared and vigorously discussed and guarded against than elsewhere.⁸⁸ Evolutionary theology abandoned the Bible both as the authentic record of revelation and as the primary textbook of religious truth. Now that was to be discovered empirically by all men, making religion a relative truth for each man and not a final doctrine supernaturally revealed. With its fusion of human and divine elements, this new theology emphasized the world as the center of life. Salvation was to be worked out by each man in terms of this world, which made it really only an ethic. Calvinist and even Malthusian principles were replaced by a charitable universalist economy of salvation which came through works, ultimately to be judged by the world's standards and thus the survival-of-the-fittest theme again. With the Reformers and the Puritans, as well as the early nineteenth century, doctrine had counted for much, but now religion for many people shifted from knowing or believing, in that earlier sense, to feeling or experiencing, which Darwinism fully endorsed.

Orr's essay can be taken to represent the British evangelical opinion on the subject, with some unavoidable

differences, and the other three are written by Americans. There contemporary writing (1870-1920) on behalf of evolution and Darwinism made a great impact and hesitancy toward it was immediately suspect.⁸⁹ Darwinism attacked the entire American Weltanschauung, having undergone probation there until about 1880 and then gaining fuller acceptance. It seemed to men everywhere the natural answer, and Huxley's famous remark, that if Darwin had failed to discover the principle of natural selection the palaeontologists would have been forced to invent it, seemed only too true. Charles Darwin had fired a shot that was heard round the theological world; it had become the symbol of an era and contributed to an intellectual revolution. The ascent of man was substituted for the fall, from which fact proceeded endless new views. Darwin could abide theistic creationism but never supernaturalism which was the antithesis of control.⁹⁰ And American evangelical opinion did not permit this to go unopposed.

In "The Passing of Evolution" (VII: 1) George Frederick Wright states that the Bible itself teaches a system of evolution, though it does not nearly eliminate God from the process and relegate man "to the tender mercies of a mechanical universe...". Like Orr, he does distinguish between Darwinism and a theory of universal evolutionism, which the very title of the Origin itself denotes. It is noted how easily Darwin has made God the first cause only to have life itself continue in all its "variations". Wright

therefore believes that Darwin made two great mistakes which vitiate his theory: geological time and the minuteness of beneficial variations.⁹¹ The failure of evolution to account for man was most conspicuous, at any time, and it has asserted itself for thousands of years, its bolder forms being atheistic and the milder ones deistic.⁹² For Wright the worst foes of Christianity are not physicists but metaphysicians, because the fatalism of philosophers is more to be dreaded than the materialism of scientists. As for the evidence for evolution, even in its more spiritually acceptable form he says it does not begin to be as strong as that for the revelation of God in the Bible.

To adopt a system so widely that was based "upon hypothesis only" was in itself remarkable to "an occupant in the pew", who anonymously contributed the essay "Evolutionism in the Pulpit" (VIII: 2).⁹³ That men of science, who claimed to deal only with established facts, should have accepted as a system an hypothetical built on "we may well suppose" was baffling. Even more remarkable was the way Christian theologians and ministers, in accepting this new proposition, were willing so quickly to surrender large portions of the Bible. Especially noteworthy here is the writer's citation of many opinions from leading scientists at home and abroad who confessed that Darwinism no longer was convincing, that it was "the note of the dying swan".⁹⁴ The great question is raised as to how men can claim to be Christians when they repudiate large parts of Scripture and

deliberately sow the seed of skepticism among so many. A most serious offense for clergy who continue to accept their living from the church. Somehow the phrase "thus saith the Lord" no longer has weight, as that has been replaced with man's words which will never lead to a knowledge of the power of the Holy Spirit. So serious is this matter that this writer urges such men to leave the church, taking their followers with them. Not only is truth not being proclaimed, but also souls are being degenerated rather than regenerated.

The issue between Darwinism and theology was no mere academic question for it involved man's eternity. The Darwinists were quick to say that men cannot depend on the Bible to show them "how to go to heaven" when it misleads them as to "how the heavens go". Henry H. Beach in "Decadence of Darwinism" (VIII: 3) goes to much effort to put forth some of the major claims of Darwin and Huxley and their commentators, and in doing so lets them speak for themselves, without interposing biblical evidence to the contrary. His conclusion is metaphorical but to the point, as he sees the teaching of evolution, at least Darwin, to the youth as "the most deplorable feature of the whole wretched propaganda". He likens this to the burning of the temple at Jerusalem, when Titus had wanted to spare it but the Roman soldier's blazing torch thrown into a small window put the whole structure in flames; the revenge of the Pied Piper of Hamelin; and, Rachel weeping for her children.⁹⁵ Beach examined the claims on their own grounds and found them in-

sufficient, to say nothing of the discord when put beside Scripture.

The criticisms made by all four of these writers, covering some fifty-two pages, focus not so much on what Darwin has said as how that conflicts so violently and necessarily with Scripture. Admittedly, Darwin was as keen to discount Scripture as these men were to preserve it, the former having no eschatological interest while that was primary for the latter. In America, certainly at this time, the Darwinian principle of individual competition was much to be seen, and still is, for Darwinism and capitalism are not opposed. As a conscious philosophy Darwinism had largely disappeared in America by the end of the Great War, and latterly, humanists have agreed that such a survival idea based on biological reasoning has little worth when trying to understand society.⁹⁶ To know that so much of Darwinism had no foundation and yet continued to damage the Faith severely made for an irretrievable ill, for reconciliation between the two seemed impossible.⁹⁷ That could only be healed by direct action against its promulgation, which did occur in America with the legislation in Tennessee in 1925 that led ultimately to the Scopes trial.⁹⁸ Evolutionary history in these formative years was most critical, for it and its opponents could not have had presuppositions that were more polar. The effect of these essays could in no wise be properly measured, but certainly it was considerable, not only because of the total number circulated, but also because of

the calibre of their authors which itself signifies something much deeper. Within the Christian church then evolution was a black and white proposition and it was also a key factor in determining one's theology, much more so than to-day, when the psychological sciences have lessened that dichotomy greatly.

The higher criticism and Darwinism were the two greatest challenges to orthodox Christianity at that time, for both aimed very much at a reconstruction thereof. As a response to that alone The Fundamentals devoted twenty of its ninety essays. Still very much a challenge was the rise of the sects, or the isms of Spiritualism, Russellism (Millennial Dawn), Eddyism, and Mormonism, each receiving one essay, and the perpetual threat of Romanism, having two essays. Certainly these first four sects were the result of dissatisfactions within established Protestantism, and as such have a different relationship to orthodoxy than the other three. The last ism, the social gospel or socialism, while a major threat has only one specific essay and that will be dealt with in the next chapter together with a lengthy commentary on that theme. However, considerable discussion thereof has already taken place in the first chapter and its thread runs throughout the essays whenever the gospel message itself has been displaced by a purely social interpretation. It is necessarily the least sharply defined of the isms in the collection and yet perhaps the most persistent, apart from Romanism. Evangelicalism has

always made severe criticisms of Roman Catholicism, which it regards as the most dangerous of all deviations because of its enormous subscription and proselytism, to say nothing of its teachings.

That is expressly seen in T. W. Medhurst's "Is Romanism Christianity?" (XI: 6), where he begins by saying that if he proves the answer to be no he will be called "bigoted, harsh, uncharitable". He is on every count highly anti-Roman and supports this with five objections which are fair enough. The source for Rome's position throughout his essay is Trent's decrees, and he thus takes issue with the equality of Scripture and tradition, the avowed hatred to those outside its communion, the ever-reconstructing of Christ's death in the Mass, justification through baptism and constant good works, and Mary as an intermediary. On all issues he stands on firm ground in the face of both the biblical and historical record, save for the second. From Scotland himself, he would seem to have forgotten the immense damage to the church done by the reformers there as elsewhere, Rome being no more guilty in these things than any other ecclesiastical body. Even so, this does not weaken his argument which he has supported biblically. Fundamentally, his objection is to Rome's having inserted the mortal church, with all its machinery and unavoidable failings, between man and God, making that very much a sine qua non for spiritual salvation. Liberty of conscience, private judgment, worship of saints and angels, confession to man, interference of the virgin, over-

stressing of works, and the authority of popes and councils, because of these and many more facts Medhurst asks whether such is legitimate and biblical Christianity.⁹⁹ The text cited is Revelation XVIII: 4 -- "Come out of her, My people ...". The illustrations and arguments against Rome are the usual ones which have been used since the sixteenth century, and while perfectly in order there is surprisingly no mention made of the most recent development in Catholic modernism. Neither is it mentioned in the second of these two essays.

In quoting Cardinals Manning and Newman, that the Church of Rome is either the house of God or Satan, there being no middle ground, J. M. Foster in "Rome, the Antagonist of the Nation" (XI: 7) stoutly proclaims the latter, with his essay following immediately after Medhurst's. His attack is twofold: Rome's teaching of false doctrine, and her political interference historically. The papacy is seen as the principal reason for corruption. Doctrinally, Foster lists eight errors: restricted use of the Bible¹⁰⁰; acceptance of the Apocrypha as part of the canon; equality of Scripture and tradition¹⁰¹; seven sacraments; transubstantiation; Mass as a perpetual sacrifice; withholding the cup from the laity; and, the misuse of the Mass to alleviate ills, whether souls or debts. These points are well-reasoned and wide evidence is presented. Turning to Rome as the nation's (i.e. America) antagonist because of engaging in a political system of foreign despotism, Foster cites the

major Roman persecutions in the Empire and then in the Middle Ages, with a wide jump to the modern period to demonstrate the nearly total sway she had on the state as well as the church.¹⁰² So cursed did Foster find this that he refers to her as "the great whore of the Tiber". Then he proceeds to show her control in specific American cities as well as in foreign diplomacy, which resulted in illegitimate votes and financial support for her communicants and pope respectively. He saw Rome's desire to have both parochial schools and public funds for education as unethical and a further political invasion. To the entire matter of Romanism his concluding remark is: "But our blessed Lord is upon the throne and His cause shall prevail."

Both essays reveal the typical evangelical feeling toward Romanism. They complement each other with the doctrinal points being substantiated conciliarly and biblically, and the political ones historically. Nowhere does Medhurst provide any hint as to date of writing, but Foster does refer at the end to President Taft, which puts the date ca. 1910 or well after the decrees on modernism were put forward, yet no notice is taken. Quite apart from the usual differences, it would be proper to believe that evangelical Protestantism was especially concerned with this equivalent development in the Roman Church, due to the higher criticism, and what this would mean for future relations. Catholic modernism and Protestantism shared many similar developments, to such a degree perhaps that the higher criticism

can rightly be regarded as the first kind of attracting force between the two. For this reason alone Rome would have alarmed evangelical Protestantism all the more. Yet, nothing of this is intimated in these two essays which only keep to the classical objections.

Catholic modernism was proud of the church's past and wanted to maintain that, but it did concern itself with the conflict between science and faith. If in the Middle Ages the church saved science, then in the modern period science was to save the church. For modernists the church was not the ultimate but the mother and educator, rejoicing that her children have discovered horizons which she had not even suspected. Tradition was neither taken lightly nor canonized. It was assimilated and altered in order to produce new fruit, analogous to Christ's words that He came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfill them.

Modernism was no philosophy or creed, but pervaded all of life and promoted honest inquiry, seeking not to destroy but revitalize. The heretofore fixed mentality was ruinous and uninhibited discovery was now encouraged. Agreement with one another was not necessarily sought though a common aim in truth and love was. Modernists accepted all that was true in the church's past, and simultaneously, and maybe paradoxically, wanted to reconcile that with the findings of modern knowledge. The church, historically, slew the synagogue and the modernists tried to have their church slay the political and anti-scientific Christian synagogue of yester-

day.¹⁰³ In quantity there were modernists in Europe, Britain, and America, with Loisy in France and Tyrrell in Britain being the leaders.

It was no light matter when modernism advocated that scholastic philosophy be relegated to the history of philosophy, modern philosophy be taught in the seminaries as the base for rational theology, dogmas be harmonized with science, and positive theology be founded on the history of dogma. Furthermore, ecclesiastical government was to be reformed, the Index and Holy Office modified, and the clergy were to return to their primitive humility and poverty, with even an attempt to suppress celibacy. The official condemnation of modernism in 1907 was no surprise when knowing the reactionary policies of Pius X. Instead of broadening the church, these actions caused it to become even more entrenched because of the great misunderstanding within the hierarchy. The opposite had in fact happened to what Loisy and Tyrrell had envisioned. Higher criticism was more suspect than ever and so were those orthodox scholars who used it. And this reaction also attacked liberal Protestantism root and branch. The Galileo story had been re-enacted with the failure of modernism, and ultramontaniam reigned again.¹⁰⁴

Theological upheaval, therefore, was not just peculiar to the Protestant church in the nineteenth century, but also to the Church of Rome. It is disappointing that this is not discussed in Foster's essay at least, for he must have been aware of modernism. This development would have sharpened

his outlook and given his argument more current value in warning non-Romans of the dangers therein both old and new. Theological study of this period is signally incomplete without notice of this enormous shift in Roman religion.

Whatever the views about Romanism, it was undeniably an immense part of ecclesiastical history, which was not the case with the sects. They were thoroughgoing aberrations and at best contained only a Christian ethic. Their historical place and reason for existence have already been discussed, and now it remains to examine the four sects which The Fundamentals take notice of with one essay each.

Spiritualism began in 1848, that most memorable year in which France finally rejected its old feudal royalty, Mazzini set up a republic at Rome, Germany and Austria were rebellious, Chartists were active in London, and the abolition movement gathered strength in America. But the immediate events that gave rise to Spiritualism were distant to these, having begun with the interpretation of certain rappings in a haunted house in Hydesville, New York, involving two sisters, Catherine and Marguerite Fox, and one Isaac Post. In England and France it was also to be found with varying forms and its own personnel. It has its own sacred books, certain pages of which show an high degree of morality, but believers do not limit themselves to these as does the church to the Bible. Admittedly, Spiritualism wanted to soften the bitterness of life's grief, soothe the soul's despair, and lessen the future's uncertainty. It was

practical and man-centered and the Great War heightened its practices all the more. It does not think in terms of a devil and is full of magic. While there is no system of truth, the canon of Spiritualism grows as do the whims and experiences of its adherents. Its churches do have moral requirements for their ministers and mediums, which are conventional Christian ones, and they have Sunday Schools as well as worship services. The chief function of Spiritualism, both popularly and officially, is communication with deceased human beings, very much an outgrowth of the scientism and materialism of its age, having reached its height in the 1850s.¹⁰⁵

Algernon J. Pollock's "Modern Spiritualism Briefly Tested by Scripture" (X: 11) is a condensed version of a larger study and he comes down very hard on it totally. Of all the attractions to it, he believes most stem from the deep desire to fill the void caused by the death of a loved one. As the title indicates, Pollock is concerned with examining Spiritualism by the biblical standard, which he does well, though he fails to understand and comment on it as a social phenomenon.¹⁰⁶ Rather impressively he cites the Old Testament condemnations of Spiritualism, because it is defiling and heathen, whose followers God was to destroy and its mediums were to be stoned.¹⁰⁷ He then does the same for the New Testament, using the total evidence as conclusive proof of its wickedness and divine disapproval.¹⁰⁸ He also notes how Christ healed those under the sway of the devil,

while the Spiritualists looked upon Him as a "medium or reformer in Judea; that He is now an advanced spirit in the sixth sphere...". For them medium and mediator were used synonymously. They had a desire to have the support of the divine for their work, but at the same time they were fighting off Christianity.

It was Spiritualism's explicit denial of biblical inspiration, fall of man, deity of Christ, atonement, existence of a personal devil, demons, angels, heaven, and hell that brought the most positive objections. Then, as a result of an American conference in 1866, it further resolved to abandon all Christian ordinances and worship, discontinue all Sunday Schools, denounce sexual tyranny, and affirm that animal food should not be used. And still they wanted to call themselves Christian Spiritualists. What is more, they never came to terms with the nature of evil. In an address, one Frank Swainson spoke of the "three black I's" of Spiritualism, infidelity, insanity, and immorality. With them evil virtually did not exist, for evil was good as a lie was truth intrinsically. Much of the apparatus needed to effect spiritualistic fruit, that is mediumship, led to insanity. Marriage was not binding if one had a closer spiritual affinity for another, and this sexual emancipation bred immorality. Spiritualism has an hierarchy of values but there is no eternal damnation, only a gradation of the good, for the fall and depravity of man figures not. Christianity they flatly denied, but at one meeting where a

Christian was present, the medium declared that fact and said such could not proceed until he had gone. What they denied existed had then interfered. For all of this there was real biblical judgment, not only for Spiritualism but also for kindred fellowships, which was powerful evidence for Pollock to close on.¹⁰⁹

Conan Doyle has commented that Spiritualism's mission was to those openly declared agnostic, but so unlike many religions because of being irreconcilable with materialism. He further admitted that most who embrace it have found Christianity unsatisfying, and that the emphasis on contact with the dead is part of the timeless spiritual continuity which it offered. Christ is only an example and not a redeemer, as man does not need that. Behind spiritualist thought is the evolutionary process, which is at work in both the terrestrial and celestial spheres, and as man becomes finer so will his post-earth environment and he will evolve from heaven to heaven until final glory comes. Its evolutionary bent can explain much of its manward thinking and its disenchantment with the church much of its heresy. It was born in those years of intellectual and social uproar and with each success became more dogmatic. Spiritualism was a serious threat to the Faith because of its roots and fruit.¹¹⁰ In some ways it might be thought a minor error, when compared to the false doctrines so powerfully asserted by the monolithic Roman church. Nevertheless, it was one of many such serious deviations, which when taken either

singularly or collectively pointed to a major deficiency in the church, especially as all these sects arose in the same period.

Russellism, or more popularly known as the Jehovah's Witnesses, is the second of the four sects discussed in The Fundamentals, in William G. Moorehead's "Millennial Dawn: A Counterfeit of Christianity" (VII: 8). It was founded in 1884 by Charles Taze Russell, who organized the legal corporation known first as Zion's Watch Tower Tract Society, and in 1896 re-named it the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania. This movement was called Russellism until his successor, Judge J. F. Rutherford, changed its name to Jehovah's Witnesses in 1931. They talked of a new era or coming millennium as beginning in 1914, renounced clerical orders for a ministry of the laity, erased the belief in hell-fire, and, most seriously of all, held an Arian view of Christ. They considered Christ before His birth a spirit-creature named Michael, and as a result of His earthly birth, but not incarnation, He became a perfect man equal to Adam before the fall. With death His human nature was annihilated and as a reward for His sacrificial obedience to God He was given a divine spirit-nature. For them Christ is never co-equal with God nor is He eternal, only a man on earth with no atoning power. They reject the biblical passages that speak of Christ's deity and the Holy Spirit, which leaves them with an unitarian view.¹¹¹ Never would they speak of being "in Christ", which phrase occurs

in Paul's epistles some 164 times, which puts them completely outside any trinitarian consideration and thus without Christianity entirely.

Russell's background was both Congregational and Presbyterian, and he found evangelicalism and evolution both a curse. In fact, this sect would claim that the former encouraged the latter, as well as higher criticism, by making the Bible look so ridiculous. Having come in contact with the Second Adventism of William Miller (1829), whose principal belief was Christ's return in 1840, Russell preached that 1914 would mark the end of the Gentile times and the beginning of a world judgment, which would climax in Armageddon and the establishment of the thousand-year reign of Christ. The Witnesses have held to this conviction, that in 1914 the kingdom actually began, and from 1919 on their New World Society has grown "under Kingdom rule amidst its enemies". Since then they have become perhaps the fastest-growing religious group in the world and orthodoxy has had to take serious notice of them.¹¹² To the anti-ecclesiastical Russell the church was still an "obscure traveller along the highway of nations".

Moorehead begins his essay by giving the basic facts about the multi-volume set called Millennial Dawn (1886), whose title was changed to read Studies in the Scriptures (1911) probably because of the disrepute that came at first. Evolution and Russell's doctrines are equated for their heresy, though it is made clear that only Millennial Dawn

and not Russell himself as author is being arraigned. Moorehead does not consider Russell self-deceived, as many thought, though Russell himself believed that he had written the truthful explanation of the Bible. Moorehead does claim that Russell was being satanically used to subvert God's truth, which indictment he tries to establish.

In so doing he has set forth ten doctrines which he discusses at some length, presenting the facts as Russell stated them and then giving his own opinion together with much biblical quotation in support. This is followed by a "summary of the false doctrines of Millennial Dawn", giving twelve short-sentence statements that highlight the previous discussion.¹¹³ The innumerable falsehoods are glaring and such teachings have stripped Christianity completely of its unique truths and miraculous claims. Russell himself claimed knowledge that was not for all to have save for his followers, biblical statements were blatantly ignored and overridden, and analogies could be made with Mormonism and other sectarian systems, all of which and much more caused increased bitterness with the established Faith. As effectual doctrines of the Jehovah's Witnesses their heresy in the extreme was far more serious than simply a theological disagreement. An acute threat to Christianity, these were incontestably proclaimed and increasingly believed. Moorehead ends by saying that Russell's system is a mixture of Unitarianism, Universalism, Second Probation, Restorationism, and the Swedenborgian method of exegesis.¹¹⁴ With the Bible

as the absolute standard and the enormously rich history of the church as its witness, the faintest glimpse of Russell, Millennial Dawn, and the Jehovah's Witnesses themselves would show real danger that demanded correction, even though social, intellectual, and religious circumstances could explain it. The same held true for the final two isms which The Fundamentals attacked, Eddyism and Mormonism, whose threat and actual hold were equally as serious as that of Spiritualism and Russellism.

Eddyism, or Christian Science, was founded in New England by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy in 1866, a patient and student of Dr. Phineas P. Quimby, who had herself been for many years a semi-invalid, three times married, and never free from pain. In February 1866 she suffered an injury that was declared fatal, but three days later, having read Matthew IX: 2, she was renewed and traced the founding of Christian Science to that moment.¹¹⁵ It was ten years later (1876) that she wrote her Science and Health, the Bible of the Christian Science church, which contains an idealistic metaphysics and a pantheistic theology.¹¹⁶ Christian Science had a close similarity with other systems of thought having currency in New England at that time, Spiritualism being one and Hinduism in its Vedanta form another. Mrs. Eddy's writings abound in ideas from Berkeley, Hegel, Fichte, Huxley, Hume, Spencer, Socrates, Plato, Descartes, Locke, Leibnitz, and Spinoza, all combining in her mind in a new way to produce a dynamic movement that taught a gospel of

healing.¹¹⁷ In theory she believed that the mind alone could remove the pain and the disease proper, that no aids were needed, though she did approve of surgery "until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind". This was an avowed revolt against nineteenth-century scientism with a working belief in pragmatism. Both Josiah Royce and William James brought an academic interest to the development of religious therapeutics then as well. The Church of Christ, Scientist, was fully her creation, and when in 1882 she had it moved from Lynn to Boston, it was to gain immeasurably by being in the city that then claimed to be the religious and intellectual capital of the nation.¹¹⁸

Unitarians looked kindly on this new religion while conservative churchmen naturally opposed it. Others like Phillips Brooks and Henry Ward Beecher could see both its goodness and error. With the magazine revolution by 1900, many thousands were brought into contact with it and converts came not only from among Protestants but also Catholics and Jews.¹¹⁹ The idea of the unreality of sin and evil, the disbelief in heaven and hell, the skepticism of medical training, the repudiation of Christ's incarnation, atonement, and divinity, together with calling Him the foremost practitioner of Christian Science, all this combined with many more biblical denials brought legitimate horror to evangelicals. Its denial of medicine brought firm denouncement from the American Medical Association in the 1890s, for by then medical research was greatly advanced for which the church

was grateful. As a monolithic organization with a prejudice against anything not of Mrs. Eddy's fashioning, with all the obvious fraud and inwardness that that generated, Christian Science took upon itself to oppose in the most bitter manner both the theological and medical world. After its initial shine had dulled the suspicions far outdid the acceptances. It was as dangerous as much of the higher criticism and was in addition a revival of ancient Gnosticism, leading very much to self-indulgence when saying that the body could not corrupt the soul.

Maurice E. Wilson, "Eddyism, Commonly Called 'Christian Science'" (IX: 9), begins by using the quotation "the reason so many new isms are constantly springing up is because the old Gospel is so hard to live". Appropriate enough, for often these sects taught antithetically to Christianity simply because they were overcome by it for any number of reasons. He has chosen to deal only with Science and Health, which he agrees is totally illogical as well as archly heretical; and, he further limits himself to the subjects of God, prayer, sin and atonement, the Lord's supper, resurrection, and healing.¹²⁰ God is not a person but a principle, like the "principle of mathematics", and this leads to pantheism although she denied that. Consequently, this precludes all need for and possibility of prayer. She was opposed to audible prayer, having said "desire is prayer", and even altered the Lord's Prayer and had it read aloud alternately with her own version. As she misunderstands sin

there is no need for atonement in her scheme, which mistakes the whole purpose of Christ's advent, for sin is only an illusion. This gave unlimited licence and was certainly the most serious of her teachings. The atonement meant nothing more than man having some kind of unity with God. Therefore, when John talked about the logos that could be none other than Christian Science.

The Lord's Supper is viewed as a "mournful occasion", and Christian Scientists instead commemorated that last spiritual breakfast which Christ had with His disciples on the shore of Galilee, because for them that was a joyful occasion. After all, the agony in the garden and the torture of the crucifixion were "errors of sinful sense". In 1908 even that form of communion was abolished as a "dead rite". Christ's very words, "this do in remembrance of me", were done away with again. Concerning the resurrection, on which the communion hinges, they hold that Christ did not die but was only hidden in the sepulchre, "demonstrating within the narrow tomb the power of Spirit to over-rule mortal, material sense". Then Wilson brings forward a most important statement, in saying that the public is never really informed that Christian Science does deny so completely Christian truth, for these issues of theology are never discussed either on the platform or in their publications. Not until Science and Health is read closely are these beliefs exposed. After all, Mrs. Eddy was anxious to win converts, and, while she herself had developed an anti-Christian position, she

and the organization found it not expedient to reveal these views when on the strength of a theology of healing alone they could appeal. It is not out of order, either, to ask Christian Science why it will trust God as a physician but not as a surgeon. Their cures were no better than those of other shrines across the world. And their understanding of scientific medicine was corrupt because they refused to face up to it. Medicine itself has long admitted that much illness is psychosomatic.

Any criticism of Eddyism always brought the sharpest retort from the organization, which assumed an innate superiority for the founder herself. The dishonesties, whether in exaggerating their total membership, or the doctrines themselves, are part of the total effort and would never stand up to scrutiny. The constant theme of "self-reliant trustworthiness" is the precise opposite from what Christ and St. Paul demanded, though that in itself was very much part of the moral climate in which Mrs. Eddy's New England found itself. Transcendentalism, as it was then called, carried optimism to the pitch of poetry, and almost to a visionary level, where it seemed not impossible that the kingdom of heaven might descend at least to New England. A co-existent pragmatism wanted to substitute a technological utopia for the heavenly kingdom and found in science a justification for much hope.¹²¹ Wilson is not wrong in saying that no doubt many of Eddyism's disciples, who were formerly members of evangelical churches, think they still have

the same Saviour as formerly, even though it was the founder's boast that she had "taken away their Lord", marvelling all the time that the press and pulpit were so patient with her. In conclusion, Wilson asks how long before a minister would be expelled from his office were he to claim that the true Christ is Calvinism, Arminianism the Holy Spirit, or that Lutheranism lights the fires of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, the blasphemy of Eddyism has continued uninterrupted. It has been observed that the founder's own life is the sect's greatest detriment, namely her three husbands and herself.

These sects felt fully justified to put forward this kind of anthropology in the name of theology. When they saw the church and its theologians in such disagreement, the alternative seemed to be to put the focus more on man, which they did. Mormonism was another example, where people were ready to follow the dictates of a man, something concrete and not beyond this world. Joseph Smith fulfilled that function as he unearthed the golden tablets (1827) and began to translate them, which was believed to be the Book of Mormon. With Smith's murder in 1844, Brigham Young was his successor and led the Mormons from New York to Utah as part of the vision to establish Zion through migrations and pioneering. In the early stages Unitarianism was important to Mormon thought, but was soon abandoned. Their religious thought process went through three stages, monism originally with a reversal to tritheism, and an expansion to polytheism. The Book of Mormon most probably originated from an Indian

novel written by Solomon Spaulding, a Congregational minister, which was later revised to incorporate the theology of the Disciples of Christ. This was done by Sidney Rigdon, who left the Disciples to become the distinguished theologian of early Mormonism.¹²²

Mormonism knows no absolute values, as the good is the realization of functional achievement and divine life is life in nature. Divine unity was thought to have been interrupted because of a disagreement among the spirits, which resulted in a war in heaven. Instead, the emphasis was placed on this world, where Lucifer proposed to save men through knowledge, even though they did not will it. This was in contrast to Jesus, Who insisted that man must choose and retain his free will. The Mormon priesthood is headed by prophets who represent God. The law which created a new religion was contained in the Book of Commandments, which were Smith's written revelations from God, printed in 1831. Here were sanctioned such doctrinal innovations as polygamy. These prophets got a hearing because of manifesting the gifts of New Testament times, tongues, miracles, healing, and prophecies, but in no way did communication with the divine mean mystic absorption.

The Book of Mormon (1830) and the Doctrine and Covenants (1833) naturalized biblical prophecies and events and adapted them to the American scene, which was to be the promised land. Missouri, as the geographical center of the continent, was to be the site of the New Jerusalem. They

taught that God Himself in Christ had trod American soil before His ascension and that America was now fulfilling its role as a sanctuary. The communities they founded through their "gathering" were the prelude to the kingdom.¹²³

What for other millenarian faiths marked the end was for the Mormons just the beginning. Their view of the second coming was momentary and they expected mansions on earth rather than in the sky. That event would only change the administration, becoming a monarchy of the king of kings, with the present established kingdom continuing. They had a zeal for missions, and, used the term "Zion" to denote both the pure in heart as well as their actual dwelling place. Nevertheless, it was definitely a victim of the historical scene, for as conditions improved, especially in America, and the century aged, Mormonism postponed its prophecy, took its writings less seriously, and was apathetic to issues that forecasted the end-time. With the betterment of economic and social conditions at home and abroad, the old longing for distant utopias weakened. To gather at their Zion was a goal in 1850, while in 1890 it was an option.¹²⁴ The "gathering" of the saints had to precede the kingdom of God; it was the summing up, the last dispensation, and the unifying theme of Mormonism. Unlike other millenarians in their response to the end of this world, the Mormons appointed a place and gathered their own there, proclaiming themselves to be the Church of the Latter Day Saints of Jesus Christ.

R. G. McNiece's essay, "Mormonism: Its Origin, Characteristics, and Doctrines" (VIII: 9), carries with it a most practical knowledge of the subject, as he lived in Salt Lake City, Utah, the Mormon headquarters, for over thirty years while serving as a Presbyterian minister there. At the outset he lists the chief official books of the sect that he has studied, which was augmented by his knowing so many of them personally and having countless associations with the organization. A brief historical sketch of its origin is given, whereupon he deals with four major characteristics of the movement. First, despite the providential-prophetic view which Mormonism held of America, its system was anti-American in insisting that a priesthood government was only right, thus contradicting the principle of free, representative government. They held that to disobey the priesthood was to disobey God, their scheme being nothing less than a tyranny. Secondly, that Mormonism is thoroughly anti-Christian has already been substantiated, and McNiece insures that by pointing out their cardinal heresies of ridiculing God's sovereignty, asserting that He is just another man like Brigham Young, denying Christ's atonement, and teaching salvation by works. Thirdly, it is not only a counterfeit but also deceives the ignorant, first by calling Joseph Smith a prophet when he was quite the opposite, much of which began with the deception in his autobiography (1838). Further, it puts forward a counterfeit Bible in the Book of Mormon which is a totally inept and lifeless imita-

tion thereof, the famous golden plates being a well-known fraud. And, it has a counterfeit priesthood, claiming to be the "Melchisedek and Aaronic priesthood", which openly opposes Scripture in bypassing Christ as the fulfillment of all priesthood. Fourthly, it sets forth a counterfeit group of apostles, who must demonstrate their status by having known Christ before His crucifixion, seen Him after His resurrection, received their commission directly from Him, and worked miracles to prove that God had appointed them.¹²⁵

The last section concentrates on the doctrines of Mormonism. McNiece states that it does not publish its teachings, but waits until its converts are safely within the fold before these are disclosed. Throughout the organization there is rampant deception and it has even espoused Christian doctrine under false pretenses. This came about in 1844 when the Mormon church was being severely condemned everywhere, and to counteract that, Smith and some of his associates drew up thirteen articles as a summary of Mormon belief. By taking only the first eight of these, McNiece amply demonstrates their deception. Even if they would want to appear Christian, that would collapse when compared with their own official writings alone. The following statements will prove their heresy in Christian terms: when they wrote God they meant Adam and a polygamous one at that; the Holy Ghost was ethereal but not divine; the fall was not calamitous but a blessing; Christ was the son of the Adam-god and also a polygamist, and redemption came only through

the requirements of Mormon ceremonies and works; Christian denominations were to be unseated for Mormonism is the only true church and thus sacramentally effective; the early church's organization was replaced by their own, without any New Testament warranty for its different offices; and, their own scriptures were substituted for the Bible. For two generations this system had been in force as McNiece writes, and its attraction was growing, holding the people of one western state (Utah) in its bondage and even influencing the election of congressional members from five other states. It was a national and not a local problem and McNiece urged that the Christian missionary forces in Utah be doubled.¹²⁶

These final five isms, representing a total of ninety-five pages in the collection, complete those urgent problems of the period to which evangelical Christianity felt compelled to speak. Apart from Romanism, which certainly could not be written off as non-Christian despite its major failings, the others were and have remained major heresies, with Spiritualism being the least troublesome and by no means militant as were and are the other three. These were arrantly anti-Christian, and if ever there was achievement in creating a thoroughly man-centered religion with the guise of a pseudo-Christian ethic, these were such. The essays themselves on these subjects combined reasonable learning with simplicity of presentation. They were meant to instruct all Christians everywhere, and in providing such information and warning were to advance the cause of the Faith in a missionary

sense, according to the Stewarts' original plan.

Indeed, the challenge presented received a full response: the authority and centrality of the Bible was laid as the only foundation, a standard carefully defined, from which the higher criticism was judged, and with which Darwinism and Romanism, Spiritualism, Russellism, Eddyism, and Mormonism were found to be, in most cases, in total and even most deceptive opposition. The complement to these essays of The Fundamentals now follows in the next chapter, with the positive discussion of its own theology of the Christian faith and life, just as correspondingly the first two chapters complemented one another and thus relate respectively.

CHAPTER FOUR.

THE FUNDAMENTALS AS A THEOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE.

For the remaining forty-nine of the ninety essays in The Fundamentals the emphasis shifts markedly from that of destruction to construction and purposely. Even though these are scattered throughout and not lumped together in a block, they nevertheless aim to deepen the reader's faith. Collectively they present a very real theology of the Christian faith and life. To do this with some direction and precision, these essays have here been divided into four sections, hopefully according to a proper theological progression: the fact of man -- sin and conversion; the remedy -- Christ (Christology and revelation); the result -- evangelism; and, the error -- social gospel and socialism. The balance within these sections has turned out remarkably, with thirteen essays in the first and third and twenty-two in the central section on Christ. Although there is only one essay under the final heading, it is one of the signalisms and holds great importance for the entire series. What is more, together with its discussion will be some careful consideration of the whole subject of socialism in its wider setting, especially as it affected the presentation of the gospel. Those essays treating evangelism are much aware of this threat. And also, where appropriate the discussion of the new direction in New Testament scholarship, as it emerged

at the turn of the century and virtually claimed the spotlight which the Old Testament had had earlier, but by then had run its course, will be expanded in relation to what the essays themselves suggest. This will be done to set the context more specifically, but in no way can it equal the Old Testament discussion herein because the subject itself was only coming on the horizon when these essays were in the making. To the section on Christ this will really apply.

Soteriology is the principal theological interest of the writers of The Fundamentals which the essays themselves show. Once the battle royal had been waged against the inroads to orthodoxy, the soteriological theme, while all along prevalent, loomed even larger because in its own way it is the seminary for any theology of the Christian faith and life. In brief, soteriology releases truth about man's condition and then proceeds to propose the remedy, running that long gamut between man as a fallen creature and his new life in the fact of atonement. Thirty-five of the remaining forty-nine essays speak to precisely this, under the headings of the fact of man and the remedy.

In constructing some kind of theology from these essays alone, the subject of man himself must be the first consideration and here some thirteen essays address that chiefly in terms of sin and conversion. In "Sin and Judgment to Come" (VI: 3) Sir Robert Anderson proclaims with no uncertainty man's depravity: "Man is a sinner not merely because of what he does, but by reason of what he

is"; and this he treats within the paradoxical limits that man is both fallen and God's creature, which is Scripture's presentation with Christ coming as the revolutionary Second Person.¹ Sin always has to be judged from the divine and not the human standpoint, relating to God's requirements and never to man's estimate of himself. That there must be individual redemption before there can be a reconciliation between man and God is indisputable, and Anderson strikes forcefully at what he terms "Neo-Christianism" because this he saw as the current attempt to lessen the importance of sin and atonement by presenting a God who is a "weak and gentle human 'Jesus' who has supplanted the God of both nature and revelation".² The argument then must be in favour of a perfect standard, for if God accepted a standard other than perfect righteousness He would have to declare Himself unrighteous. What is more, the duty of redemption is not just how to be just in condemning but equally just in forgiving.

The discussion shifts from this world to the next, whereupon mention is made of the believer's new heavenly body, with much Scripture being quoted, and equal attention given to the infidel, all in support of the claim that future judgment is inevitable with proper rewards and punishments.³ In no way does this do injustice to the use of grace, which stands waiting always to be given but not without the price of commitment. Though making certain to denounce all arguments about man that are extra-biblical,

Anderson does bring his essay to a positive ending by stating that "the wonder of the revelation is not punishment but pardon", even though eternal death and life are absolute realities and for which redemption is the key. Without Christ's cross there is no soteriology and inevitably it will determine either depravity or beatitude depending on the individual's response to its call.⁴ The very life which Christ led on earth made both sin and the need for conversion a reality, and to discount that is to reject Scripture. Anderson admits to many mysteries therein, but this fact of the cross could not be more carefully or repeatedly presented and the consequences therefore have every right to be final and eternal. Typically, he has relied heavily on the Bible for documentation and categorically referred to any opposing views as wrong. Nevertheless, in setting man and God in such vivid and polar terms he has amply demonstrated their need to co-exist, and thus has put down the first principle for a theology of the Christian faith and life.

To demonstrate the vivid reality of sin with all the eventual judgment that would accompany it was a natural concern for these writers, not only because of biblical allegiance but also as the higher criticism had blurred the subject and the social gospel discounted its individual nature. Sin was always discussed in terms both of the existential and eschatological and it was invariably presuppositional with these writers because it is such in Scripture. Thomas Whitelaw begins "The Biblical Conception

of Sin" (XI: 1) on that note but makes certain to talk also of the removableness of sin as does the Bible.⁵ Here sin is not rationalized in man's favour, but rather labelled as the free act of a responsible being asserting his will against that of his Maker's, and Whitelaw gives many examples from both Testaments in definition.⁶ What is more, sin has no restrictions but has affected extensively the entire human race in every age and intensively every individual in every department of his being. Sin has complete universality in its operation.⁷ Original sin is an eternally true fact and, whatever view one might take of the Genesis account, Whitelaw holds that its teaching is unmistakable and true: that the results of Adam's sin, both legal and moral, have been transmitted to Adam's posterity. And as long as this sin remains with the person, unconfessed and unbroken, the just punishment for it includes bodily as well as spiritual and eternal death.⁸ Yet the gospel stands as the great deliverer, the "good news" for this condition, and as Genesis through Revelation unfolds the God of love and the story of forgiveness, certainly the predominant biblical concern, so Whitelaw in his essay reflects longest on the removal of sin, for which discussion of its origin, nature, universality, and culpability was preparatory.

The theme of the lamb of God is as much an Old as a New Testament figure with an unmistakable message, and Whitelaw rightly views it as the central message of Scripture, as it seeks to release man from his inherited plight

and grant him a new heavenward direction. Even though, as he concedes, theories of annihilation, second probation, and universal salvation might figure and even gain scriptural support, the essential concern to regenerate man is without confusion. Life then truly becomes union with God and death the absence from Him.⁹ That he deals with these other explanations of sin alone shows that each one had its own adherents, for they were seemingly legitimate interpretations, especially at a time when hard truth about man's errors was little heard. They were another way out from literalism and had to be recognized because of their scriptural connection, although Whitelaw expresses all his doubts about them. He would hold that the sinful will remains always and cites John V: 29, and then concludes that "Happily we are not required to understand all mysteries...". Instantly, for saying just that he would have been accused of avoiding the realities of textual problems, even to having been written off as naive and anti-intellectual.

The nature of the sin that besets man takes on another facet with the embodiment of the satanic, which Mrs. Jesse Penn-Lewis discusses in "Satan and His Kingdom" (X: 6.)¹⁰ She opens dramatically with Christ's words on Satan in John VIII: 44 and I John III: 8, labelling him a murderer and sinner, and then describes his position and character citing several New Testament statements as proof. As the ruler of the corruptible world, Satan's own religious system is built on idolatry and a pseudo-godliness which will pass,

and with much success, for a genuine way of life. This was doctrinally expressed by Paul to Timothy (I Timothy IV: 1) and history has more than obviously displayed its truth in many forms. Theosophy, Christian Science, and "all other teachings now being poured into the world by spirits of evil" are listed as satanic and the gospel is the judge in all cases. Mrs. Penn-Lewis sees Satan at work in every area of life, always ready to insert misunderstanding whether of the Word or any other truth, subjecting men to worldly peace, and forever counterfeiting God's work, all of which Scripture forewarns and stands ready to correct. Again, spiritism, palmistry, and crystal-gazing are named concretely by her and superficially noted as signs of the last days.¹¹

Finally, the essay shifts from the triumphs of Satan to those of Calvary, but in doing so satanic corruption is forcefully noted again by its determination to restrain the soul from full surrender to God, resist the removal of all filthy garments spotted by the flesh, use some to tempt others away from the cross, inflame the life of nature into division and strife, and speak out against godly revelations, guidance, and liberty.¹² Yet in the providence of God the Christian will often be at war with the world in order to have peace with Christ. The wiles of the devil are guaranteed, but as progress with God increases the satanic decreases though always present. The personality of Satan has here been drawn with some vividness, for an actual being he is considered, and the contemporary religious aberrations used

as manifest examples. Even though the thinking and presentation have been simple, the principle has been sharpened.

Charles B. Williams' "Paul's Testimony to the Doctrine of Sin" (VIII: 4) points up the conversion principle with the Saul-Paul illustration. Paul himself was possessed with the reality of sin and equally with the assurance of its cancellation through faith and regeneration, and to demonstrate that Williams has even counted the times terms for sin appear in Paul's writings.¹³ This positive view of sin was intimately bound up with his conversion, having discovered that he could in no way work out his own righteousness, that his being a Pharisee was of no ultimate worth. For Williams this was a truth that had an especially important message for the turn of the century. Paul's mind on this question is contemporary and timeless, for it was more the practicality of the issue than an endless discoursing thereon that concerned him. Nineteenth-century theological study was much more geared to relating God and the Word to man than to strict doctrinal formulation, which had already been done carefully if not always agreeably, and was more concerned with relatives than with ultimates. Paul always wrote as one who existentially knew the curse of sin's bondage and his own testimony thus serves as a paradigm.

Believing that sin for man began in Adam and was inherited by each generation thereafter, the human race being helpless to extricate itself therefrom, Paul goes on to dis-

cuss what sin is and its relation to the law. For him the cause of sin is the flesh and not the law which is "holy, righteous, good".¹⁴ Further, he sees sin as universal, as a part of every man, and forever persistent (Galatians V: 17-18). But its conquest is by the grace of God through Christ, that conquest being infinitely greater than even sin's own power of demolition. Both Paul and Williams testify that the Christian life certainly does not mean a life without sin, but that that tendency is superhumanly lessened until in death there is triumph. The invasion of Jesus Christ alters man totally and in Him, not in himself, he finds that new strength.

In this essay Williams has edited Paul's views on sin from all his writings, with his own comment being slight, except occasionally when stating a principle about Paul's life and work. Thus, the Bible itself has here spoken rather than a commentator thereon as has been usual, and, as this is the last of the four essays to discuss sin as such in this first section on the fact of man, it is appropriate that the discussion has ended with a direct biblical word. The next group of essays in this same section deals with conversion, with Paul again being used as the example in the fourth and last one.

In addressing himself to the subject of conversion, H. M. Sydenstricker, "The Science of Conversion" (VIII: 5), proceeds very much in the mind of the day. He raises the question whether the conversion of the human soul lies

within the range of scientific investigation and answers most affirmatively. For the promises of God are absolute and church history has demonstrated that "the conversion of souls was the direct result of God-appointed and man-applied means thereto, operated by purely scientific methods..."¹⁵

Beginning with the premise of original sin, that the total man has been born depraved in all his parts, the proposition is advanced that both the sinner and the sin must be replaced and this is done by means of conversion. The divine power has now interfered with man as he has reached out to God in repentance, seeking cleansing and assuming a new life in Him by faith. Usually this is all brought about by an agent who has already experienced conversion, but the actual regeneration is of God as well as the maintenance of that new life. Still, this in no way limits the power of the Holy Spirit to initiate renewal within an individual quite apart from any human contacts.¹⁶ But, whatever the means, the conversion process from first to last must be done according to God's methods as revealed through His Word in order to assure that He is represented fully.

Scientific steps for conversion are suggested as: the prayer of the church and the Christian worker for the Spirit's quickening, preaching of the Word and the use of external means, cooperation of the sinner himself in this preparation, and the act of faith in Christ on the part of the sinner which entails confession of and obedience to Him.¹⁷

Sydenstricker maintains that these conditions must

be met, as all scientific operations demand, before the results of conversion appear. What is more, he attacks those other methods, which are not true or scientific, of the "many who pose as expert conversionists in so many of the pseudo revivals now so much in vogue".¹⁸ Conversion is ultimately God's doing and when the human agent does not comply with His instructions then God is blamed for the result, and, equally, when the sinner himself is irresponsive to the necessary conditions for salvation. More often than not it is a three-part process between God, the Christian worker and the sinner. The result is a scientific one as an entirely new man has been created according to the biblical injunction; finite man with his mortality has been brought into eternal life with a renewed will which is the "scientific result of the life-giving touch of the Spirit of God". The sin having been exposed followed by deep repentance and an unlimited faith in Christ, the conversion has run its course. Furthermore, the results are scientific, a term which Sydenstricker likes to use, because they have followed the biblical order. Otherwise the procedure is doomed, for scientific means -- prayer, the Holy Spirit, and the Word preached -- are necessary for scientific results -- conversion, confession, and Christian service.¹⁹

The acute intellectual inquisition that surrounded nineteenth-century theology has been evidenced and dealt with in Sydenstricker's treatment of conversion, which despite its essentially other-worldly quality still could

and had to be explained aright. This was no mysterious matter as many, including evangelists, would have it, and, at a time when Christian scholarship talked very little of conversion The Fundamentals were anxious to stress it anew with intellectual respectability as well as theological viability. To continue that subject an essay of Thomas Boston's "The Nature of Regeneration" (X: 3) was incorporated, he being a contributor who was not contemporary as such. Boston begins with six propositions which he then expands and documents with biblical quotations: the name Christian is spread among many who have no notion of it; good education is not regeneration as it may "chain up men's lusts, but cannot change their hearts"; the saving change is much more than "a turning from open profanity to civility and sobriety"; outward religion is not inward rebirth; religious strictness can mean nothing; and, initial testings and soul-exercises can stop short of true regeneration, which he goes on to develop particularly.²⁰

Having said what regeneration or conversion is not, Boston then spells out carefully its marks, a process in which "the Lord loosens every joint, and sets it right again". Quite simply, in regeneration no new substance is created but new qualities are infused, the new birth is of the Spirit assuming something of the divine nature which creates a likeness in God. The great question is posed as to how sinful man can raise himself out of that state any more than a dead man can raise himself from the grave. Yet,

when spiritual regeneration occurs "all things become new" as Paul declared, for regenerating grace plunges as deeply as sin and raises all to a new life. It becomes a spiritual condition that affects the entire person.²¹ Boston has said nothing beyond Sydenstricker except that he is much less philosophical and scientific in approach, which his own historical time can account for considerably. The reason for his inclusion cannot be ascertained (this subject having been discussed earlier), yet, without being ad hoc in date as are the other essays, it does point up the changelessness of biblical standards if they are to be employed, even to an explanation of them.

In the third essay on this theme, George W. Lasher casts his "Regeneration -- Conversion -- Reformation" (X: 4) in similar terms, but uses the word "reformation" to denote the ultimate condition. Here the author is meticulously concerned with the proper usage of these words, all of which are so important for the true Christian and should follow in that order. It would be fully possible to accuse Lasher of mere semantic niceties here, yet the point of his argument is to underline the meaning and importance of the first term -- regeneration. He asserts that much Christian discussion has confused this term and that it must be properly viewed as the most crucial act in the life of one who truly repents and comes to Christ.²²

When citing the statement "Except a man be born of water K&C spirit...", he notes that scholarship takes the

conjunction to mean far more than "and", rather it amplifies the antecedent and has the sense of "even" or "namely".²³ This means that when a man decides for Christ and repents and seeks Him, it is the regeneration of the Holy Spirit which sets to work first.²⁴ Lasher comes down hard on baptismal regeneration and discounts it, using Paul and Scripture otherwise as evidence. Instead, when the person senses that a change has taken place within himself, that he is a new creature, then regeneration has happened. Christ has been at work in that life and conversion should follow: "Regeneration implies conversion; but there may be conversion without regeneration".²⁵

Lasher insists that conversion has been an overworked and misunderstood term, for it means only "change", and the Christian can be expected to be converted often along his path, while "regeneration can occur but once in the experience of the same soul; but conversion can occur many times".²⁶ The final process, reformation, implies conversion but not necessarily regeneration: regeneration insures reformation but not necessarily vice versa. Biblically, these three terms are meant to follow one another, and Lasher would even claim that when regeneration has not occurred first then the other two have not fulfilled their potential. That could mean that the Christian experience might suffer seriously. Without the anointing of the Holy Spirit Christian salvation cannot be understood. For to talk only in terms of conversion is not to have begun at the

beginning, and these terms are important if the biblical pattern is to be heeded. Lasher has written in answer to a prominently double-headed situation theologically: the liberal who often side-stepped these considerations anyway, and the evangelical, who, in the heat of revivalism, was more interested in a momentary effect than a properly lasting Christian growth. To repeat, while the essay might well be an exercise in theological semantics, it also reveals its vast concern for erecting a solid foundation in the new birth. Lasher maintains that so much in religion that claims to be honest is only pharisaical.

St. Paul's testimony to the doctrine of sin having been discussed earlier, in the last essay of these on conversion he again becomes the subject, in Lord Lyttelton's "Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul" (V: 4). This together with Thomas Boston's were the two oldest essays in the collection, the latter having come out of the eighteenth century, so well-known for its agnostics and deists, rationalists and unbelievers. Lyttelton literally fought his way, intellectually, to belief, and was converted in the midst of defending the position that the Bible was an imposture.²⁷ His original treatise was entitled Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul. There he concluded, quite unintentionally, that Paul's conversion "...duly considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation", having dismissed three other logical possibilities: that Paul was an impostor, an enthusiast

working under an "overheated imagination", or that he was deceived by the fraud of others.²⁸ The greatest proportion of his argument is given to Paul's not being an impostor, for the question has rightly to be raised how he on that Damascus road became totally a new creature. Lyttelton argues conclusively that the change had to be miraculous, for Paul admittedly wanted to destroy Christianity in order to preserve his Jewish heritage, which later he saw only too well as its fulfillment. Had the conversion been a fraud, it would have been unprofitable as well as perilous and he would never have risked it. For it was only his genuine divine attachment that enabled him to withstand his new and bitter enemies, to say nothing of his miracles and incalculable influence. To seek to impose upon him traits of heated temper, melancholy, ignorance, credulity, vanity, or whatever would be wholly malicious. Nor was he deceived by others, for his own miracles could never have been done in that frame. The facts must speak for themselves in this case, which Lyttelton's own life was proof of. Interestingly, both Paul's and Lyttelton's conversions came at a time of similar circumstance.

The willingness to admit to supernatural reality is fundamental to acknowledging biblical truth, for man's sinful nature and need for conversion are absolute in those terms and Paul himself is the perfect model for that claim. There is a balance in this arrangement of these essays, as these two on Paul's testimony to sin and his conversion

properly complete their respective groups as well as lead to the final subject of grace. That Lyttelton began so antithetically to the position that he finally and inevitably had to espouse represents a truth in itself, and at once says so much for the biblical record and its force when brought face to face with man himself. In essence, Lyttelton's experience was very much Paul's and his entire analysis thereof was as real as it was academic. In no way were these subjects of sin and conversion ever handled with a sense of fear for what might stand beyond death. Rather, as always in this collection the principle was that of taking Scripture absolutely. Face value was their standard, with a genuine concern for intelligent evaluation that was in no way obscurantist, in most cases, while the higher criticism had almost uniformly raised the allegorical as its standard.

That standard is best noticed in William C. Procter's "What Christ Teaches Concerning Future Retribution" (IX: 7), which essay acts as a stepping stone to this final group of essays dealing with grace. For the view taken of retribution will determine the kind of bridge that exists between sin and conversion and grace, which grace is prepared to determine if the biblical rules are properly observed. Procter sees this issue as the turning point of the entire biblical revelation for in that light "its loving invitations and tender expostulations are presented..."²⁹ The supporting quotations from all four gospels breed conviction and he holds that Christ taught retribution as a cer-

tainty, addressing Himself to its character, continuity, and causes. Quite apart from the definite argument for both a heaven and a hell, Procter also speaks to universalism, which the higher criticism looked upon more congenially. He concludes that such a doctrine cannot be founded on Christ's teachings, nor is there even a shadow of a suggestion biblically that the wicked will be restored in the hereafter.³⁰

Procter finds Scripture referring to heaven and hell with definite permanence, with further support from Revelation XXII: 11. The very familiar formula in these essays is uttered yet again: he who is born only once dies twice, while the born-again dies only once; but, this concept is the underlying force for the argument presented, lifted from the Bible literally and explained with no lessening of the informed imagination.³¹ The law of retribution is thus fixed and unalterable, as certain as that of gravitation, for hell has not been prepared for men, they have prepared it for themselves. The doctrines of heaven and hell must stand or fall together, for they rest on the same revelation and have the quality "everlasting" applied to them. To have one without the other would make Scripture inconsistent and senseless.³² Man's duty is therefore to heed Christ's clear teachings "without mitigating, modifying, or minimizing His solemn warnings".

To talk about the fact of man in terms of sin and conversion with retribution as an underlying reality is only

part of the soteriological story, however important. For without the assured hand of God in this there is no health in any of the efforts mentioned. The authors of The Fundamentals were fully aware of this and the four essays on grace bring full circle what began with depraved man and will end with the hope of a second, new life because of the utter graciousness of God.

C. I. Scofield in "The Grace of God" (XI: 3) is quick to point out that grace is a favour without recompense or equivalent, for in it "God acts out from Himself, toward those who have deserved, not His favor, but His wrath".³³ Grace is so towering a concept that it is ineffable, as Scofield agrees, and while he has handled it sublimely nearly, demonstrating that he has both experienced as well as understood it, he apologizes for its inadequacy. The discussion on law versus grace gives the clearest picture and the plethora of biblical quotation in support of a negative-positive analogy for law and grace respectively is most convincing.³⁴

Protestant theology has consistently held to justification by faith through grace, yet Scofield insists that Protestantism most inconsistently has held to the "second form of Galatianism". That is, not sufficiently has modern theology accepted that a justifying faith also ends the rule of law; the law judges absolutely whereas grace ever encourages progressive betterment.³⁵ Succinctly, Scofield puts it that deliverance does not come by self-effort under

the law (Romans VII), but by the omnipotent spirit (Galatians VI: 7) which brings the believer into the experience of Romans VIII.³⁶ It needs to be said that Scofield does think in dispensational terms and therefore sees the present course of history, from Calvary to the "rapture of the Church", as the era of the dispensation of grace. In no way does this make suspect his handling of the Bible and its exposition for non-dispensationalists; rather, if anything, it might well add insight to this complex concept of grace which in the reformed tradition is the key to understanding salvation. Sin and conversion are powerless without grace and here Scofield has done well to clarify its meaning, for even though its importance is so recognized its understanding is so wanting.*

When Thomas Spurgeon takes up the same theme, "Salvation by Grace" (IX: 5), he fully admits that grace is beyond man's capacity; yet those who have received it know it, however unintelligibly it might be expressed. Even explanations by eminent contemporaries were not satisfactory and, with Dr. Jowett, he was forced to say that grace is indefinable. Nevertheless, genuine Christianity involves grace primarily, however little the believer may understand of it.

The New Testament many times states the fact that salvation is wholly of God and not obtainable through the merits of men, otherwise, there would be boundless human rivalry to that end and righteousness would be a temporal token rather than a heavenly gift. The cross foresaw and

arrested that and claimed salvation to be of the Lord:
" the sword of Justice is scabbarded in the jeweled sheath of Grace".³⁷ The dynamic of grace must be two-way, as the grace which God brought about through Christ's death does not in itself save; rather, it is man's acceptance of that in his repentance, prayer, and faith that makes it truly recognizable saving grace. In Spurgeon's words " Grace always flows down"; only God's to give but it had to be actively received by man in order to be effective. A humbling doctrine it is but fully in line with all that happened in both Testaments, and because it admittedly sought to rob man of himself in order to fill him with God it was bound to be misunderstood. Grace was the offering of something free, that required a supernatural reception by men who were naturally and eternally damned through disobedience. It showed up sin and pointed to its release through conversion, all the while being the only ground on which all this was possible according to God's command and standard as Scripture revealed it.³⁸

Systematically, then, man's condition is being dealt with, beginning with his original sinful nature and moving ultimately to his consecration. Two essays remain in this first section on the subjects of prayer and consecration, and only can they be discussed sensibly once grace has been examined. To take the first, prayer is both the means to and the result of the recognition of sin, which leads to conversion, and is operative because of grace and thus part

of it. It is interesting to note that immediately following Spurgeon's essay is Arthur T. Pierson's "Divine Efficacy of Prayer" (IX: 6), a proper theological progression, though probably without intention. It is in this essay, especially, that something of the great piety that underlies the work of these writers shows itself. Pierson cannot stress too much that everything in the Christian life depends on prayer, which feeds and amplifies faith. Reasonably, it would seem that once prayer ceases so does any vital life with the divine.

This essay is very much an homily and it is replete with many statements that are easily memorable.³⁹ A lofty subject always, here prayer is put in most human terms with a constant emphasis on its centrality, what it will do and has done and what its omission means. The poles of God and the devil are vividly portrayed with prayer embracing the one and rejecting the other: "A praying heart is the one thing that the devil cannot easily counterfeit".⁴⁰ Prayer reconditions lives, brings true revival, deepens liturgy, directs daily life, and brings God's power to all the demands of life if only used.⁴¹ Again to use Pierson's words: "All practical power over sin and over men depends on maintaining this secret communion." Further, he makes a real distinction, and rightly, between supplication and intercession as both together bring balance in prayer for oneself and for others, and that leads to unity among God's people in Him. True prayer must fulfill two conditions: first,

the praying soul should be in harmony with God; and second, those who unite in prayer, because of that unity with Him, should be in harmony with each other.

It is to be noted that nowhere has the author talked about prayer in anything other than its most traditional form, even to never seeing beyond the Matthewan model. The examples given of men of prayer are those out of pietist and revivalist history and formalized or liturgical prayer is not held highly.⁴² An indirect comment on the situation then it is, yet, with all the cumulative insight given on the subject, a more extended comment on the philosophy of prayer might well have been in order. Also, liberals and conservatives came closer to listening to one another on this subject than on most others, and that could have been taken more into consideration.⁴³ Many of the most unorthodox believed fervently in prayer. In view of the complexion of this collection, it is not easy to know why such a subject was not more widely treated specifically. Such practical helps as recording intercessions made and fulfilled, together with claiming that prayer is the logical way of life for the spiritually renewed could not be more appropriate. It is not depth but breadth that is needed in order to meet the situation more realistically. As with Scofield, the outlook here has been dispensational but not with any interference, save for perhaps some imagination for breadth.

Without prayer consecration would be impossible. Henry W. Frost first deals with this theme personally in

"Consecration" (X: 8), by showing how such deepened and rectified his already Christian life.⁴⁴ Already, he claimed to have been blessed and used by God, but his life was in and out of fellowship with Him and he wanted a new consecration. It was in the exposition of Exodus XXVIII: 40-43 by another that that renewal came to him, first through consecration followed by sanctification. Frost then defines consecration as the initial act in spiritual determination, as well as many subsequent similar ones, while sanctification is the resultant and final state.⁴⁵ When reduced to simples, the watchword for both consecration and sanctification is "Jesus only", or, in Paul's words "For me to live is Christ". As Frost admits at the outset, he is taking the supporting Scripture for his argument as verbally inspired, and goes on to say that as Christians standing initially and equally "within the privileges of the priestly succession", what God has already done He is ever able to do again now and always. The clenching fact about consecration for Frost is that it changes even Christian lives from a respectable mediocrity to brilliant success, whatever the work. This he dramatically illustrates with three examples.⁴⁶

Even though this essay opens with a discussion of both consecration and sanctification, it is the former that is the center of attention. The final paragraph is a beautiful invitation to the consecrated life, with reference to the early church and the reassurance that such a life "is for anybody and everybody who is the Lord's". The image is

fully biblical when he speaks of emptying one's hands of the world, holding them up to God to be filled with Christ, and then finally "holding up Jesus between yourself and God, hiding yourself beneath Him, confessing Him to be your only merit, glory and power, you too will be consecrated". Throughout Frost has spoken in the sincerely spiritual idiom so characteristic of many of the conservatively religious of his day, never overlooking the personal and homely expression. Basic truths are stated simply and eloquently and his is an exposition that carries an invitation. In so many ways, it might well have been par excellence what the Stewarts had in mind for this collection, for its demands run deep however easy its prose.

With these thirteen essays the first section is complete and the fact of man in these prescribed theological terms has been examined through defining sin, explaining conversion, and discussing the means of grace. In a soteriological sense the cycle has been completed, but only in outline. To complete that soteriology the person of Jesus Christ must be included, for He is the "remedy" to the "fact of man", which represents the next step in this theological system and thereby includes twenty-two of the forty-nine essays assigned to this chapter. This second section will have two parts, Christology and revelation, and it is here that any awareness which the authors had of the beginning development in New Testament higher criticism will be seen.

While it is true that New Testament studies as such

in modern history extend back to the eighteenth century, the question of the identity of Christ was very much a later nineteenth- and twentieth-century development. However, neither the Jesus question nor the New Testament documents themselves concerned the writers of The Fundamentals nearly as much as the Old Testament issues had, and with real reason as discussed earlier. Nevertheless, the essays given to Christ Himself and the New Testament are meant very much as a preserve, even though the reader by comparison has not been sufficiently made aware of the background for doing so. Formgeschichte insisted on intrinsic merit only and no longer could the student bring to the text whatever he held dear.

The fact of humanity itself had especially invaded New Testament study, due essentially to the conclusions of Baur and Strauss, and much of what had been supernatural became only natural religion through such strokes as making Christ the creation of the church, undoing the biblical idea of revelation, and making a metaphysic of God's redemptive deeds.⁴⁷

Inasmuch as Germany was the theological breeding-ground, it is worth noting again that with the eighteenth-century the universities there cut their subservience to the court and church, and research could be pure and without consideration with an inter-disciplinary emphasis as well.⁴⁸ German New Testament scholars such as Michaelis, Eichhorn, Heyne, Wolf, Herder, Lessing, Gieseler, DeWette, Strauss, Ullmann, Baur, and Weisse were intimately associated with the universities and had no other official loyalties to either church or

state. This was a different atmosphere than prevailed in the rest of Europe and in Britain. Even though lastly Strauss lost his professorship and his theories were repudiated, it was not the university but scholarship itself that had condemned him.

Biblical scholars were obsessed with objectivity and the goal was clearly that all Christian records be judged by the same standard as all other ancient texts whatever the outcome might mean. In this aim a proper analogy can be drawn between the so-called Protestant liberals and the Catholic modernists, for both desired to be loyal churchmen but were united in their concern to raise the church's thinking to a modern critical level.⁴⁹ The textual critic insists on pushing back to the author's own draft, thereby presenting the ipsissima verba of the text, as well as tracing the various later readings of that draft to their sources, to determine which most nearly approaches the autograph and what were the reasons that led to these differences.⁵⁰ It is true that Baur and the Tübingen school had much to teach theological scholarship in their steadfast refusal to take anything for granted and on insisting that every New Testament book must be considered in relation to the historical circumstances of its origin as far as possible. Yet, much can be said on the other side, for at very few points has later investigation confirmed the correctness of these solutions even when it has approved the formulation of the questions. Speaking for Britain,

Bishop Stephen Neill says that ca. 1830 "almost all good Christians...were what now would be called 'fundamentalists'", because they accorded the Bible unqualified reverence and maintained that if its inerrancy were successfully impugned the entire faith would collapse.⁵¹ On the basis of the scientific method, which was never a threat in itself, conservatives and liberals differed often rather widely in their results, but not very often on the method itself. Certainly, for the authors of The Fundamentals, Neill has gone absolutely to the crucial point when he says that once scholar and prophet and preacher and priest have done their work the question of following and being born again in Jesus Christ remains a very real one for every man, and must be resolved despite scholarly difficulties, for that is His command in the drama of the fourth gospel.

Modern conservative scholarship has continued to demonstrate through profoundest investigation that both Testaments are reliable, and, Professor F. F. Bruce claims that the grounds for accepting the New Testament compare favourably with those on which students of the classics accept the authenticity and credibility of their own documents.⁵² The Fundamentals would have agreed perfectly but without the commensurate scholarship in support. It would have strengthened their argument academically had they exhibited the same familiarity with current New Testament debate as they had with the Old. They had truth to tell because they were explaining and not questioning the

biblical original. The task as they saw it was to understand what the documents said rather than to dispute them as such and consequently their contents.⁵³ This is not to say that criticism did not figure in their discussion of Christology and revelation, but it was comparatively minimal.

To turn to the essays themselves as they present "the remedy -- Christ" in answer to the fact of man, the first of the ten essays on Christology might appropriately be G. Campbell Morgan's "The Purposes of the Incarnation" (I:3). The foreword itself bears out the discussion immediately above when Morgan says the statement "the Word was made flesh" will not be defended but taken as true, nor will there be any explanation of the Holy Mystery's method as that is a fact beyond human comprehension. The author has written to arouse a deeper sense of wonder at and thus inspire further meditation in the incarnation.⁵⁴ The New Testament has declared a fourfold statement on the purpose of the incarnation and Morgan has spelled these out as the substance of this essay: to reveal the Father, put away sin, destroy the works of the devil, and prepare for a second advent.⁵⁵

When Christ comes to people first He does so as "fulfillment of all that in their thought and scheme is true...for the correction of all that in their thought and scheme is false".⁵⁶ That personal revelation leads to the second purpose, the taking away of sins, as Christ was to

lift man's sins onto Himself that man and God might come into harmony. In Jesus Christ the perfect One had come and according to St. John He will save his people from their sins. When the Hebrew prophet-herald on the banks of the Jordan uttered to his fellow-countrymen, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world", his audience could only think in terms of the long line of symbolic sacrifices which had been previously offered, but now the true purpose had been revealed in His birth, life, and cross. To replace sin with a new life not of this world was to overrule the devil and restore what had otherwise been an alienation from God. Christ came to loosen and dissolve all lawlessness, death, darkness, and hatred, as the incarnation was "the invasion of human history by One Who snatched the scepter from the usurper".⁵⁷

Fourth and last, Christ promised to return at the consummation of the age. Having revealed and borne and destroyed sin in His first advent, He will return not to poverty but to wealth and victory: "the first advent was for atonement; the second will be for administration".⁵⁸ Morgan claims that Christians already dead are not yet perfected, but are consciously at rest with Him awaiting the second advent. In fact, heaven and hell, the earth and universe are all awaiting that moment. The kernel of the gospel story has been presented in these pages, as with other essays, and never is any doubt cast on the biblical record or reference made to differing opinions. While this

was written in the full bloom of theological controversy, the incarnation being a major issue for authentication and exegesis, its contents would never reveal that. Morgan himself was a distinguished preacher of orthodoxy, and the very assertion unreservedly of his message, always biblically based and enriched, is the chief attestation to his locked view.

John Stock handled the same subject in "The God-Man" (VI: 5) on the basis of what Christ claimed for Himself, and the list was lengthy: as the Son of God, divinely supreme in both worlds, the greatest gift of infinite mercy, center of rest for the human soul, comparable with God, and appropriate end of men's lives; with the ability to have absolute and indisputable power concerning moral duty and destiny, forgive sins, be adored as Lord, claim unlimited faith in Himself, raise Himself then and all the dead at last, do all His Father's works, demand endless affection and devotion to His glory, and abide with all men forever. In each instance the supporting biblical texts are given which are not disputed but assumed as true and absolute. Stock does ask the reader to reconsider these claims and then asks himself about their validity apart from the record. He finds that he must conclude that in order for this Christ to be holy and just He had to be the God-Man.⁵⁹

However, Stock does consider the questions of both the Socinian and the Unitarian on the incarnation and even

admits that alongside some of these "we are but babes in intellect and attainment". But, that is not meant to lessen belief in the biblical message and he reminds of Matthew XI: 25. He goes further to say that "the times demand...a vigorous re-assertion of the old truths..." because the mythical account of Strauss' Leben Jesu, the unreal and romantic Christ of Renan's Vie de Jesus, and the merely human Christ of Ecce Homo "can never work any deliverance in the earth".⁶⁰ Such a Christ has no regenerating power and therefore can neither be trusted with man's salvation nor loved with all one's being for that would be idolatry. Either the God-Man is what Scripture claims for Him or He is not the Saviour of the gospels and apostles and thus in no way a Jehovah. Stock allows for no partial acceptance of the biblical record; it is an all or nothing choice as with all the other writers.

One-third of the way through Robert E. Speer's "God in Christ the Only Revelation of the Fatherhood of God" (III: 3) comes a most arresting statement, that when subtracting from one's conception of God what is owed to the person of Christ there is practically nothing left. Opening with a text in John XVI: 2, 3, this essay maintains that without the full recognition of God having been revealed in Christ nothing remains save for some kind of theism. The precious doctrine of the Trinity has lost its power. Furthermore, the Apostles' Creed itself rests on this fact and the incarnation with all its divinity as

well as humanity has got to figure in every theological step.⁶¹ It is impossible to separate the Christological elements of the gospel from the gospel itself, and here Speer reveals his own contact with the higher criticism even though he cannot subscribe.⁶² He insists that Christ's revelation of the fatherhood of God cannot be separated from the person of Christ, and that He did not expose the fatherhood of God by what He said but by what He was. Not to believe fully in Christ and all that He represents biblically is, for Speer, to have moved away from the Faith entirely, because the Father and the Son are inseparable.

So important is this concept that Speer spends the second half of his essay trying to work out the practical application. First, this only becomes intelligible as one understands God as Father, according as Christ has revealed Him, and then secondly, this inspires and rectifies the ideals of one's life. The question is put whether one can find the "full ideal of moral purity anywhere in this world where it has not been created by the revelation of the father-character of God in Christ". This conception of God makes rational and sweetens obedience to Him, and gives new courage and hope, because God has shown man who He is and what is expected through Jesus Christ. Finally, this understanding of God sheds much light on the life of prayer. Not a single prayer of Christ's was addressed to God as such, nor does He even mention God; that theism does not figure beyond asserting God's majesty and might as creator.

Rather, Christ's prayers rested on the father-concept as witnessed in His great prayer, "Our Father", and it is this personalness and kindredness that makes the relationship truly real and dependent and proper.⁶³ The analogy between father and child, and God and man is not unreal, for the incarnation breathed an humanity into the sacred as well as the secular. Only then can that immense quality of Christian fellowship be at work, when the relationship between God and man, and man and man takes on a reality and an assurance only because of what happened in Jesus Christ.

Morgan, Stock, and Speer have provided the foundation to the Christological development as here conceived and they have done so most traditionally, but with a thoroughness that properly serves the theological position here advanced. At best, there was a hint of some differing views but almost nothing was made of them. Any specific consideration of the higher criticism and Christology will come more in the remaining seven essays in this group which deal with the virgin birth, deity, atonement, and second coming. Nevertheless, the very fact of these essays alone speaks for the affirmation they were making in an age when so much was being discarded biblically. Creedal statements were still in print but their actual implementation in church life had been seriously weakened. The Hulsean lecturer at Cambridge in 1936 agreed that great was the achievement of the early church and the decision at Nicaea should have been no other way, nor even the Chalcedonian

definition of the incarnation despite its having wrecked the unity of Christendom and bequeathed a legacy of church controversy, and yet all that does not assure their present validity.⁶⁴ In the patristic, mediaeval, and early modern period the Bible was the sum of the Faith, dogmatically significant, only later to be labelled as de facto by Troeltsch and robbing it of its majesty and totality. With the radical change in viewpoint in the nineteenth century, when the concept of revelation was altered due to the seeming one-track historical approach to the Bible, there was inevitably to be a change in Christology as the basic premise was no longer infallibility.⁶⁵

Moving from the incarnation as such to the personal qualities of Christ, biblical infallibility continued to be the rule always and the classical doctrines were affirmed. James Orr's "The Virgin Birth of Christ" (I: 1) holds the especial distinction of leading off this entire collection and setting the tone initially at one of its highest points intellectually as well as spiritually. Himself a theological professor and certainly one of the leading scholars represented herein, he begins by acknowledging the larger controversy surrounding the virgin birth with specific references to Pastor Schrempf in Germany in 1892, who refused to use the Apostles' Creed for this and other reasons, the greater threat of historical criticism, and the existent situation within the church itself where it was looked upon as unessential to the Faith. The attacks

came from literary criticism, science, mythology, history, and comparative religion, and Orr is convinced that once this doctrine is rejected an adequate view of Christ in other respects is always wanting. In fact, he further states that those who accept the doctrine of the incarnation, with scarcely an exception, automatically accept with it the doctrine of the virgin birth, for when the latter is denied usually His supernatural claims are rejected.⁶⁶

It is because Orr views the doctrine as so essentially important that he defends it; he finds its rejection as having endless repercussions.

Even though the evidence for the virgin birth is not of the same public kind as for the resurrection, Orr still finds it strong. The gospel story is a unit and for him the virgin birth is as natural a beginning as the resurrection is an end. It is always a matter of taking the Bible seriously, and if not why not, a question the critics seldom treated profoundly. If Christ was to be what the Old Testament predicted, and John and Paul affirmed and His church ever believed, then this claim is in order.⁶⁷ And Orr has argued this well in the light of the biblical narrative, with appropriate examination into the trustworthiness of the accounts themselves. The objectors talked both of the mythical character of the narratives and of the silence of Mark and John, and, what is more, the silence of Paul on this subject is not easy; but, Orr defended according to all other biblical claims for Jesus and did not falter logically.

He faced up to the major objections of his day, including the supposed denial of the early church's acceptance of the virgin birth, but considered it useless to consider the theories on the mythical origins of the doctrine.⁶⁸

Had Christ been naturally born, what Paul affirms in Romans V: 12ff. would not be true, for, having not shared in Adam's race, He inherited no guilt and needed no regeneration or sanctification, and instead was Himself the redeemer.

Throughout, Orr appeals with a gracious and spiritual intellectuality that is at once balanced and profound and brings real distinction to this collection. He has written from a firmly reasoned presupposition for belief and has addressed the arguments as they arose. The outcome is a positive underlining of the claim for the doctrine, but with a quality in the procedure that could only command admiration from the opponent.

Taking another of the attributes, "The Deity of Christ" (I: 2), Benjamin B. Warfield brings to this his vast theological learning as a distinguished successor to Orr.⁶⁹ Succinctly, Warfield's claims for deity are based equally on the Scriptural assertions and Christ's entire manifestation. He asserts that the abundance and persuasiveness of the evidence for this claim greatly increases the difficulty of stating it adequately, and even adds that the Christian's conviction of his Lord's deity does not depend on his ability to express it properly. Because every word spoken about Christ, together with those He is

reported to have spoken about Himself, is done on the assumption that He is God, Warfield finds here the most shattering fact for criticism. When the critics ask that the testimony of the New Testament to His deity be eliminated, such is hopeless, for the entire New Testament itself would have to be abandoned.⁷⁰ Quotations from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Hebrews are cited in support of deity and Warfield notes that all the designations are not so much asserted as assumed by Him for Himself: speaking freely as God's Other, the forgiver of sins, and to have and be all that God has and is. The Scriptures give sufficient evidence for deity, but there is more, namely the great revolution which He has wrought in the world, the sheer fact of Christianity.⁷¹

In both the objective and subjective examples, Warfield has hit upon a powerful argument for deity. So transforming an influence, so fully and widely recognized and undiminished after two millenniums, could hardly have proceeded from a mere man. What is more, every Christian has within himself the proof of Christ's transforming power, and to deny that would be "to slander the noblest faculties of our nature". That is, lastly, the supreme proof for deity to every Christian, whose warmth and power can be felt as easily as the sun's. What began as a proof objectively has ended as one subjectively, as Warfield admits that nothing can witness to the power and truth of a divine Lord more than a human life touched and renewed by that.

For while Christianity is a carefully constructed system, it is finally to be applied individually, wherein lies its true test and power however well that may be expressed. Orr argued ultimately from the words of Scripture and Warfield from the experienced truth of the Christian. And in both cases, as they set out to assert anew and assure Christ's uniqueness, they have trusted and examined the two kinds of evidence that have the greatest importance for the Faith.

Three essays then consider the atonement, the third being concerned more with the bodily resurrection itself, all of which does complete in outline the essential characteristics of Christ's special significance. Franklin Johnson's "The Atonement" (VI: 4) presupposes the qualities which Orr and Warfield have discussed, in order to claim solidly for a substitutionary atonement, which exists in fact in the Faith's doctrine but about which there are several variations rather than a single view, making acceptance and rejection more relative. To counter the substitution claim is the "moral-influence theory", held by a minority of equally devout and able men, which says that the sole mission of Christ was to reveal God's love in a way sufficiently moving to induce men to forsake sin. They argue straightforwardly that substitution is both impossible and immoral. Impossible because guilt and punishment are considered non-transferable, and especially to the innocent, and, it is further pointed out that vicarious suffering is

commonplace among men even though Christ suffered so to the utmost.⁷² Immoral because men's guilt was transferred to Christ with His being punished for all their sins, but this is immediately suspect because it makes immoral sympathy and love and also cancels the great moral advances that the substitutionary view has definitely produced.⁷³ For Johnson the "moral-influence theory" is by no means adequate and is too circumscribed, whereas substitution "promises an eternity of delightful progress in study. It can not be exhausted". It would also end emotion as well as thought: "An atonement of infinite cost, flowing from infinite love, and procuring deliverance from infinite loss, melts the coldest heart and inflames the warmest."⁷⁴ The theory makes the death of Christ a spectacle rather than an offering for man's salvation; the former is remembered with horror while the latter with "tears of reverence and gratitude". And finally, such a theory is unscriptural for the Bible is everywhere full of a substitutionary atonement, most often seen in Paul's epistles and the words at the Lord's supper. Johnson admits that these have been declared not genuine and thus refers to the critics, but still they exist.

Substitution does presume a high view of Scripture, inspiration and inerrancy, while moral-influence does not, and even holds an inadequate view of sin and responsibility, which is a natural sequence to a lesser biblical view.

Johnson does not attempt, admittedly, to set forth a theory

of substitutionary atonement and thinks it not necessary, as the New Testament writers and early fathers held to the doctrine without a theory. It has been demonstrably sufficient just to present Christ as sin-bearer. He concludes by stating the adequacy of the substitutionary view which accepts the Bible fully, acknowledges tradition, believes in a profound Christian experience rather than a kind of brotherhood, views Christ's sacrifice as an eternal event foreknown and most extensive, and, finally, recognizes God's admiration of it through the personal and infinite love He offered everyone. To make Christ the propitiation for each man's sins, as well as for the entire world, puts God and mankind in a most intimate and profound relationship one to another, showing grace and patience unending. Essentially then, Johnson is arguing for an orthodox or high view of Scripture which will lead automatically to a substitutionary view of the atonement. Anything else falls short because it is not biblical and in claiming differently meddles in varying degrees with that record and thus challenges God.

The claims for atonement reverberate in Dyson Hague's "At-One-Ment by Propitiation" (XI: 2) where he says that Christianity is more than an ethic and a revelation, it is "uniquely a religion of redemption" and the atonement epitomizes it. He deals with the subject from four viewpoints and tries therefore to replace "the misrepresentations of that revamped Socinianism" which leavened so much

of German, British, and American theology. The evidence from both Testaments is commanding, with the great theme of the atoning sacrifice in the Old and the prominence given to Christ's death in all four gospels.⁷⁵ The witness of the saints must also be taken seriously: for Peter Jesus' death was the central fact and climax because of what it meant for human sin; for John it was propitiatory, substitutionary, and purificatory; and Paul's theology was written because of it. At the root of biblical atonement is estrangement in sin; Christ died because God loves and that is propitiation. Hague holds that the Bible sets forth the substance of both theories, moral and vicarious, which ultimately gives a "completeness of the spiritual, moral, altruistic and atoning aspects of the death of Christ".⁷⁶

Historically, the church has fully witnessed to a propitiatory atonement, although Hague's generalizations about the early and mediaeval church are not wholly reliable, even though he does rightly view Anselm's Cur Deus Homo as a significant work on the subject. The Reformation brought much emphasis to a theology of atonement and with the nineteenth century came even more consideration, however controversial.⁷⁷ Using the term "Modernism" for what grew out of German rationalist theology and evolution, Hague has tried to explain the reason for the new views on the atonement. For him this modernism was tantamount to what Paul called sophism and it could not help but weaken Scripture on several counts. There was still hope, however, in the

church's continued confessional orthodoxy wherein Christ's death was central and sacrificial, and not an at-one-ment in the Ritschlian or another sense. The confessing church on this and many other points did lag behind theology.

In the fourth and last viewpoint the atonement is seen practically, in its actual power. Lives of great Christians, as well as hymns, are used to exemplify its truth and it is offered as the reason for the preacher's power. Hague insists on orthodoxy because he claims that sound doctrine is crucial to sound living. The atonement itself has to generate love for God and man, evoke a hatred for sin, and demand self-sacrifice for new life.⁷⁸ He comes down very hard both on a Christianity that is without "a Christ Divine, an atonement vicarious, and a Bible inspired" as well as one that is merely orthodoxy without genuine spiritual life, for the worth of every religious system is the man it forms. Hague, together with the majority of the writers here, realized only too well the uselessness and death of mere creedal conservation, for the opposition did at least appear to be alive. In arguing for a propitiatory atonement he had hoped to build up the convinced and maybe convince the rejecters. Biblical infallibility as a proposition had suffered greatly as the scholastic method again gained strength and increasingly biblical data was falling prey to criticism. The Bible and even Christ were, at the time of The Fundamentals, no longer normative as earlier viewed, and that became most

apparent first in theology and only later in the church.⁷⁹

The resurrection of Christ stands as the living witness to His eternal atoning power, both facts being called "the two fundamental truths of the Gospel" by R. A. Torrey in "The Certainty and Importance of the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead" (V: 3).⁸⁰

Without the resurrection the atonement itself is invalid because the atoner is dead. Torrey sets forth three lines of proof to show that the biblical statements on the resurrection are historic fact, the first two dealing with the gospels themselves. He dispenses instantly with the argument for the external evidence of the genuineness of the gospel narratives because it is already so satisfactory, and then presents a lengthy discussion on the internal proofs for them with no assumptions. But four facts alone prove for him their credibility: their being four independent but basically harmonious accounts; each indicates eye-witness; their natural, artless, straightforward, and simple quality; and the always unintentional evidence that flows from their words, phrases, and accidental details.⁸¹

If these and other supporting examples are accused by the critics as being "little things", Torrey asserts that therein lies their significance, for fiction reveals itself in the detail but fact begs for microscopic examination.

The third line of proof is that of the actual circumstantial evidence for the resurrection. The apostles

always proclaimed this fact and even laid down their lives for it. They carried it far in preaching and conversation and that became the gospel story. The day of rest was changed, as a result, from the Jewish seventh day to the Christian first, for that was the day of resurrection. What had been the custom for centuries was changed in an instant by those who believed. The greatest piece of evidence, however, is the "moral transformation" that occurred in the disciples themselves who witnessed the event. Indeed, so enduring have been these facts about the resurrection that even the critics had to recognize them in some way. Torrey cites Baur's admission that Christ rose from the dead, Strauss' acknowledgment that the apostles affirmed the fact, and Schenkel's granting of an empty tomb, even though Renan said that hallucination resulted in resurrection and Paulus held that Jesus was not really dead.⁸²

With these lines of proof, Torrey believes that the claim for the resurrection is most solid, and adds that if one is determined not to believe no amount of proof will convince. To argue that resurrection never occurred before or after immediately questions His divinity. Torrey sees the argument as much more than an a priori theory and thinks that the facts for the case should be taken seriously. It is a claim that invites scientific investigation. Of the three essays on atonement, Torrey's is by far the most concerned with criticism and validating the biblical claims. Of all the doctrinal factors, Christologically, that bear on

the remedy in Christ to the original fact of man, the atonement is the most important for it bridges both in His own divinity-humanity. Finally, it remains in this section to treat the two essays which view Jesus in His own time and in the future of man's.

The one essay that honestly deals with New Testament criticism is John L. Nuelsen's "The Person and Work of Jesus Christ" (VI: 7). Opening with the question of Jesus' historicity, with references to the standard names in the debate, he puts the main points forward, if too simply. He says that whether Wrede or Bousset, Pfleiderer or Wernle, these men kept reducing the biblical account until both Johannine and Pauline theology were nearly discounted, together with much else in the gospels, which purifying process of "religionsgeschichtliche" left very little of the Christ.⁸³ The whole pursuit could have been serious but was absurd because it became a game: Jesus went from being a person to less than a literary hero. Professor Pfleiderer of Berlin thought Him to have been formed out of the myths and legends that were common to many religions, and together with others saw Babylonian mythology as the principal source.⁸⁴ The folly and even humour of it all are finally shown when there is an attempt to disprove Theodore Roosevelt, the American president, by the same methods as used for Jesus' disproving.⁸⁵

In this search for a truly historical Jesus, the New Testament material had been glossed over in an effort to get

at the sources behind it, for as inspiration no longer figured other evidences had to be searched for from which His life could be constructed. The writings of John and Paul were deemed inadequate as sources for Jesus' life and the gospels were found unsatisfactory for a number of quite personal reasons that varied from person to person. It was so easy for scholarship to assert that the New Testament was a collection of crude beliefs from the early church rather than an historically trustworthy account of the facts. The result was quite simply a theological Christ, whatever scholars wanted Him to be, and at best that was far from being and having the qualities of the Son of God. Nineteenth-century theologians went much further than the rationalists earlier, for they too often wrote off the New Testament account while the latter did attempt to show that there was at least a vague similarity with their own findings.

Nuelsen warned more than once that Germany and America (he never mentioned Britain) were being flooded with this kind of cheap broadcast, both in pulpit and print.

At the last, Nuelsen shows that there are two highly intellectual sides to this controversy, even though it is the theology of infidelity that occupies him here. Conservative theologians writing then cut through these arguments by referring to the record of Scripture and how that came to be. They claimed that if Christ were the creation of speculative theologians like Paul and John, then there was no need for the true Jesus to have lived in order to explain

Christianity.⁸⁶ It did not matter how often this Jesus changed in the hands of each theologian, for truth was thought to be much more in ideas than in a static record labelled inspired and infallible. Nuelsen found that "religionsgeschichtliche" led to negation, and, that such a decomposed Christ did not satisfy modern man just because He was man-made. To try to make the Faith more acceptable by removing its supernaturalism was a failure. There is dishonesty itself in the scholarship that wants to replace the Christ of the gospels and the church and "cleverly substitute their self-made Jesus for the God-given Christ".

The reinstatement of the biblical Christ that Nuelsen pleaded for in the face of a sweeping infidelity was a necessity if Charles R. Erdman's "The Coming of Christ" (XI: 5) was to have any basis. Erdman saw the return of Christ as a fundamental and scriptural doctrine, as necessarily held universally by all who admit to biblical authority.⁸⁷ However, he does admit that among those who hold to this there are certain differences, such as the millennial and pre-millennial views treated earlier, and these must be respected, for they in no way alter the basic fact of a second coming. Because the Bible describes this event as personal, glorious, and imminent, Erdman uses these categories also. To emphasize the personal does not lessen the spiritual presence of Christ, but underlines that He will some day appear again in bodily form. And, it is to be noted, that special manifestation of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, for all its im-

portance, did not fulfill this and Paul's emphasis long thereafter is reassurance of this fact. The Olivet discourse in all of its prophecies, as with the Old Testament, has yet to be fulfilled despite all the tragedies of history, but the promise for the future remains steadfast.⁸⁸ Nor is the second coming to be confused with death, for those who are now dead in the Lord are waiting for their "bodies of glory" and rewards that will come with His return. Erdman describes that return as more marvelous than Pentecost, startling than Jerusalem's fall, and blessed than the Spirit's indwelling or departure to be with Him.⁸⁹

The glory of Christ's coming will affect the church and the world and His majesty will be supreme, with His appearances to Isaiah in the vision, the disciples on the holy mount, Saul on the Damascus road, and John on Patmos being a foretaste. A triumphant return of the risen, ascended Lord is most natural and brings the second historical age (A.D.) to a proper completion. His power now is not fully manifest and then it will be in a form known only to Him.⁹⁰ His followers will share in that glory: the resurrection of the dead into glory; the bodies of living believers to be glorified; the blessed reunion in glory of the risen and transfigured followers; and, the time of reward for His servants. The coronation day for the Christian is not at death but with this return as Paul claimed.⁹¹ Then all will know Christ as Lord, destruction will be replaced by His rule with all believers as co-regents, and all art,

science, and social institutions will be Christian. Nevertheless, this in no way erases the final judgment and the separation of the saved from the lost.

Finally, that coming is imminent but how immediate cannot be known. Uncertainty in time but possibility in nearness is Erdman's phrase, which leads him to mention the interpretation of the millennium and the pre- and post-viewpoints.⁹² While there is no absolute statement by the author for one or the other position, he reads the biblical evidence to suggest that the millennium will follow the coming of Christ.⁹³ The statements of Daniel, the Psalms, Paul, Matthew, Luke, and John specifically speak of that glory coming after the Son of Man returns. However, either view can even be a detail as both sides share so much else in common. As believers they are united in their expectation both of an age of glory and a personal return of Christ. And they are equally harmonious about the one primary precedent condition to those events, that, as Matthew says, the gospel must first be preached to all nations. The world must be evangelized and the promise of His return could offer no higher inspiration for that work. In conclusion, Erdman urges that until then there is no time for unkindly criticism, dispute over divergent views, or dogmatic prophecy, but instead there must be friendly conference, united action, and humble understanding. Therein lies the "blessed hope" in which all Christians are called to live and win others to.

The ten essays in The Fundamentals dealing specifically with Christology have now been examined and, while some of them have demonstrated an awareness of current theological difficulties, always the principal concern has been to portray the biblical picture of Christ from His incarnation to His coming again. There is great simplicity and relief and beauty in what is said here, most especially when that is juxtaposed to the other contemporary extreme that seemed so often to lack even reverence. Such questions as whether Jesus knew Himself to be the Messiah as the sources asserted or not as His conduct implied; what kind of messianic consciousness He had when that left His conduct and discourses unaffected; and, whether he built on the presuppositions of later Jewish eschatology concerning the coming of the Kingdom of God and the Messiah or upon a non-eschatological foundation, these and many, many more were what theology throughout the nineteenth century was asking. In the name of truth Christological enquiries were to be expected, but when the Bible was no longer considered a special revelation and was merely to take its place among other evidences then a division occurred. These writers were not simply preservationists, although that element is present, but they were concerned to exalt and even hold as supreme the biblical record because of what its words meant in terms of changing lives and ordering civilization. The evangelistic power of the Bible was sufficient for them to hold such high claims for it and which it alone held for

itself. It was a much larger matter than the negativism of the critics versus the positivism of these writers and their kind. For the latter there was an unfathomable awe in the Bible's claim for itself to be the word of God and they refused to have the audacity to tamper with that.

An honourable survey of some two centuries (from Reimarus to Wrede) of scholarship on the question of the historical Jesus is to be found in Albert Schweitzer's The Quest of the Historical Jesus which appeared in 1901.⁹⁴ His aim was to reveal the true Jesus, beyond the biblical account yet amidst its own sources, Who claimed to be and is the most vital force ever known to man. Before Reimarus no one had attempted to form an historical conception of Jesus' life. Luther himself is somewhat to blame for this as he was not interested in knowing the order and truth of the recorded events but took them for granted, as have the so-called evangelicals ever since whose doctrine of Scripture alone adequately covered their action.⁹⁵ In academic terms, whatever the persuasion, that view is not satisfactory. To consider the works which Schweitzer has discussed -- Reimarus and Semler; Reinhard, Opitz, and Herder; Paulus, Schleiermacher, Strauss, and Renan; and Holtzmann, Keim, and Weiss, to mention the most major ones -- is to realize anew the kind of theological enquiry which The Fundamentals engaged in and how comparatively simple-minded and straightforward and accepting that was, and at the same time no less significant.⁹⁶ It must further be stated that the very recognition of his-

torical problems with the life of Jesus by such conservatives as these writers was a great intellectual advance for their side of the argument. Once that was admitted, even though much of the solution was to depend on the view taken of Scripture regardless of the difficulties therein, there was mutual understanding and obscurantism was much less likely. That was to come later.

By 1900 historical theology had only a tattered account of Jesus' life to bequeath the next generation and the Bible, especially the Gospels, was equally tattered as a result. The Jesus of the Bible had been replaced by the Germanic Jesus and that in the name of honest scientific inquiry.⁹⁷ There were adjustments and re-adjustments to the biblical record, and Mark's account, for example, was even ignored finally having fallen prey to speculation. And Schweitzer added his own research to the network. The biblical Jesus became a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed in an historical garb by modern theologians.⁹⁸ With the Bible held suspect and therefore Jesus having been reconstructed, scholars believed that obsolete views had been replaced. None of them, and especially Schweitzer, claimed any finality as to who He was for they saw Him as too big to be contained, but they did believe that they had presented a more accurate picture than the Bible.

What is more, the person of Jesus was more and more conceptualized as spirit which then made His actual, bibli-

cally-recorded person and work seemingly all the less important. To talk of Jesus' incarnation, virgin birth, deity, atonement, resurrection, and return as were just discussed in this last group of essays had comparatively little meaning now and often times none at all, and that all stemmed essentially from the view taken of Scripture. Schweitzer himself wanted to disregard Jesus' teachings in the New Testament so as not to be bound by authority and especially when its authenticity is so disputed. Rather, the plea is to catch the spirit of it in one's own life experiences and through conscience and not to be confined to a small Jesus contained in print. The apocalyptic wrapping round the gospel was a serious obstacle to these theologians, and they were offended by any demand that exceeded mortal reason and experience. However, the Heilsgeschichte school of theologians which arose out of this milieu was able to balance pure research and the biblical claims and has become acceptable to evangelicalism, but not so much to this other tradition because of their initial biblical trust.⁹⁹ Yet, even with Schweitzer himself there is a repudiation of the spiritual emptiness in the historical Jesus debates which did not seem even to care about such.

James M. Robinson has made a real contribution by continuing the story of the quest into the mid-twentieth century, which itself continues in that mood generated by the anti-clericalism of the Enlightenment and then moving on through the reaction to Strauss, the impressiveness of

Ritschl, and the search for meaningful existence in Bultmann and others. Modern scholarship, both sympathetic and otherwise, is aware of the severe difficulties of the earlier quest and has tried to be more personal and existential in deriving meaning from the Jesus figure.¹⁰⁰ The "new quest" depends on new scientific information gathered through research into philology, comparative religions, and history proper, and with it all the phrase "historical Jesus" has come to mean "what can be known of Jesus of Nazareth by means of the scientific methods of the historian".¹⁰¹ The old quest was chiefly concerned to ascertain names, places, dates, occurrences, causes, and effects, while the new is more philosophically oriented to man and his humanity, existence, dilemma, and hope.

The historical Jesus, however approached and defined, became the "historian's Jesus" and Lessing's problem as to how "accidental historical truths can serve as proofs for eternal rational truths" seemed insurmountable.¹⁰² It was clearly a choice, finally, between acceptance of humanly verifiable evidence, however much in conflict with tradition, and the faithful acceptance of the unchanging biblical record which continues to stand. Examples for both sides abound in this study and again the opposition which the latter faced in the former has been increasingly brought into focus. Scientifically, each would have to acknowledge the other, and often did, and the underlying guiding rule either to prove or to obey determined the out-

come, while the plethora or lack of scholarly apparatus respectively should have had no lasting bearing as each side performed its task honestly. But the essential question of which Jesus was being portrayed, man's or the Bible's, with the assumption that the latter was an infallible and inspired presentation, had to be faced as well as all the consequent ramifications.

These essays on Christology which The Fundamentals present have sought to be faithful to their first principle as their counter-arguments have to theirs, two very different systems with perfection and imperfection being the pre-supposition respectively. The former could at least claim a consistency and an honest connection with historic Christianity, even though accused of preserving shibboleths, while the latter held that inconsistencies were natural and that the Faith was never fully revealed but was ever-changing. New Testament criticism followed the same lines as the Old and these essays in relation were equally defensive. The object of The Fundamentals' Christology was the biblical Jesus with no apologies or doubts, and that was further substantiated when the revelation of that Christ was explained both in terms of Himself and others. The second part of this section on the remedy in Christ treats of revelation with twelve essays.

In many ways the term revelation is a difficult one because it naturally invites every kind of imaginative definition, even in biblical and theological study. 1860

has often been cited as the beginning of a new era in the history of ideas, for the repeal of the "paper duty" in that year greatly encouraged new views as more literature was being produced. Darwin himself profited from this through the Fortnightly Review, the Saturday Review, and others. The discussion of God's self-disclosure, revelation and authority, became one of the burning contemporary issues with a relevance that was infinite and here again the Bible came in for repeated scrutiny.¹⁰³ In 1963 H. D. McDonald published his Theories of Revelation which treats this vast subject in relation to the Bible and theology for the century beginning with 1860, in such terms as the challenge of materialism and the reaction of idealism, the advent and advance of criticism in biblical scholarship, Christ and revelation and the Scriptures, biblical inerrancy and inspiration, revelation and authority.¹⁰⁴ From the many segments of criticism, McDonald sees the most pressing question as the relationship of Christ to the Bible, especially in view of His having often quoted the Old Testament, together with the extent of His knowledge.¹⁰⁵ Only then could God's revelation in Christ be understood by and have meaning for all for whom He was sent. Nevertheless, the ideas of revelation between 1860 and 1960, as McDonald has so carefully compiled them, seek to establish just who this Christ is in order to determine His worthiness as Lord, however suspicious of the biblical evidence they might have been.

On the other side of that argument were the conservatives like the authors of The Fundamentals whose essays on revelation ranged the full spectrum from Thomas Whitelaw's "Is There A God?" (VI: 2), to a discussion on what the church should be. To answer Whitelaw's question five spokesmen are presented: the atheist, agnostic, materialist, fool, and Christian. Atheism then was far from extinct and yet not having a belief in God is no demonstration that He does not exist. As Kant put it, reason can neither disprove nor demonstrate the existence of God. Further, the inability of a Huxley or Blatchford to see, know, or feel God does not support atheism any more than when the blind cannot see means there is nothing to be seen. The agnostic is more open. He does not say there is no God because none exists for him, though he operates without one and ignores the spiritual factor in man, believing that since the finite mind cannot fully comprehend the infinite it does not know that at all. This then undermines any kind of morality for both religion and morality cannot rest on uncertainties.¹⁰⁶ The materialist holds a theory of the universe and evolution that does not need a God, even though scientists have found fault with such thinking.¹⁰⁷ Pantheism eventually has to come down to an original force which is either avoided or not admitted. As for the fool, his intellect admits to a God but not his heart, as it would suit him better that there were none.

Finally, the Christian cannot sufficiently acknowl-

edge God for without Him the material universe is an enigma. Everywhere creation enchants him and attests to a perfect revelation: effects have causes and designs designers. The person and work of Christ is inexplicable without God as father for that life was so supra-human and its claims too other-worldly. What is more, without a God the Christian could never begin to explain his own new being through regeneration. The explanation for the idea of God and the consciousness which He creates is something far more than heredity; the distinctly religious experience of conversion itself being one of the greatest testimonies. Intellectual, moral, and spiritual changes amounting to an inward revolution or a new birth are not ultimately traceable to education or environment, or even to philosophical reflection. With St. Paul the new man can only attribute this newness to God's grace, having been laid hold of by a superhuman power.¹⁰⁸ This then carries with it a personal relationship to Jesus Christ, addressing Him in prayer and receiving His blessings through a daily walk together. To the non-Christian these experiences are illusions but to the Christian realities. It is impossible for him to believe there is no God for he has been confronted with true revelation that continues to reveal as that new life grows.

What Whitelaw says is remarkably borne out in Arthur T. Pierson's "The Proof of the Living God" (I: 5), which comments on the life and work of Mr. George Müller of Bristol (England) that is a classic demonstration of the

power of faith. By beginning in 1833 a very small work of caring for neglected children together with teaching them the Bible, Müller demonstrated to the unbelieving world that God does live and answers prayer. For, at the end of sixty-five years there were under his care in the orphan houses he built some twenty-two hundred orphans with their helpers, and throughout God supplied those needs absolutely. He appealed to no man for help and did not even permit any need to be known before it had been supplied, and, for some years he never presented to the public an annual report lest that be considered an appeal for aid.¹⁰⁹ The Scriptural Knowledge Institution for Home and Abroad, as the total enterprise was called, depended on no visible support, no human patron, endowment, or funded property; it was totally an act and work of faith and its record of growth remarkable.¹¹⁰ In addition to the orphan work, the Institution provided financial aid to day and Sunday Schools in Britain and abroad, as well as to missionaries, and circulated Bibles, books, and tracts. The expenditure for all these departments for more than sixty years was 1,500,000 pounds sterling, all of which was provided for solely through prayer. For himself, Müller kept only enough for "the simplest and most necessary supply of actual wants".¹¹¹

Müller shared his secret widely and in the thousands of pages he wrote encouraged total reliance on God, to await His supernatural power and therein His revelation. Pierson sees much instruction in this and notes also that Müller's

work went beyond the Institution he founded, extending to the wider church as teacher, pastor, evangelist, and the author of tracts and books.¹¹² Even with so vivid an example many will doubt God's existence to say nothing of His revelation, contending that if Müller's prayers were answered why were not those of other equally fervent faithful.¹¹³

Each case must be dealt with individually, but certainly for Müller his life's purpose was to demonstrate both to the world and the church that one can live and work on a large scale through faith with no or at most minimal reference to needs. Pierson lauds that and challenges anyone to set the same goals without prayer or any acknowledgment of God, but simply depending on natural causes. George Müller began with a capital of one shilling and made an indelible mark on Christian history. Not only did he prove that God exists but also that He is fully accessible, revealing Himself to all who earnestly seek Him. While this kind of argument may be too personal or subjective to have any academic validity for higher criticism, it did suffice for the conservatives who took the biblical directions for faith and prayer at face value and added very little private philosophical judgment.

David James Burrell argues in much the same way in "The Knowledge of God" (VIII: 7) as he mentions three ways that are "vainly trodden" by many in search of God. The first is intuition though very few have ever gained His acquaintance thereby for that usually leads to some form of

idolatry. Reason, secondly, has much the same consequence. Historically, the ontological, cosmological, teleological, and anthropological arguments for the existence of God have brought understanding, but not always have they led to a face to face encounter.¹¹⁴ Thirdly, the five senses which can be used for detecting God do not include faith, which is a sixth sense divinely given to man to discern spiritual truths. Burrell believes that to try to grasp a spiritual fact by the physical senses is as "preposterous" as to insist on seeing with the ears or hearing with the eyes. Faith is not to be construed as credulousness or some kind of emotional idea, but rather very much as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen". That sixth sense is real and awaits being used.¹¹⁵ Burrell does not deny the usefulness of the scientific approach to theology, but he is convinced that God is explained and known beyond natural terms.

In the other direction, independent of man himself, Burrell presents two further ways of knowing God, through the Bible and then the incarnation. Both are mutually dependent whereby the law and love of the former were exemplified and reconciled by the latter. The leap from reason to faith is not explained here, or in most of the essays, but it is expected as proper and necessary, because the things of God are not of this world and any revelation of Him must transcend natural limits of every kind. So no apologies need be made. Never losing sight of the value of

reason for knowing God, Burrell does emphasize faith heavily, especially for the beginner. His concern is that God's revelation in Christ be a personal confrontation with a knowledge that will bring new life, rather than a mere intellectual assent that does not know an actual encounter.

Moving from discussion about God's existence to some general truths about the Christian faith, which carry its revelation more from the propositional to the confirmed, Thomas Whitelaw in a second essay comments on that move in "Christianity, No Fable" (III: 5). The first point he makes about Christianity is its "supreme excellence" as a religious system. Should it be a fable it is the most divine ever put in human speech, and St. Paul himself admits that what God has revealed in the gospel eye, ear, or mind knew nothing of. As a message of redemption for man it immediately puts the action above mortals. Another point is its "perfect adaptation", for even if it were a fabrication one could still profit much from its claims as its morality alone speaks so directly to humanity.¹¹⁶ That Christianity has never needed to be modified or improved, at least theoretically, implies that it is God's work and not man's, that its adaptation to man is both perfect and eternal. Whitelaw naturally refers to orthodox, biblical Christianity and knows the hostility to that position, and he quotes a contributor to the Hibbert Journal in 1910 who confesses that "the simple Jesus of Liberal (rationalistic) Christianity cannot be found". It is a system to be taken

on God's terms and not on man's and the conversion it demands is an heavenly not an earthly action initially. To free from sin, make man holy, and confer a blessed immortality because of an incarnation, atonement, resurrection, and future coming is at once to admit of a loving deity and a timeless plan without discrimination.

The third and last point that Whitelaw notes is Christianity's "conspicuous success" which itself attests to its being true and not a fable. A baseless imagination or superstitious legend would never have lived so long or achieved so much, both in terms of individuals and the world at large. It has dramatically transformed countless lives with no sign that that power, if sought, is on the wane, for God and Christ and the Spirit are eternally active. Christianity promised and gave renewed lives and blessing in return for obedience, and its church's positive results have far outweighed its imperfections. Conclusively, Whitelaw asserts that all this is no "'cunningly devised fable' but a 'Scripture of Truth'".¹¹⁷

In "The Testimony of Christian Experience" (III: 4) E. Y. Mullins also emphasizes the personal side of the faith and states that even by the turn of the century science and philosophy were only beginning to "recognize the evidential value of Christian experience" and then reluctantly.¹¹⁸ Philosophy does not answer man's deepest craving because it refuses to consider all of human experience including the religious. It is too concerned with the analysis of life's

parts in order to formulate an abstract principle to explain the whole.¹¹⁹ Mullins posits God as the final answer, the focal point, otherwise the arguments have no beginning or end: "man's upward soaring thought is met by God's descending revelation and love". Christian experience lights up the abstractions of philosophy and brings them to a climax, and simultaneously it makes more real all the unique claims of Christianity.¹²⁰

The spiritually regenerated and morally transformed man proves the deity of Christ and the substance of religious experience because of His real presence in that life. That fact alone proves divinity for Mullins, because for him no man has the moral resources to transform himself. When a sinful man turns to Christ He responds as promised. Miracles no longer would trouble him because he has experienced the "miracle working power" in his own soul. Christian experience breeds moral power and with that Christ becomes final for man and his reason, conscience, will, intellect, faith, hope, and love.¹²¹ Mullins is persuaded that even to the outsider such an experience would be convincing for the spiritual cosmos has laws and forces analogous to the physical. As planets revolve around a sun so redeemed men revolve around a Saviour.¹²² It would be impossible to destroy the Christ of history, the creeds of Christendom, the Bible, and religious experience, for in all of these a genuine revelation is involved. Biblically conceived, true revelation touches first the heart and then the mind, with

the experience being its proof and faith amply figuring. With some kind of initial Christian experience subsequent acts through faith have their rightful place.

Principally, the fact of H. C. G. Moule's essay "Justification by Faith" (II: 6) is both the main theme of Romans and Galatians and the watchword of the Reformation. Revelation is now further amplified for justification through faith can only come by way of a direct encounter with Jesus Christ, which means an actual experience between the human and divine.¹²³ Moule cites the mediaeval scholastics and the Tridentine decrees as "two remarkable instances of misuse of the word Justification in the history of Christian thought", because they meant by that term personal regeneration and inner sanctification, and renovation respectively.¹²⁴ Justification means first of all to be received by God into His presence and fellowship, and only then does the gift of His pardon come. And faith is the very stuff of that relationship.

The same analysis is made for faith. It contains something of the unknown, but also connotes a genuine and practical reliance on a presumed trustworthy object. The famous New Testament definition of faith in Hebrews XI: 1 is examined and found to go much beyond the practical into a mysterious spiritual realm. Moule finds it too other-worldly and insists that faith itself whether in practical or spiritual things is the same, reliance placed on a trustworthy object with sufficient uncertainty.¹²⁵ Because

faith is so important for salvation it must be explainable and understandable, as it is a reliance upon an infinitely good and great Object, God in Christ and all that His love and fidelity and promise mean.¹²⁶ In having proper faith it is important to make certain that the faith is not in the weight of a reliant attitude on some object, but on that object alone: "His feet are on the Rock, and he knows it, not by feeling for his feet, but by feeling the Rock."¹²⁷ There is neither merit in thinking of justification as the ultimate cause of salvation nor of faith as the object of hope. Rather, both are expressions for Jesus as Lord as He is given and taken. Neither have the power to save but both point to the "acceptance of the guilty by reason of a Trusted Christ".¹²⁸ The word "by" carries the action so that man's sin can pass over to Him and in turn His redeeming wealth to man. There is finally then a marriage between man and God, with their total trust released to one another. Justification and faith cannot operate independently, but both are dependent upon God in Christ.¹²⁹

The first six essays in this section on revelation have dealt with the existence of God and Christian experience as the principal argument for that, three essays on each. The remaining six will advance the practical proof of Christianity still further and, in keeping with the original intention of the Stewarts, these are three personal testimonies as well as two essays on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and one on the church. The testimonies all speak of

the authors' conversion and therefore the revelation of Christ in their lives.

Philip Mauro, "A Personal Testimony" (IV: 5), reports that at age forty-five he came to a personal knowledge of Christ, but did not fully understand what had happened until he had studied Scripture carefully.¹³⁰ He describes his previous consuming self-concern, rational and physical approach to life, meaningless church membership which began at sixteen, and material comfort and professional success in law, and, admits that it yielded an uneasy conscience, discontentment, and dissatisfaction. His gratifications were largely intellectual and he indulged in the amusements and relaxations of the worldly. For him it would have seemed that if Christianity were to have any meaning its presentation would have to come from articulate theologians, but instead it was faintly-heard singing from a New York gospel tabernacle that attracted him inside, only to be brought face to face with the gospel by a few of God's simplest people.¹³¹ As a result he states that having confessed his need of Christ absolutely previous doctrinal difficulties subsided, because it was the Lord that he was chiefly in pursuit of.¹³² That meant the biblical Jesus as there presented which the higher criticism would have considered a misplaced effort. Mauro cannot stress enough that when God overrules in a life His own sovereignty displaces much, including troublesome questions, in order to put the priorities right. Frustrations and criticisms there remain, but Mauro views the

Christian life primarily in eschatological terms and finds the greatest hope in the promise of the second coming, in which emphasis his*pre-millennialism comes to bear.¹³³

Similarly, Charles T. Studd, "The Personal Testimony" (III: 7), writes of being brought up in the Church of England, while saying that conversion was something that happened to Chinese and Africans but never to Englishmen. Born into a wealthy household, his father was a keen sportsman who was converted at one of D. L. Moody's meetings in London, and later held revival meetings in his own country house. It was through a visiting speaker there that Studd himself was converted. Later with Christian friends in London he began to discover God's will for his life which ultimately led him to China.¹³⁴ In this testimony he mentions a few personal incidents to demonstrate God's continuous revelation to him and how his dependence on that quickened his Christian maturity.¹³⁵

Having been reared in a devout Christian household, H. W. Webb-Peploe, "A Personal Testimony" (V: 5), also attributes his decisive Christian conviction to extra-family circumstances, having met up with three different persons in one week who were spiritually dealing with him. He admits to many "ups and downs" in his Christian life, and the great injury which he sustained while a student and champion gymnast at Cambridge he regarded as the work of God to save him from worse and worldly diversions.¹³⁶ Webb-Peploe opens and closes his testimony firmly convinced that

however much one owes to the "holy zeal of some beloved relation or friend", it is first and last the work of the Holy Spirit which brings about this miraculous new life that enabled him to say: "...Lord, Thy love at last hath conquered; None of self, and all of Thee".

These three testimonies have very much demonstrated practically the more academic presentation and argument of the earlier essays on revelation and in a real way round that out. The abiding working principle that this collection must appeal to the educated and simple alike is again seen, with the personal and spiritual force of these testimonies appealing to both. The subject of revelation will be concluded with the two essays on the Holy Spirit and the other on the church as its manifestation. With this section on Christology and revelation any kind of theological system that is to be found here will have taken on appreciable additional form.

Insisting that a proper doctrine of the Holy Spirit emphasize both spirit and person, R. A. Torrey, "The Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit" (I: 4), believes that knowing the Holy Spirit as a person brings an obedience that humbles and makes the possessor responsible. Otherwise, simply to claim an undefined spiritual influence breeds a false feeling of superiority without making any real demands. Such a view holds closely to trinitarian theology. Torrey documents his argument biblically and sets forth four proofs which he sees it presenting for the Spirit's personhood.

First, the Bible assigns the Spirit all the distinctive characteristics of personality: knowledge, will, mind, love, intelligence and goodness, and grief.¹³⁷ Secondly, many acts that only a person can perform are ascribed to the Holy Spirit, such as searching, speaking, praying, and teaching and guiding.¹³⁸ Thirdly, the office of comforter is given the Holy Spirit and this could only be predicated of a person. Jesus constantly spoke words of comfort and He sent another Comforter, the Paraclete, to take His place, and that was something more than simply an influence or power.¹³⁹ The Holy Spirit is the very on-going presence of Christ Himself in man and the world. Torrey gives a testimony on this point by saying that for years he refused to become a Christian because of a determination not to preach, and the night of his conversion, instead of saying he would accept Christ, he said "I will preach", and eventually in doing that he realized that he was to be the mouthpiece while the Holy Spirit took over completely. And fourthly, the Holy Spirit is as much susceptible to such conditions as grief, rebellion, lying, and blasphemy as is a person, which would not be so if it were an influence or power.¹⁴⁰

With the Bible as the authority, Torrey concludes there can be no doubt that the Holy Spirit is a person and then asks if Christians genuinely recognize this in their actions. In saying that the Spirit is as real a person as Christ and worthy of man's full love and surrender, it would

seem that Torrey has kept too much to the literal biblical words and not sufficiently to the actual exposition of them. For nowhere does he discuss in detail Christ and the Spirit as distinct yet joined, with the result that he blurs both in relation to each other even though the more general meaning comes across.¹⁴¹ Christians must be aware of the Spirit's potential indwelling and possession of life, that communion with it means "fellowship, partnership, comradeship". Torrey's final words are "To have as one's ever-present Friend, and to be conscious that one has as his ever-present Friend, the Holy Spirit...", which more than suggests the supreme part that is to play.

In contrast to the unintentional ambiguity in Torrey, W. J. Erdman begins "The Holy Spirit and the Sons of God" (X: 7) by stating explicitly that the Holy Spirit is another person but not a different being : God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit perform the same acts because they are one, and their division in three only helps to explain their work at creation, after the incarnation, and after the ascension respectively.¹⁴² Both Torrey and Erdman stress that the Spirit is not an impersonal medium, power, or influence. Erdman goes on to make a most important point in the argument for the Holy Spirit by saying that spiritual life in God's people has always been the same "in every age and dispensation", but with Christ's coming the relationship was changed because of the third person.¹⁴³ Absolute perfection of every kind came with the Messiah and the God-man relation-

ship was completed for all time. The model for sonship had been provided and the sending of His Spirit after His departure from earth brought the Godhead to fulfillment.

With all this accomplishment came the actual enlargement of the spiritual life, and, as Erdman claims, redemption had to precede both sonship with God and the gift of the Spirit. Being born anew in Jesus Christ meant becoming a son of God and only after that was the Spirit given to the believer, which crowned that new life and provided fuel for its continuance.¹⁴⁴ Also, Erdman is concerned to make clear that there is a danger in making the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man identical and co-extensive with the doctrine of salvation by grace and redemption. These can even be separated into Old and New Testament concepts, though both are indispensable to the whole biblical record, while the gifts of the Spirit at Pentecost have New Testament associations only. Nevertheless, there is no difference in God's gifts and acts before or after that day, save that in view of the incarnation they are more properly explained. Whether in B.C. or A.D. the signal question still concerned one's own relationship to his God.

The question is raised whether there is with God an interval between personal justification and the giving of the Spirit and Erdman says that cannot be proved.¹⁴⁵ The gift of the Spirit can come immediately at conversion or later on, depending on the maturity of the divine relationship which can be measured in numerous ways, such as a fuller

knowledge of Christ, more effective service, and more patient endurance of ill.¹⁴⁶ The Spirit comes differently to each one just as conversions themselves differ, but the proof of that is to be found in one's growth in Christian holiness and achievements, the only concern of the Spirit in this world.¹⁴⁷ Erdman, a dispensationalist, has been concerned here with the baptism of the Holy Spirit in relation to the sonship of believers and does not engage in a discussion of resultant gifts or any ranking of them. For him the blessing of the Spirit is a sign of true sonship with God which began in justification and regeneration, and to what private ends that might lead he does not consider.

In a proper theological discussion of revelation there should be as many questions about the very existence of God at the beginning as there are solid affirmations of His reality at the end, and in a way this group of essays runs that gamut. With all the seeking to explain who God is as well as the positiveness of Christianity, by Whitelaw, Pierson, and Burrell at the outset, there comes in the final essay that note of immense certainty about it all, the great assurance that the church on earth is the consummate expression of God's claim on the world, the revelation of His own body to all men. There is something truly other about J. C. Ryle's "The True Church" (IX: 1) with its great emphasis not on the physical but the spiritual form of the church. His one insistence is that the Bible be the only constant, but from there he moves about with the greatest

sweeps in his thinking, admitting that worship must and does have many forms, that ministers are not indispensable, and that church membership, baptism, and the eucharist are not absolutely necessary though highly desirable in the lives of believers. Ryle says all this as an Anglican and a bishop, because he sees the true church as needing to rest on nothing more than full repentance and faith.¹⁴⁸

Furthermore, he claims that the true church has true unity for its members are agreed on the "weightier matters of religion", the proof being that strangers from far corners of the earth when examined separately will agree corporately. Such a church also knows true sanctity, is wholly catholic in not belonging to any one nation or people save simply to believers, and is apostolic in its foundation and doctrine.¹⁴⁹ These are the attributes which will assure its existence and make it "truly glorious at the end" as it seeks to do the work of Christ on earth, even though its members are few. With no uncertainty Ryle stresses that "this is the true Church to which a man must belong, if he would be saved", for a strong religious or denominational involvement can be outside the true church. Great light or knowledge or privilege or some kind of church attachment will never save one's soul. Ryle is so emphatic about this that he says finally that not to belong to the one true church, fully imbued with the Holy Spirit, "it will be better at last if you had never been born".¹⁵⁰

The beginning section on the fact of man has now been

answered in terms of the remedy offered through the person and work of Christ. The result of this is to be found in the work of evangelism, and, with that the systematizing of these essays into a reasonable theological progression will have been accomplished. The thirteen essays in this third section range from evangelistic preaching, the Sunday School and sabbath, missions, and stewardship, to St. Paul, prayer, and again the church.

On no more appropriate a theme can this section begin than with Howard Crosby's "Preach the Word" (VIII: 8), which was after all one of the last injunctions of the aging Paul to Timothy. To follow that maxim means to keep quite separate the gospel message or the philosophy of God and the philosophy of men. The Alexandrian school of Clement and Origen is a good proof of how mixing the two can confound the object, especially when that is to be a proper exposure of the plight of man. Crosby views as one of the saddest sights in the church the yielding to the spirit of pride by clergymen, who use the pulpit to discourse on art and literature, display rhetoric and oratory and humour, but proclaim nothing of the fire of Christianity with all its purifying effects. Consequently, churches are attractive for the wrong reasons and are called prosperous as these devices succeed.¹⁵¹ St. Paul commanded that the gospel must not be made in man's mould, fitted to his preconceptions, or filtered through or mixed with his ideas, but rather be presented just as it is if the Paraclete is to be at work.

Religious truths man does not himself possess and to speak from him and not God on these matters is blasphemy. This also pertains to accepting the views of quasi-Christian scholars and philosophers when they have ultimately undermined the gospel.¹⁵² Not bibliolatry but a proper worship of God as the author of Scripture is Crosby's real concern, which carries with it a great disparagement of the higher criticism and an equating of that with the weaknesses in the Vedas, Avesta, and Koran. Crosby greatly emphasizes the academic worthiness of conversative scholarship, that learning and biblical acceptance are not inherently opposite.¹⁵³

The greatest proof by far for the Bible being what it claims is the witness of the millions who know it.¹⁵⁴ The knowledge of the heart is viewed as more profound than that of the head and Crosby sees the preacher as a proclaimer, a herald, and not as a theorist. As Christ's herald nothing is before him but human hearts to appeal to and nothing behind but God's Word to proclaim and enforce, all of which should yield far more for the kingdom than any kind of human wisdom.¹⁵⁵ This is to insure greater understanding of Scripture alone, as it is evident that Crosby has little use for classical Christian literature to say nothing of biblical and theological scholarship generally.¹⁵⁶ He also attacks the theological seminaries "for turning believers into doubters".¹⁵⁷ And finally, there comes an obscurantist plea at the end of the essay that science should be left alone by the preachers because knowledge of the material

world "has nothing to do with the soul's salvation"; they are to "avoid questions and strifes of words which do not minister to godly edifying...".¹⁵⁸ This is not to rule out any connection between science and religion, or that there should not be an acquaintance with the natural world, but that heavenly truths are not to be taught in terms of material science. For Crosby it is a matter of avoiding in the pulpit anything that "can make no impression on a guilty conscience needing the Divine pardon".

Crosby's plea to preach only the gospel is amplified by L. W. Munhall's "The Doctrines That Must Be Emphasized In Successful Evangelism" (XII: 1). He does not view successful evangelism in terms of great audiences, eloquent preaching, and moving music, for often sentiment was more conspicuous than the Holy Spirit and the "lachrymals more frequently appealed to than the intellect and conscience". Foremost, the evangelist himself must possess true discipleship and genuinely know what spiritual power and faith are before following the divine directive to go into the world and bravely preach.

As for the message to be preached, Munhall outlines ten doctrinal points that must be stressed if there is to be true evangelism. He begins with sin, its universality, nature, and consequences, and assures that when this is ignored an emasculated gospel is being preached.¹⁵⁹ God's love is shown at its best when man's true condition as a sinner is fully acknowledged, and only then can a change be

prepared for. The act of redemption must be explained and the significance of the substitutionary atonement underlined.¹⁶⁰ The same holds for the resurrection, justification, and regeneration, for without the first the other two would never have been possible. These first five doctrinal points pertain to the message as Munhall has constructed it, even with some overlap, and the remaining five are suggested as a method for entrance to the Christian life.

Again the approach is standard with the first act by the sinner being repentance, which means a change of mind brought about by the Holy Spirit as a result of confession and a desire for newness. Conversion follows with the turning about from old ways to a full commitment to the things of God, and this being done through faith. Faith, as the eighth point, is an active belief that God will effect His promises as Scripture records them and this creates a growing trust in Him through prayer and meditation. Faith in turn inspires obedience which cements the life in Christ as Lord, and this leads to the assurance of salvation which is the tenth and final point to be made.¹⁶¹ The evangelist/preacher is to make this assurance perfectly clear so that converts will be "surely and safely anchored". Other doctrines such as those of heaven, hope, and rewards can be emphasized by the evangelist but are not necessary to the evangelistic mission.

As a final word Munhall records his observation that the new theology of his day was quite apparently barren of

spiritual power. Without giving documentation he asserts that a large number of ministers found their ministries failing and any view to conversion was largely ignored. As a widely travelled evangelist Munhall could speak from a vast experience and he gloried in leading men to Christ and thus adding to the community of saints. He warned that when preachers were not faithful to their message "we had better never been born," using Bishop Ryle's same words.

To move from the concept of mass evangelism to the personal, John Timothy Stone has provided a careful instruction for dealing with individual persons in "Pastoral and Personal Evangelism, or Winning Men to Christ One by One" (XII: 2), and notice that this essay immediately follows Munhall's. The model here is Christ Himself, who won most of His followers and chose His apostles one by one, yet in no way is this to minimize the throngs converted under Whitefield, Moody, or Spurgeon. Whether a personal or mass appeal, the spokesman must himself know the power of the Holy Spirit through prayer and Bible study and then seek to transmit that life to another, otherwise the approach will ring hollow. The relationship with God in Christ is ultimately a personal one and it is the Spirit which effects that and makes the Trinity meaningful in all its parts.

The Bible itself is the most powerful instrument in personal evangelism as well and the worker himself must reveal a genuine acquaintance with it and be able to demonstrate its timeless relevance to all things in a sound,

logical way. References to verses, chapters, and even key words and phrases, coupled with illustrations from the world, will bring the hearer a fuller appreciation of its immense relatedness to every facet of life and faith.¹⁶² The use of contrasting themes in verses, such as the penalty of sin and the freedom in Christ, and the assurance that Christ never forces Himself into one's life but always awaits an invitation, will put the good news in relief and simultaneously give it an urgent appeal. As the Bible is the center for the witness, prayer brings the right relationship between both persons and in relation to God. Stone's concept of prayer for this is very practical, praying first for complete guidance in the approach, then for the person, and finally with him.¹⁶³ There is even the suggestion that the witness begin by pouring out his own heart to God in the other's hearing and then asking him to make a similar response as his first act.

As well as discussing the process for winning men, Stone also considers the method and means of getting on to people in the first instance in order to present the message. The example of the Twelve is cited with their personal contact one by one after the manner of Christ which then multiplied accordingly. The large meeting is not overlooked, but the principle that eventually the encounter must be personal is stressed. Witnessing must be the concern of every church member and believer, in addition to any professional missionary concern, and Stone urges each pastor

to have special evangelistic services together with contacts through correspondence, the Sunday School, and any other suitable organization.¹⁶⁴ The witness must always be able to stand in the place of the hearer and gain his sympathy, ascertaining prayerfully individual direction in each case. To seek salvation is the beginning, but to want to bring others to it is a considerable advance in the divine imperative.

Stone listed the Sunday School as one important means of evangelism and Charles Gallaudet Trumbull takes this up specifically in "The Sunday School's True Evangelism" (XII: 3). At this writing there were more than thirty million enrolled in the Sunday Schools of the world which then systematically trained up people in the Bible for every department of the Christian life, including church membership and Christian vocations.¹⁶⁵ Its membership extended from the cradle-roll to the most elderly, with graded teaching materials of varying kinds, and in every phase the purpose was evangelistic.¹⁶⁶ The teaching was based on the Bible in its entirety as the inspired Word of God, "unique, authoritative, infallible", and the higher criticism with its destructive statements had no place there. A personal and total concept of salvation was the principal aim, with the consequent concern to make the faith and all of its doctrine become a workable way of life, thereby making the gospel unendingly practicable.

Trumbull admits that not all Sunday Schools were

evangelistic and puts this down to the higher criticism that had "crept into" their lesson helps, be they independent courses of Bible study or those helps issued by the denominational boards, which assented to error and ordinary authorship rather than inspired authorship.¹⁶⁷ The pattern seemed to be first a discrediting of parts of the Bible and then of the person and work of Christ, presenting a "modified Christ". The Sunday School Times, a weekly newspaper carrying instructive biblical articles as well as news of the Christian world, was founded and edited by Trumbull and did much to bring into the open the seeming destructiveness of the higher criticism.¹⁶⁸ There was much excellent material in the widely used International Graded Lessons that moulded Sunday School teaching, yet even there were elements that undermined biblical authority, blurred the line between the natural and supernatural, and equated nature study with Bible study for gaining a knowledge of God. Extra-biblical material became increasingly the main source of study.¹⁶⁹ This was lamentable for the Sunday School hour was the one assured session of specifically Bible teaching offered each week, whether in the church or under private auspices as the Sunday School actually began.

The Sunday School was geared not only to evangelism, but also to educating doctrinally. The half century between 1875 and 1925 was so given to doctrine and very much paralleled the early church in that concern. The meaning of salvation and regeneration and sanctification was important if

biblical principles were to be understood as well as followed. The Sunday School was not an institute for morals or a social service center, but an evangelizing agency that was theologically rooted and whose teachers knew personally the power whereof they spoke. Therefore, to want printed materials that advance such an ideal is only a manifestation of loyalty and concern for that power. The Sunday School as a teaching center was a target for the new ideas that academic theology was advancing, however modified they had to be for the many grade-levels, and Trumbull as an important overseer for the American and the international Sunday School did his utmost to warn against this. His The Sunday School Times exerted immense influence in that direction, although it could be obscurantist.

The essays of Munhall, Stone, and Trumbull followed each other originally, that rare occasion here of some kind of planning perhaps, while Daniel Hoffman Martin's "Why Save the Lord's Day" (X: 1) comes two books earlier despite its connection with Trumbull's essay. To preserve the Sabbath is an order of the Decalogue and that it was kept though shifted with Christ's coming says so much for its continued importance.¹⁷⁰ Sheerly on the strength of the events that occurred on the first day with the advent of Christianity, whether the resurrection, Pentecost, or the revelation to St. John on Patmos, Martin argues vigorously for a faithful Sabbath observance.

Quite apart from historic reasons, there are also

legitimate human ones for keeping this day. The body of man needs it to rest from routine functions, as does the mind and soul. The year's Sabbaths constitute nearly two months, which if properly used for worship and study will yield a relationship to and work for Christ that is inconceivable. Christ said that the Sabbath was made for man in order to renew and make him complete and put each week in the world in balance. It is for his liberty and not his licence. Any pleasure one seeks in it beyond himself only forces others to work which further breaks the sabbatarian ideal. Martin submits that on Sunday everything should stop except for the most necessary public services; otherwise, God is being robbed with the abuse of His day. That should be the one day set aside for the cultivation of one's own spiritual life, the other six being ample time for a full professional and recreational life. Blue laws would be redundant in the light of Martin's argument, for he desires that the Sabbath be kept not just for the sake of the church and religion but also for believers and unbelievers alike, because it was made for every man's total refreshment. That further means that many deep-seated activities must be forsaken, including even aimless social intercourse, travel, and the Sunday newspaper.¹⁷¹

Martin here sounds a plea to resist the secularization of the Sabbath and adhere to the biblical ideal, to stop being "jelly fish Christians, who have opinions without convictions, and prejudices without principles".¹⁷²

To deal with the Sabbath in terms of one's own preferences and associates rather than on a basis of religious faith does not close the wider issue. For Martin is insisting that it be observed regardless of any faith, when that is the case, because the Sabbath is the "guerdon of our national prosperity, the hope of our civilization". And, what is more, there can be no doubt that to keep it for divine purposes is one of the most forceful testimonies, evangelistically, that Christianity can realize.

To move from the Sunday School and Sunday observance as instruments of evangelism, the next four essays in this section will deal with missions, which gained such enormous strength in the nineteenth century and was a most burning issue with conservative churchmen. Missionaries were sorely needed everywhere but the urgency was not felt by liberal theology nearly so much, with the result that orthodoxy had a great opportunity. Tens of thousands of copies of the complete set of The Fundamentals were sent to missionaries everywhere and the Stewarts saw this project as of great importance to them because of its original aim: noting the errors in the new theology, and, giving further instruction in the Faith.

Missions, almost more than anything else, testify to the reality of Christian faith, and Arthur T. Pierson's "The Testimony of Foreign Missions to the Superintending Providence of God" (VI: 1) underlines that fact. The missionary efforts act as a "vanguard...bodyguard...rearguard"

for God and clearly demonstrate His force in the world, through both the major obstacles that are overcome in presenting the gospel in new areas and those who take up this work and often uproot their lives to do so.¹⁷³ Mission history also shows traces of the "Judge" as hindrances have been removed suddenly by retributive judgments, ungodly nations have declined and even perished, and apathetic churches have decayed. That the concern for missions emerged from the indifferent and deistic conditions of the eighteenth century, when infidelity and irreligion were rampant, because of a vast circle of prayer ranging from Spener and Zinzendorf to Wesley, testifies to the power of providence. Entry into lands sweeping from Korea to India and through to South America resulted, and between 1853 and 1858 alone entries were made to seven different countries, which themselves held one-half of the world's population. The reasons for and implications of such accomplishment is a study in itself. Countless men and women were offering themselves for service and the biographies of leading missionaries "read like chapters where prophecy lights up history".¹⁷⁴ Special evidence for providence Pierson cites in Gordon's leaving for the Sudan the very day Livingstone's death was first known in London, and Pilkington's arrival in Uganda the year Mackay's death was to cause there a great gap. Also, in governmental changes such as in Turkey in 1839 and Siam in 1851, when a missionary-taught native was elevated to the throne. The case is a strong one which the facts

will more than support.

The results of missions, with all the martyrdom and disappointment, can be seen in the perpetuation of native churches through their self-support, self-government, and self-propagation. Since Pierson's day the point has been reached where what once were mission stations are now sending out their own missionaries, Korea being a most notable example. Missions also increased the concerns in the home-supporting churches, insuring against Alexander Duff's statement, "the church that is no longer evangelistic, will cease to be evangelical".¹⁷⁵ The home churches which supplied the missionaries showed marked spiritual prosperity and other progress, and, as Theodore Parker claimed, their great investment was no waste if it produced but one Judson. Pierson viewed missions as very much God's front line, "the true succession of the apostles", and he refers to Acts XIV: 27 to XV: 18 which speaks of God's total providence and man's nothingness, and assures of His lordship in history, all of which the missionary ideal advances through many means. The marshalling of forces for world-wide missionary activity could never have been done by man as they were; indeed, the printing and circulation of the Bible in five hundred tongues reversed the miracle of Babel and repeated that of Pentecost.¹⁷⁶ One of the most impressive manifestations of missions and God's superintending providence is to be found in the large number of "spiritual quickenings" under missionary leadership around the world in the nineteenth

century alone.¹⁷⁷ While some places saw sudden outpourings of spiritual power, most all of them witnessed some peculiar circumstance usually arising out of despair that preceded this new life.¹⁷⁸

Pierson observes that surveying missionary activity in the nineteenth century is like reading new chapters in Acts, with the new translations of the Bible, establishment of Christian schools, organization of self-supporting native churches, the self-surrender of missionaries, and the new dimension in prayer. Another great proof that God continues to honour His own gospel and issues aids for its understanding and implementation. The New Testament provided an irresistible culture and the lives and work of a feeble band of missionaries in their mastering new languages, translations of the Bible, setting up schools, winning and training converts, uprooting pagan customs, building medical stations, and in every way revamping the society -- all this within a generation and sometimes a decade -- more than proves the hand of God at work. It was in every way a superhuman task that had to be carried out by men and the great successes for the Faith as well as the world were staggering. With all the innumerable and inexplicable victories in missionary history, Pierson is convinced that this only proves the validity of full biblical belief and obedience.

Not only are missions a comment on God's sovereignty, but also they are a fountain of inspiration to the supporting home churches, far more than the latter are sources of

encouragement to the former. Charles A. Bowen speaks in these terms in "A Message from Missions to the Modern Ministry" (IX: 8), having found the church then to have "an appalling dearth of aggressive spiritual life". By contrast the missions themselves were flourishing, yet they did fear that the home church might not live up to its privilege of supporting the distant work both spiritually and materially. Spiritual guidelines for the work of the whole modern ministry of the church were to be gained from the missionary enterprise, because that emphasized what Bowen called a trinity of doctrines: atonement in Christ, ministry of the spirit, and prayer.¹⁷⁹

The atonement was one of the central messages of the first missionary, St. Paul, which he preached everywhere regardless of conditions, even though at Athens and Corinth he might have been tempted to preach differently because of their education and culture. There was a lesson in that for when the atonement was neglected so was any new birth of true Christianity. Carey believed this and so did the Moravian church which inspired him, whose work was such that for every member in the home church they had more than twice that number in "congregations among the heathen".¹⁸⁰ James Denney maintained there was nothing more universally intelligible than the cross which was older than Wesley or Augustine or Abraham. In that light, Bowen asks whether there was a Unitarian mission and if so would there be any revival as no atonement would be preached: "When you steal the

cross, you take the crown of missions".¹⁸¹

Following on the atonement is the desire for the Holy Spirit which has been called the "conservator of orthodoxy in every successive age".¹⁸² Again it would seem that missions were laying hold of this much more than home churches whose comfort and security caused them to rest in men's strength. Bowen sees the adumbration of foreign missions in the Holy Spirit's directing of Philip to the eunuch and Peter to Cornelius, to say nothing of Paul's most remarkable guidance.¹⁸³ Missionaries were very aware, but not so with many of the home churches, that a "supernatural beginning must have a supernatural leadership" which depended so heavily on the Holy Spirit. Prayer provided that means and was the single greatest tool for missions.¹⁸⁴

As a comment on this third doctrine Bowen cites the example of Dr. Schofield, who, despite having received large grants for research in England, gave himself to medical work in China and constantly prayed that God would call out men from the English universities for missionary service. One year after his early death the Cambridge Seven went forth. Such examples are unending with great prayer behind each one and only that could account for the missionary efforts of A. J. Gordon's church in Boston, J. Hudson Taylor, and the Scudder family of India, who with their nine children also as missionaries gave 530 years of continuous service there. Bowen stresses the mightiness of prayer but also warns of its being a costly exercise, because to pray for

something is to become a part of it. The message that missions must and do convey is not that of Atlas holding the world on his shoulders, but Christ bearing the world upon His heart.

The argument for foreign missions should be needless for believers and is useless for unbelievers, for belief in God automatically carries with it the missionary ideal, according to Robert E. Speer in "Foreign Missions or World-Wide Evangelism" (XII: 4). Nothing can be true of God in America or Europe which is not also true for Asia and Africa. He is the same for all men everywhere. Belief in God's Christ makes mission mandatory, for the example of the early church showed that His was a gift for all men never to be confined.¹⁸⁵ Part of being a Christian is to want to share that experience as the gospel was never intended for a few. Rather than being a perpetual fire in the temple it is meant to be a burning light set upon a hill. Christianity's social and redemptive message, together with all its moral ideals and power, were meant to be spread abroad as good news, and where that has already occurred the results are sufficient proof for its unique claims. Speer claims outright, at a time when question and hesitation were the usual, that the Christian conceptions of truth, purity, love, holiness, and service are original, and that every ideal save the Christian is defective.¹⁸⁶ The reason for missions or world-wide evangelism as he put it follows naturally.

In terms of missions and evangelism the world was

and always will be divided in two, another kind of haves and have-nots using today's parlance, and as ancient beliefs and customs were fast disintegrating the time for a replacement was at hand. Christianity had virtually every opportunity, which meant putting as much an onus on those at home as on those who went abroad. Each culture could and did develop its own commerce and government, philanthropy and education, but these were superficial considerations compared with the spiritual and philosophical quests for religious faith. Much debate there was as to which should come first, with considerable conviction that civilization must precede religion.¹⁸⁷ Speer found this unreal and did not believe in a logic in these matters, rather that the gospel should be preached everywhere regardless of conditions, but with every sensitivity to the situation. For him the great question of ringing importance was how to convince all men of Christianity's special claims, application, and ultimate truthfulness when other religions seemed to be meeting the needs of so many.

To this timeless debate Speer addresses himself adroitly with seven major points. First, only Christianity is trying to make good its claim to universalism. In Wesley's words the world is its parish and it is moving with steadily increasing power, agencies, devotion, and purpose, while Islam, Confucianism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, and Buddhism have severe limits at best. Basically, there is the idea of God, Who lives and cares and seeks to be served,

and Who further revealed Himself in the person of Christ. This leads, thirdly, to a unique and developed view of God, His sovereignty, immanence, revelation, and total participation in all of life. The conception of sin and the need for salvation are most highly articulated in Christianity and demand an inevitable missionary concern, while other religions will reject such a view. It is also historical with the Old Testament, Christ, and the New Testament as the only foundation and remaining evenly important always without change. While theological systems might change, there can be no addition to the essentials which were once and for all delivered. Sixth, there is an ethical uniqueness with Christ as the example and believers are expected to grow in moral perfection in every department of their life. Consummately, Christianity is final and absolute with no good beyond it nor evil within it. It has every intention of conquering the world because that was the command of its Founder.¹⁸⁸

In the last of these essays on missions, Henry W. Frost asks "What Missionary Motives Should Prevail?" (XII: 5), because so often the scriptural and spiritual motives have given way to selfish or simply humanitarian ones. It has been true that Christianity civilizes but not that civilization Christianizes and the two must not be confused. In his earlier ministry Jesus spoke very little about missions, but latterly, between His resurrection and ascension, He spoke constantly of that even when His dis-

ciples might have wished Him to speak on several other matters. His command was simply to preach the gospel with full compassion and the cost involved is recognized. The promises of the New Testament depend on this action, with the Acts (XV: 13-18) declaring God's preparation in the present to prepare for the future and the Revelation unfolding to the believer all that awaits him.¹⁸⁹ The Bible clearly expects intensive evangelism before the Lord returns and orthodoxy must therefore see that this is done.¹⁹⁰

Frost clearly understands that missionaries will by no means convert all the world, since many will not accept Him, but they will gather those who are awaiting the good news and who must be found out before the consummation in the second coming. Furthermore, Frost returns to his initial point by saying that there is enough power in these three evangelistic motives, command, compassion, and the second coming, "to raise the missionary propaganda above everything earthly, selfish and narrow, ... upon the plane of the heavenly, the spiritual and the infinite".¹⁹¹ The ideal he has in mind is to be seen in the life and work of a Canadian who went out to China, having felt the call, and in whom was an example of what missionary motives truly should prevail.¹⁹² Frost has here touched on a matter in the history of missions that historians have often commented on at length and with severe judgment, for missionary motives were often not honourable and carried the taint of personal aggrandizement as well as furthering ecclesiastical and

national political interests, which brought a skepticism that was not easily removed.¹⁹³

These essays on missions are a focal point in the total collection for many of the authors of The Fundamentals gave so much of themselves to missionary concerns and, indeed, are among the key figures in that long and distinguished movement. Since it was the evangelical wing of the church that paid attention to missions mostly, it is to be expected that this collection would markedly advance this cause. The final four essays in this section on evangelism are a mixture topically, but each one furthers the cause and is intrinsically a part of the theme on missions.

Something of the comprehensiveness of subjects in this collection is reflected in Arthur T. Pierson's "Our Lord's Teachings About Money" (X: 5), where he claims at the outset that if those teachings were obeyed it would "forever banish all limitations on church work and all concern about supplies".¹⁹⁴ This would affect not only physical substance but also the giver's whole spiritual character, for if stewardship were practiced it would revolutionize money values. Investment for its own sake has no virtue, but when it brings enrichment to many and adds to the power of the least and weakest it is worthwhile. The parable of the rich young ruler (Matthew XIX: 16-26) puts the case right and points up Pierson's axiom that poverty is bound for those who are parsimonious while giving is the other side of getting.¹⁹⁵

The statement in the Acts (XX: 35), "It is more blessed to give than to receive", extends the law of recompense, urging that whatever one has must be shared for it is not one's own in the first instance. One's gifts are always reckoned through comparison as demonstrated by the widow's mite. It is not what is given but kept, not the amount of one's contributions but their cost in self-denial. Only when the dearest possession is surrendered to God does there come any sense of a treasure laid up in heaven. True giving is unselfish for to expect a return is only to trade. Reciprocity carries not the Christian spirit and cannot be considered as benevolence. Giving should be a sanctified act with the gifts being worthy and morally dignified, as well as an act of worship.

Further, Pierson also thinks in terms of transmutation so that what is temporal and material becomes spiritual and eternal. That is, he claims that money used for entertaining, for example, should be used instead to purchase Bibles and tracts.¹⁹⁶ However, never does he consider whether the entertaining itself could lead to an end equally positive. He insists that not until there is a new view of money will the machinery for evangelism work as it ought. To learn to give according to biblical principles is to love to give and then those gifts become abundant and systematic and self-denying. God's evangelism was in his gift in Christ and man's must be in his gifts of every kind for Christ.

As money is a necessity for the cause of evangelism, so too are the writings of St. Paul, both because they arose from that cause's behalf and are part of the sacred canon. E. J. Stobo, Jr.'s "The Apologetic Value of Paul's Epistles" (X: 9) deals only with Galatians, I and II Corinthians, and Romans, as these are universally acknowledged as genuine and point up so clearly what Paul deemed essential in the Faith.¹⁹⁷ To begin, Paul's theology is an outgrowth of his experience and his thinking is highly autobiographical.¹⁹⁸ As a Jew his great aim was to become righteous legally, but when he fully appreciated what sin was he found that legal ordinances would not satisfy the hunger of his soul. His conversion was in every way supernatural and to become a Christian meant an about face to everything he had been. That grace had superseded law was for him a great new fact.¹⁹⁹

Paul was completely captivated by Jesus Christ as a person and gave much time in his writings to His earthly life, dealing more with the natural than the miraculous course of events. His formulation of a doctrine of Christ's person is not mere theological speculation but the outgrowth of religious experience. Much is made of Christ's divinity and humanity without sin, with reference even to His pre-incarnational existence, all of which points to His being the perfect fulfillment of life eternally. He refers to Christ as both Son of God and as Lord and finds the most convincing proof of His divinity in the resurrection.²⁰⁰

As a Pharisee his prejudices were so anti-gospel and upon conversion he underlined the truth of its claims one by one. His evangelistic concern was to make sonship as real between man and Christ as it was between Christ and God. Neither by gradually changing convictions nor because of some kind of mysticism did Paul overcome his bitter opposition to Christianity. Rather, his was an instantaneous conversion that had deeply experienced divine revelation. Perhaps the changing of his name from Saul does more than anything to demonstrate that profound act. Paul's is the classic conversion and the monumental piece of evangelism that he did on the strength of that has also become classic. What better proof of the reality of this great historic fact than his writings, having taken their place in the sacred canon of Scripture. As Christ made so real the meaning of God so Paul did likewise for the Holy Spirit, without which there can be no evangelism.

Prayer is also a most important factor in evangelism and no religious awakening in history has occurred without a large measure of it. R. A. Torrey's "The Place of Prayer in Evangelism" (XII: 6) cites many such examples, beginning with the first disciples and then Jonathan Edwards and David Brainerd, and Finney and Moody.²⁰¹ The great revival of 1857 began with the private prayers of an humble New York City missionary named Landfear, which led to prayer groups and ultimately to the 1859-60 revival in the British Isles. Then followed the Welsh revival in 1904-05 which was also

the outcome of much prayer as was the entire foreign mission movement.²⁰² There can be no doubt that prayer is the most important human factor in world evangelism and Torrey makes a great plea that that continue, for as society came more to depend on secular forces so too its religion often neglected to depend on prayer. From these prefatory remarks Torrey proceeds to make some specific suggestions for prayer.

Systematic prayer is itself a form of evangelism and should begin with the individual praying for himself and for others by name. A prayer list of persons should be kept and as the needs are met these should be recorded correspondingly. No topic should be inappropriate for prayer and conversion and renewal should be foremost. The local church must always be remembered and especially that it might arouse the community spiritually. Torrey speaks out against professional revivals, though gives them their place, and instead urges prayer cells among the people themselves, that they might witness to each other first and then to the greater community. Prayer should be offered for all work in foreign lands, for the guidance of the many directors, for more to be called to go out onto the field, and that new fields be opened and old ones revitalized.

In praying for missions converts as well as new churches, and the propagation of the gospel that leads to conversion, must be sought. The spiritual must take great precedence over other concerns. Torrey admits that the burdens the missionaries themselves must bear would be impossible if

there were not a God Who answered prayer. And finally, the fourth concern is to pray for the evangelization of the world in the present generation, exactly the vision of John R. Mott and the Student Volunteer Movement. Mention is made of the "awful war now in progress" followed by a great hope that God will grant one more chance to His delinquent church. The closing words are "Even so, come, Lord Jesus" which signify the consummation of prayer in the second coming. Throughout this essay Torrey has been instructing his readers in a cardinal Christian practice and again something of the hopes of the Stewarts has been realized. For wherever on the scale the reader may be, there is application here and a positive faith being presented.

The final essay on evangelism looks to the motive for it, namely the second coming of Jesus Christ. In "The Hope of the Church" (VI: 8) John McNicol indicates a revival of interest in eschatology even though the higher criticism has attacked it. He makes it quite clear that the church's hope biblically or theologically is not in the change which comes at death in heaven or the conversion of the world, but in the personal return of the church's Lord which fact the New Testament substantiates in five ways.²⁰³ First, Christ taught His disciples to expect His return and enforced this teaching with the two parables on inward and outward preparation, the virgins and the talents respectively, as well as the events in the upper room and at the ascension. The apostles in turn taught their converts to await His return

which expectancy filled the New Testament churches. These early Christians not only looked back to a Saviour Who had died for them, but also forward to a Saviour Who was to come again. Thirdly, the New Testament church's entire life and work had that coming in view, about which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, and Timothy and of which the other epistles speak also. The "grace of hope" which the apostles talked about and the epistles referred to rested equally on that anticipated return.²⁰⁴ Fifthly, apostolic thought has revealed that while salvation is an assured fact, it is nevertheless a process that still goes on in the life of the believer and cannot be accomplished finally until the return of Christ occurs.²⁰⁵

McNicol then asks a disturbing question in the light of this New Testament evidence. That is, whether the world will be able to see in this Jesus, that despised man of Nazareth, the One Who is to be the heir of all things for all time. This can be answered thus far on the strength that as the prophetic vision of the suffering Servant had personal and actual fulfillment, it therefore can be assumed that the promise of a returning and conquering King will occur equally. To decide to abandon the idea of Christ's second coming would be to negate history as well as deprive the church, the world, and Christ Himself.

The second coming necessarily figures within the doctrine and life of the Christian faith despite contemporary arguments. Most certainly it is a cardinal truth for

this collection. It is also biblical and must be held absolutely without modification when there is a belief in an authoritative and infallible Bible. Should this concept not seem rational outside such a framework that is no reason for denying its validity. Otherwise, human reason would stand above God's Word and prophecy would be reduced merely to human foresight. The second coming does bear testimony to God's continuing presence in human history as well as exalt the divine person and work of Christ for eternity, thus balancing the fact of man's fall with the promise of restoration. And it is just at this point that McNicol rules out any form of evolution, as is to be expected. The second coming is the church's hope, inspires Christian living and service, and makes evangelism in whatever form proper. Without that promise of an eternal righteousness through the re-entering into history of the Son of Righteousness, the church, regardless of its history and its aims, has no hope. Christ has already appeared as the Alpha and has promised to appear again as the Omega.

With the conclusion of these essays on evangelism comes also the completion of the rather ad hoc systematic theology which can be produced from this collection. This chapter has used the remaining forty-nine essays and the distribution within the chapter has worked out with some proportion.²⁰⁶ The plan has been to assign each essay to a section, which means that the divisions have been geared to the essays' subjects, as each one is specialized and treats

a specific theme. It is further to be remembered that these essays were written quite independently of one another, yet in the light of their mostly unanimous presuppositional agreement on major issues there is a theological consistency which then only lacks in the degree of completeness. References to Scripture rather than to scholarship are most often the rule, as is categorical thinking rather than academic ambiguities. All of this was in sharp contrast to the norm of the day. If anything the theology of The Fundamentals may have seemed too simple and even naive certainly to the sophisticated, while its constant appeal to biblical and historical examples could not help but evoke an admiration as well as a proof for their position. Theirs was intentionally a biblical rather than a philosophical sophistication. In no way was the collection meant to present a systematic theology, but it was intended to set forth all the necessary requirements for the Christian life from pre-regeneration through an active witness. To complete this second objective of the original twofold purpose of the collection there remains a most important section which only one essay treats directly.

It became very urgent that due warning be given about those forces which tried to substitute a social for an individual gospel. By 1900 the social gospel and socialism had an appreciable history in the Christian world and especially in America with no signs of decay in its energy. The social gospel theme can be noticed in several of these

essays while only one takes up the topic singularly. A surprising fact, too, inasmuch as the social gospel movement threatened evangelical faith so directly. Therefore, as the fourth and final section of this chapter, the subjects of socialism and Christianity and the social gospel movement in America particularly will be discussed, with the twelve-page essay of Charles R. Erdman, "The Church and Socialism", serving as the center. Whether by accident or design there is some significance to this essay being the final one in the collection, for while the dangers of the higher criticism and all accompanying isms were serious enough, those of the social gospel were infinitely more insidious and camouflaged. In some ways the social gospel was a compromise, perhaps unwittingly, between the critical and conservative schools, and was the one denounced ism herein whose detection was often the most difficult. That was the one error that the most biblical theology could fall into so easily and it must therefore be treated in the light of the theological fact, remedy, and result presented here.

Because there has already been considerable attention given to social movements in relation to theology and the church in chapter one, the context of the Erdman essay needs only to be filled in more carefully in parts. Indeed, it is something of a mystery to know why many more essays were not given to socializing influences and the social gospel when that was so prominent in this period. True, this threat can be detected by implication in many of the essays, but

once again the case for priority and balance comes to the surface and neglect cannot help be charged. Nevertheless, the topic is a large one and as far as The Fundamentals are concerned it is in Erdman specifically and solely that that is properly triggered. Furthermore, England and America were the principal centers for the actual working out of socialism and Christianity while Germany did much to develop that theoretically.

Christian socialism appealed to the moral consciences chiefly of the middle and upper classes, even though it owed its existence to non-Christian socialism. It was something of a panic measure to protect church and state and the very phrase itself makes socialism the substantive and Christian a mere adjective. Christian social teaching of the late nineteenth century came equally from non-theological writers such as Kant writing of the kingdom on earth, Saint-Simon urging the amelioration of the moral and physical existence of the poor, Comte encouraging altruism and considering the Grand Être ethically, and others such as Spencer, Rothe, Carlyle, and Ruskin. It was also to be the basis for the League of Nations as Woodrow Wilson and the chief British draftsmen made no secret of their religious aspirations. Somehow this might have been likened to the vision in Daniel of a kingdom of humanity that was to include all peoples, nations, and languages.²⁰⁷

In Britain the rise of the modern socialist movement dates from the 1880's with the widespread social discontent

and great industrial struggles.²⁰⁸ Christian socialists there were not revolutionaries even though they were a movement (1848-1854) that arose from an ancestry of Chartism, Owenism, the 1848 revolutions, and the Industrial Revolution. As middle-class philanthropists who were genuinely shocked by the wretched conditions of the masses, they did aid the working classes by their honest benevolence. However, they failed because they tried to convert the working classes to an impossibly high moral code as well as to a theological approach to industrial problems which most working men were unprepared to accept.²⁰⁹ Such was the approach of the established church, but a lesson was to be learned from Methodism's high view of the layman whatever his class as well as its stress on the individual rather than the group. Because Methodism became a way of life it automatically included the industrial and political activities of its members and in this total involvement fulfilled Wesley's dream.²¹⁰

In 1889 came Lux Mundi, the founding of the Christian Social Union, and the publication of the Fabian Essays with the Sidney Webbs being the first leaders of the Fabian Society.²¹¹ The Christian Social Union was not concerned with any particular kind of churchmanship and Lux Mundi was written for everyone. Both were something more than just forms of socialism and no creed of any kind was exacted save that Christianity was the ultimate authority in ruling social practice. This did not mean keeping to biblical standards for most often it amounted to advancing secular schemes with

a kind of Christian stamp on them. Christianity was thus being fashioned into a social creed that talked in terms of an ethic rather than personal salvation. Much clerical disrespect together with many of the Union's members being unable to make any decisive break with capitalism made its program a very watered-down socialism at best.²¹²

Repeatedly, as seen with Robert Owen, then in 1848 with the Communist Manifesto and its spokesmen, and later in the outburst of the 1880's, the approach to social injustice seemed still not right and with it all the gospel was greatly distorted. Certainly the Church of England was socially conscious as the work of Lord Shaftesbury, Bishop Westcott, and the Revd. Samuel Barnett clearly demonstrates in their attempt to bring about better living and working conditions. Still other churchmen such as A. J. Carlyle, R. H. Tawney, and J. N. Figgis later tried through their writings to change church people's attitudes to reform, and such examples can be multiplied.²¹³ The evangelicals themselves did very much in this direction and their influence in social matters was far wider than their own circle of the theologically congenial. Many of the social reformers in the nineteenth century came from evangelical homes but no longer remained such themselves. Evangelicals brought their spiritual concern to every phase of their work, which was highly personal however widespread, and they left hardly a need untouched.²¹⁴

In America, it was after the Civil War that the churches began to change their social outlook and in the first fifteen

years of the twentieth century socialism itself grew with startling rapidity, that period of muck-raking, trustbusting, progressivism, and the sociological novel. The thinking of Engels and Marx brought panic and fear to many.²¹⁵ Many protestants who were ardent exponents of social reform and the social gospel believed that socialism and Christianity were mutually exclusive, for so much politics and economics were involved, and the Roman church rejected it entirely. As a result the Christian socialists in America were unstable and were suspected by both sides. However, with the twentieth century proper came a new breed when outright socialists felt they could take on Christianity as well. Christians in the socialist party were from all denominations and some were even evangelicals, yet they neither wanted to explore the theological depths of their own faith in relation to socialism nor the theoretical foundations of socialism itself. It was a superficial combination but filled with a determination to better conditions.²¹⁶ With the Great War came inner tensions both in the socialist party and the Christian Socialist Fellowship, which opposed the War, and by the 1920s Christian socialist societies and their publications disappeared only to be revived again with the Great Depression.²¹⁷ Nevertheless, for many decades prior to the War Christian socialism was a major force in religious and political America. For 1850 to 1914 was a period of bright and unbounded dreams for social justice which possessed utopians and early Marxists alike, but there-

after quickly changed to bitterness and distrust.²¹⁸

To move from Christianity and socialism in the wider sense to the more confined subject of the social gospel proper, it is here that the heart of the argument is to be seen, showing without any doubt what was offensive to biblical Christianity and what this meant for the church. Clearly, society had replaced the individual and evil or sin had ceased to be a major stumbling block. Social gospelism was a bourgeois, middle-class religion wanting peace, harmony, and good-will with capitalism never being abandoned but reformulated. Theology was modified to fit social schemes, a theology for the group and not the person, with a system of Christian principles being applied to society and social principles to Christianity. Sin itself was changed from being separation from God to selfishness, while conversion meant a new social order and not the changing of one's life, mind, and soul. Puritanism and revivalism were replaced by ideas from the Enlightenment and science in order to encourage social gospel ideals. Even eschatologically speaking the aim was an earthly kingdom for all men rather than Christ for each man.²¹⁹

The social gospel was geared for urban society while the so-called old-fashioned, individualistic gospel with its homely virtues held its place in smaller towns and rural society, and there was no reason to force attraction one to the other. Urban Christianity in all its denominational strengths became quickly involved with the social gospel

emphasis if for no other reason than to appeal widely and hopefully responsibly to great areas of neglect. Rural churches, on the contrary, largely remained bastions of conservatism and the gulf between the two was real and inevitable but not without reason. After the Great War, when religious controversy became so widespread, rural churches were often much more a party to the endless splintering process based on doctrine as the social gospel and other such considered heresies came under great fire.

Wealth also became very much a gospel in itself, regardless of socialist influences, and the long-standing democratic doctrine of the free individual was very useful for developing an industrial capitalism. This having been established and supported either by Protestant theology or Darwinian naturalism, it became a dominant intellectual force in the 1865-1917 period of economic transition. Furthermore, the prevalent socialist and humanist views now so widespread held that man could build a more productive society without Marx's suggestions of revolution and proletarian dictatorship. In fact, the Christian socialism of the social gospel owed nothing to the materialistic dialectic or the class struggle of Marx.²²⁰ Between 1870 and 1900 social gospel thinking advanced and a theoretical basis for their objections to laissez-faire had been provided, largely by Washington Gladden, as well as a practical program for implementing their ideals through political means. Private property and free competition were fully acknowledged and

encouraged, but always in the interest of society rather than the individual as social welfare was the aim. The social gospel did try to control monopolies and publicized that fact widely, and thus contributed substantially to the eventual "trust-busting" schemes of national politicians.²²¹

With the ideological roots of social Christianity in Unitarianism and the relative ignoring of biblical directives, there was grave tension on the American religious scene because of conflicts with a basic theological conservatism. It was only proper that Christianity had now to speak directly to the conflict between labour and capital, the growing urban problem, and to business ethics. However, integrity became a shining issue when the claims of the Bible and Christ were either overlooked or re-fashioned in order to satisfy a secular philosophy that forever claimed to be Christian. The definition of that term was to make all the difference.²²² The social gospel was the reaction of a socialism-stimulated Protestantism to the ethics and practices of capitalism. Equally it was a legitimate development from the contemporary intellectual climate with something of Christ's social teachings as its basis, and, it aimed to speak directly to a situation which had been rent profoundly by sacred and secular criticism.²²³

In many ways the social gospel movement became incarnate in Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918), a Baptist who originally prepared for missionary service but was rejected for his theological views. He was impressed by the British

cooperative movement and the concept of the Brotherhood of the Kingdom and during his academic career in Rochester Theological Seminary made a great civic as well as literary contribution.²²⁴ His Christianity and the Social Crisis (1907) immediately established him as the leader of the social gospel movement for which he became an evangelist. For him society was so integrated that one man's sin caused others to suffer, with the same principle applying to the sins of a social class. Darwin he used, capitalism he opposed, and collectivism he favoured, but he did see merit in personal possessions as long as there was public ownership of public services. He also viewed the working class as the most important factor in presaging a Christian social order.²²⁵ Yet, when Rauschenbusch gave his Taylor lectures in Yale in 1917, presenting his most mature thinking on social Christianity, war was imminent for America and the optimism of the social gospel had dropped, and that was soon to be replaced by a resurgence of historic Christianity however extreme.²²⁶

Taking his place nobly with such men as Washington Gladden, Josiah Strong, Richard T. Ely, and many others, Rauschenbusch was no utopian dreamer though he did hold specific socialist doctrines. Reinhold Niebuhr sees him as the real founder of American social Christianity and its most brilliant and generally satisfying exponent. For Rauschenbusch social righteousness preceded the religious, life was good and not evil, and the imperative in "thy

kingdom come on earth as in heaven" was more than sufficient for proclaiming a social gospel.²²⁷ In the years 1915 and 1916, when the last of The Fundamentals had been circulated, America was enabling Britain and France to buy her munitions, a transcontinental telephone service had been set up, the federal income tax was declared constitutional, Mexico was invaded, the churches were intensifying their social concern, and America also was considering involvement in the War, and perhaps it would have seemed that more than ever the message of the social gospel was the answer. But it was not, as history has demonstrated, and the warning of Erdman and his company was not so absurd after all.

In the midst of these currents Charles Erdman wrote "The Church and Socialism" (XII: 7), noting at the outset that socialism's sudden rise was the "most surprising and significant movement of the age" for which supporting statistics are given. Seeing socialism when strictly defined as an economic theory, he claims it must be distinguished from communism, anarchism, and nihilism and simultaneously disassociated entirely from Christianity, as Christ is incapable of being reduced to any human theory.²²⁸ Speaking very much as a man of his era he comes out strongly against any church entanglement with politics and economics. Christian socialism is at best a benevolent idea but would never permit either concept to be carried to its own limits, rather it settles for compromise. Erdman is most specific in spelling out its non-acceptability to Christians because

it denies the cardinal truths, such as the incarnation, virgin birth, atonement, resurrection, justification by faith, work of the Holy Spirit, and the second coming. And he acknowledges similar losses for socialism.²²⁹

The difference between philosophical and popular socialism is great and this is recognized, even though the potential damage remains constant. Erdman views popular socialism as a social creed which is offered in place of religion, promising material benefits and "bitterly opposed" to Christianity. Accordingly, Erdman notes four major faults with popular socialism's propaganda: identifying the church with capital and therefore being held responsible for the present social order, regarding all capitalists as potentially dishonest and selfish, forgetting that its own principles of justice and fraternity are basically Christian, and placing physical above spiritual needs.²³⁰ Far from being a "rich man's club" the great proportion of the church's members were wage earners and the clergy were rarely recruited from the ranks of the wealthy then, but they were usually fearless in rebuking social sins. Socialism's attack on and sheer ingratitude for Christian charity is in itself suspect, for with that amelioration went some kind of spiritual message to set the individual right which socialism never would provide. Society and the body were its concerns rather than the individual and the soul.

Nevertheless, it must be granted that socialism did carry a legitimate burden in its concern for social wrongs

and cruelties, for it did uncover the "social unrest, the sullen discontent, the bitter envy and sorrow" of so many who found hope in its claims. This fact the church simply had to understand and was to be prepared to take on many additional concerns which were fitting, such as more seriously proclaiming Christ's social principles and insisting on their practice, counselling on the stewardship of wealth, marriage, the state, and employment, and a renewed consideration of morality and ethics in every context. It is precisely here that Erdman boldly expresses, and quite rightly, one of the greatest pitfalls and even hypocrisies of orthodoxy: belief in cardinal doctrines and simultaneous gross dishonesty in daily living. He insists that one cancels the other without any blessing of the Faith and has introduced this matter within a most appropriate context, for it often came under fire from social gospel exponents and with real reason.

That socialists would even talk about the kingdom of God somehow points to the church's failure to make that sufficiently real. Erdman supports the view that the state "is quite as purely a divine institution as is the Church" but sees both as having separate functions. In Christian terms the state has no right to promise such a kingdom while the church has and must, but never apart from demanding high obedience from its members. And to compel "Christless men to accept the principles of her Lord" is not a question at all. It is only in terms of Christ's second coming that the kingdom of God has any meaning and both the church and the

world ultimately figure in that. This then makes the matter completely a spiritual rather than an ethical one as the socialists formulated it whatever Christian principles they might have used.²³¹ The implication is that Christian socialism is not Christian while it could be socialist, for both worlds have their own explicit laws but the combination is only a delusion. Nevertheless, each has many valuable lessons for the other.

Socialism in Britain and America was a major threat to the church and simultaneously a corrective, an incentive, a catalyst. Perhaps the greatest scholarly mind to consider the subject of the social gospel then or now is Adolf Harnack, who was at work in Germany when the Social-Democratic movement there was creating a similar response. While Harnack and the writers of The Fundamentals would have many major disagreements, he does produce, on the surface at least, a similar set of priorities for the church in this controversy, of which preaching the gospel is the first.²³² He believed that the church should not be involved with questions of nationalization of private property and enterprise, land-tenure reforms, price regulations, taxes, and suchlike as this requires knowledge outside the church's province and only makes for a secularization of its work. However, it is the church's duty to interfere in public matters wherever serious moral evils are involved. This has been a dictum of dedicated churchmanship that usually transcends any theological position, and Erdman and Harnack are proof of

that in view of their basic polarity in biblical interpretation. The whole question of the church's involvement with the world has always created some embarrassment for conservatives or evangelicals at any time, but The Fundamentals have spoken directly to that repeatedly and not least in this last essay of the entire collection.

The Fundamentals' theology of the Christian faith and life has now been completed and any summary comment on this ought not to be necessary. However, it is worth repeating that there is no pretence of any kind to a classical systematic theology here, but rather just a suitable ordering of the topics treated in the hope that some coherence and continuity theologically would obtain. The design has been superimposed and this is not to say that another arrangement of these essays might not have been better. This seemed most appropriate for the historical problem set. Furthermore, while the contents of chapters three and four have been more often theological than historical in kind, it is to the historical concern that they speak always, having arisen from such in the first two chapters. Now that this lengthy involvement with a most major ingredient of ecclesiastical history has been completed, for such is the nature of theological history, the historical concern will return much more sharply in the fifth and conclusive chapter.

directed future from a consciously preserved past" in Troeltsch's words.³ Von Ranke himself, one of the greatest of modern historians certainly, dealt then with Western civilization from the catholic perspective of an humanist ecclesiastical historian, as a Lutheran and with fervent Christian piety. He even thought in terms of a common human destiny, through various and devious paths, for all political humanity. Furthermore, von Ranke acted out of a belief that each age has its own concept of and contribution to God. It has been argued, therefore, that von Ranke is the proof that ecclesiastical history is a corrective to the historical corruptions and denials of brotherhood; that it is the mother to modern secular history and the faith to which it testifies.⁴

When dealing with the development of ideas, or intellectual history, man's nature is far too personal and complex for the historian to make any predictions. At best, historians are wise after the event but never before, and can only suggest the outer limits of future thought patterns. Intellectual history does put the mind of man in perspective, showing where his thoughts stand in relation to others then and at other times, and trying to give some explanation for them in relation to surrounding institutions.⁵ From the fourth century on, Christianity is seen as the principal force moulding what becomes intellectual history, with man himself shaping the other levels of history. When not the mater, the church was then the matrix of Western thought,

whether by its direct action or reaction in response.⁶ For the Christian, as a member of the church, there was another, an higher dimension in historical movement. History was no longer intellectual speculation but the unfolding of a divine story, extending from Adam's fall to the expectation of the judgment. Life accordingly was lived simultaneously in time and eternity, which meant history and super-history. That view predominated down through the Copernican revolution and on to the nineteenth century, when it came to a sudden halt. Adam was then believed not to have fallen in the traditional sense. The new biology had destroyed the symmetry of Christian though not of intellectual history, just as centuries earlier the new astronomy had undermined confidence in the incarnation.⁷

Nevertheless, the church as mater and matrix of and for history is an inescapable realization, however that might be treated in successive generations. Recognition of the church meant belief in Christ, which in turn meant recognizing the suprahistorical, as He was once in history as man, continues there in the Holy Spirit, and eventually will consummate it. This means that history can be experienced by faith as well as reason, the former being finally more important than the latter. The "advent of God" belief has steered history since the early church, though again with the nineteenth century it was taken to mean a better world through human progress, thus putting history more in secular than in sacred hands. Faith and its experiences do not lie

outside history, nor is the reality on which that is based beyond it. The salvation of man, and his taking on of faith, comes to pass in history absolutely, as the incarnation set therein the eternal plan. Faith and reason are two aspects of the same history and are inseparable, but the former is the eternal quality which will triumph as it acknowledges Who began and will end history.⁸

There is a distinct difference between being a Christian historian and understanding history as a Christian. According to the Bible, history is not the province of man ultimately, but the sum total of all events since creation, belonging to God with no one part more important than another. The cross becomes history's center and the prophet is the church, while the historian is only the chronicler.⁹ Nevertheless, the church must have before it the true record of its past in order to speak profitably, which means details and not generalizations for all history is local and personal. To claim a Christian interpretation of history is misguided, for it is the same for Christians, Jews, Moslems, or those without faith. It cannot be shaped or changed or controlled by forcing it into a Christian mould, and it would have no more weight academically than any rival interpretation.¹⁰ What matters is the fundamental acknowledgment of the author of history, its protector and final judge. Once that is established the drama of history moves normally, but the divine relationships can at any point be made without any interference. In that way, history has been true both to

man's record and God's presence.

Ecclesiastical history in the nineteenth century was full of interpretations for what was happening because of the immense intellectual and theological explosion that was occurring. The church was figuring in all major events and its historians were accountable for recording and explaining that involvement and the effects. When the subject became comparatively peripheral after the War, it was not encouraged by Barth's denial that it constituted a major department of theological study. With the increasing secularity it had often to prove itself alongside secular history and define its boundaries carefully. Theologians and secular historians were beginning to ask more of the ecclesiastical historian, by way of evaluation and interpretation, the meaning of history and the Christian view of history. This led to making certain that it was the ecclesiastical historian and not the theologian who produced the evidence for what is and is not part of the church's true record.¹¹ The task had always to be the investigation of secular together with sacred history and working within the context of the whole theological tradition of Christendom, with the person and work of Christ as the center.¹²

Historians have repeatedly recognized the impossibility so often of a scientific history, and ecclesiastical historians even more so, simply because of the intrinsic difference between geschichte and heilsgeschichte. Theologians, however, have long had the equipment to aid the

historian, because of their insight into the meaning of existence, and in the nineteenth century were an indispensable tool for the understanding of such rapid and revolutionary change.¹³ To some considerable extent, the history of modern Europe and America is the history of that intricate relationship between Christianity and men or humanism. Because of the further increase in historical and theological scholarship in the nineteenth century, the relationship between them was so real that a mutual understanding there had to be. That was to be the province of the ecclesiastical historian, which it was, with great works being produced until 1914. Since each discipline lacked the other's knowledge there was an especial qualification needed to bridge both intelligently, and ultimately ecclesiastical history proved capable and worthy.

That the ecclesiastical historian has received a trust, and a sacred one, becomes obvious. To weigh up the things of man and the revelations of God through human events is a forbidding task because of the allegiances demanded, where objectivity strictly and never sentimentality must be the rule. Therefore, having just given some consideration, philosophically, to the nature and relationship of history, sacred and profane, to borrow Alan Richardson's title, it is now necessary to remark briefly on the post-War development from the point of view of ecclesiastical history. Only a few random points will be made about this period which lies outside this study, but in doing so the drama of 1850 to 1914 will not have ended so sharply. Instead, what followed

Victorian Christianity and thereby became the age to inherit The Fundamentals will taper off with something less than total unknowing into the winds of a new and often strange set of circumstances. With that in view, a few summary remarks finally about The Fundamentals themselves will put them in another perspective, this time from them to the beyond, which for the science of history is an unmanageable kind of geometry. Still, there was part of the family of religious man that was eventually to use their legacy as it was intended.

With the twentieth century, it would seem that the Christian intellectual was no longer taking the lead, but was defensive.¹⁴ Schleiermacher himself is usually regarded by historical theologians as the first of the moderns to begin to interpret the Faith in relation to the current situation. Seldom in Christian history have intellectuals or believers themselves reacted as violently to a non-theological work as they did to the Origin. The Bible, Augustine, and centuries of keen systematic belief were disregarded, as biblical creation and evolution excluded one another in Darwin's terms. Dogmatic theology had been shaped by biblical, historical, and philosophical study; now there were to be many more secular intrusions and considerations. The present century was predicted to be more practical and real, not a vale of tears through which sinful men were to walk unhappily toward a final reward. Religion was now to be found in wisdom, virtue, and love, rather than in asceticism or emotion

or withered creeds.¹⁵ Even in irreligious movements, especially Marxism, an high form of humanism was expected. Marx himself was in the tradition of Judaism, except that he only talked about the horizontal or man to man relationship rather than the vertical one of the Jewish prophets. The Fundamentals do not mention Marxism, and understandably, for while his writings were contemporary it was not until the Russian revolution in 1917 that they became a force. That was to be the beginning of a political upheaval across the world, and Russia was to be used as the source for igniting further revolution in Germany and elsewhere, which Lenin promoted.¹⁶

To move from an irreligious to a religious manifestation in political life, such can be seen in the force of Nonconformity in Victorian England, which had contributed both to national success and failure. During that period their emphasis changed from an unworldly pietism to preaching that political involvement was a religious duty, which also led to their becoming less spiritual. They made up a large segment of the prosperous middle class, upheld the establishment, and contributed to the successes of the Liberal party in politics. However, of all the influences present then, socialism had a disastrous influence on the Nonconformists both politically and spiritually. Also, by the early 1900s the earlier concern between church and chapel was as nothing in the light of that between Christianity and infidelity. Nonconformity suffered from the latter addi-

tionally, because there was no national support as with the national church; and also, by 1914 the Liberal party seemed to have spent itself which meant the loss of much political support for the Nonconformists. Each was dependent on the spirit of individualism, which was not in keeping with the emergent social Christianity with its political base.¹⁷

Post-War Britain was to be affected even further.

Statistically, the claim can be made that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Christianity has noticeably grown. While strongest in the Occident, even among non-Europeans the percentage of Christians has more than doubled. Most notably this is to be seen in black Africa, India, China, many lesser lands in Asia, and the East Indies.¹⁸ In fact, from the late eighteenth century to the present Christianity has seen both the most extensive geographic spread to date as well as a more open repudiation thereof in communities totally committed to it. The British Empire in the nineteenth century carried Christianity to all its conquests and has thereby put the Christian world much in its debt. Protestantism itself has reached out unprecedentedly to draw Christians from other communions into a world fellowship, with the result that it is more worldwide and less sectarian than ever.¹⁹ When viewed in relation to its past, there would be every reason to expect Christianity to live and grow despite all the hazards, a proposition that has as much biblical foundation as historical.

Factors in British and American Protestantism that continued long after the Great War because of being firmly rooted before were many. Outside the missionary movement itself, the most important development would seem to be the ecumenical movement. Edinburgh 1910 was packed with history and omens. Through its total effort, and especially in stimulating the founding of two constituent bodies, the International Missionary Council and the Faith and Order Movement, it led most influentially to the later creation of the World Council of Churches. Edinburgh did not launch the ecumenical movement but hastened it, as the confidence of the previous century was closing in and the door to the War opening.²⁰ Until 1910 the church was predominantly a Western institution with scattered missionary colonies, and only then was it beginning to emerge as a world Christian fellowship. Ecclesiastical colonialism was on its way out finally. Preparatory events led to this as early as the Lambeth Quadrilateral in 1888, followed by a long list of interdenominational efforts that added increasingly to a united Christian front. The continuous opposition to that by splinter groups went virtually unnoticed. Then, as early as 1943 there was some hint of rapprochement with Rome.²¹ Ecumenism was truly making marked advances.²²

Should the Great War have promoted internationalism, ecclesiastically it promoted nationalism instead. That is, many churches of the same denomination came together under one denominational name as well as many denominations coming

together under a national name, for example: the German Evangelical Church Federation (1922), the United Church of Canada (1925), the reunited Church of Scotland (1929), the Church of India (1930), the United Lutheran Church of America (1930), and the Church of South India (1947), which came rather full circle ecumenically being based on the Lambeth Quadrilateral. All of these were national churches as such and represent what the Germans call Volkskirchen. Protestants in America were forced to organize on a national basis, principally for doctrinal strength, with the result that they became overly American which the Federal Council of Churches there only heightened. In 1870 Christianity was scarcely known in some of the largest areas in the world, but by the second War it was an international force. Even though Marxism was hostile to Christianity, it undeniably had roots therein as from Jewish-Christian apocalypticism. Also, in Germany the sale of the Bible outstripped that of Mein Kampf. Between 1870 and 1940 the church gave rise to more organizations, related and not, than ever before in its history. The intense loyalty as well as bitter antagonism which it regularly evoked, though paradoxically, can well explain its growth.

Perhaps the greatest change to occur in Protestantism with the Great War was the revival of some form of evangelical religion, both in Britain and America. Usually an economic crisis produces a spiritual one and that proved true in America in the 1920s. Apocalyptic prophecy and evangeli-

cal religion were prevalent in Germany after the War, and in Britain something of an equivalent arose in the Oxford Group Movement, later renamed Moral Re-Armament.²³ In America proper, the years between the Wars witnessed Fundamentalism, a moribund evangelicalism. During that time many inter-denominational organizations were founded there which did and did not bear the marks of Fundamentalism, several of which served well the cause of the new evangelicalism that came forth with the 1950s.²⁴ Though not true for Britain, twentieth-century evangelicalism in America found its strength in the upper lower and lower middle classes, which does say something in itself. This is becoming increasingly less true, but when for so long in the course of a life childhood rather than adulthood has prevailed, the condition is not instantly correctable. Nevertheless, as serious a setback as Fundamentalism was to classical evangelicalism, the post-1918 period did see the social gospel become less meaningful and biblical theology itself come more to the fore. There was then a noticeable swing back to individualism, which evangelical rather than liberal Christianity has always stressed, and culminating in what Rudolf Otto called the "sacrament of silence". True religion continued to play an enormous role in the daily round and common task, but as the key remained the same the tune was changing.²⁵

History always assures individuality and propriety despite all the confusions and misunderstandings that so frequently occur when a fact or event is seen only in itself

and not in relation. Just this has repeatedly happened to The Fundamentals. Certainly in their own time, that is, those years when they were being published and distributed book by book, from 1909 to 1915, two opinions could really only be formed about them. Either they were viewed as conservative, though running a rather wide spectrum within that classification, and hence evangelical, which would represent the opposition's view, or, they would be seen as the only way Christianity and theology ought to be considered and believed, which would be the view of their own kind. That kind of labelling was wholly in keeping with the categories of that day, or indeed any day as ecclesiastical history will prove. Theologically, one was either an evangelical or a liberal, and throughout this study as elsewhere these often unsatisfactory terms have been used for convenience and want of anything better, and refinements within that were only understood by the informed.

There was no secret for their having been written and they even hoped to persuade some of their critics, as well as those who were undecided about the Faith, to say nothing of the already committed who needed guidance and feeding. The total effort could not have been more straightforward, and not once was there any hint that these writers were somehow seeking to call forth Christians from their respective denominations in order to form a new church rid of apostasy and hypocrisy. History has recorded many such efforts. They knew better, their backgrounds would not permit

that, and the tradition of which they were so vitally a part was much too historically ecclesiastical for that to happen.²⁶ Neither were nondenominational efforts their concern, for most of them were deeply given to main line churches, intending to continue therein and if anything steer them back to full biblical fidelity. These sixty-three men and one lady had only one goal: to proclaim the gospel as Christ and Paul had commanded. Certainly, they were aware of the enormous contribution which scholarship had brought to the further illumination of the Faith, and were acknowledgedly grateful. However, for them the Bible and scholarship presented a constant process of sifting the wheat from the chaff. The opposition argued that often what claimed to be the Bible was in fact not so, which caused them to perform as they did despite accusations of iconoclasm, blasphemy, or whatever. The counter answer from The Fundamentals was and would always be the argument from history. The Bible had stood for so many centuries virtually unchanged, therefore surely the nineteenth-century's departure had to be questioned as thoroughly as it questioned adherence. The debate continued back and forth between both sides, to which ecclesiastical history is so used, and The Fundamentals were prepared for it as that dialogue often entered into their writing.

From the time of the appearance of the first book in 1909 until after the Great War, which really meant into the early 1920s, The Fundamentals had had an immense circulation

and by then a very wide reading. By that time Book I had a much greater familiarity because of its being in circulation six years longer than Book XII, for example, so that even by the end of the War itself these documents had had a chance to be known carefully. Moreover, and without statistical evidence, it can be properly argued that by the early 1920s The Fundamentals had probably reached their saturation point. Their main work had been done in that they were as widely known then as they would ever be again, maybe even much more so. Their message and stand had been assimilated thoroughly. It must be remembered that these never reached the book stalls for public sale. They were privately and freely distributed, save for one or two exceptions noted earlier, which meant they went directly from the press into their readers' hands. Their efforts were nearly guaranteed notice, at least as much as could ever be expected, because of this method of insuring their attention. They sent these books virtually to the entire evangelical establishment throughout English-speaking Christendom, ranging from parish clergy to missionaries of all kinds. They were not sent to formal oppositional forces, as a kind of propaganda; rather, they were to be approached by the evangelicals themselves once they were equipped with the armour of The Fundamentals.

With the advent of the post-War years, enormous changes on so many fronts took place. Not at all is it in the province of this study to discuss those changes, thus the fact of them will have to be accepted. The church, with its con-

cerns both secular and sacred, was standing amidst a frenzied world and the War left its marks very deeply thereon, as it would naturally do most to intellectual and spiritual concerns. War by necessity deranges the mind long before the body of its survivors. It is further understandable that such results might well have disturbed the evangelicals before the liberals, as for decades before the War they were fighting a battle which looked as if the liberals were winning, and the total damaging results of war for everyone only added to their already great sense of defeat. The theological situation in the 1920s really had no chance of improving, but it was conceivable that evangelicals might hold their own, because of The Fundamentals primarily. That did not happen, and even those willing to listen to them grew smaller in number than before the War and understandably. In the end, evangelicalism began to withdraw more and more from the scene, as it seemed a victory for the liberals. The natural process of defeatism set in and what had up to then been an healthy, effective, if sometimes pedantic evangelicalism had instead become what was later called Fundamentalism. To repeat, it was a moribund evangelicalism.

Fundamentalism was almost insanely concerned with doctrinal points, and not always major ones at that, at the expense of all else. Social issues they completely ignored, believing that the opposition would more than take care of that, but at the same time denounced them for doing so. Rather than carry on with a balanced biblical concern, at

best it was concerned only with matters of belief, but never how to put that into action. Immediately death had been spelled for evangelicalism. What is more, as The Fundamentals had increasingly become the biblical gloss for evangelical Christianity, with their clear statement of what to believe or fundamentals of belief, it was not long before they were to be accused and abused, and understandably. In effect, over and over again The Fundamentals were misinterpreted in order to support a cause which was not theirs, so common an occurrence with the Bible itself in order to support any theological position. Finally, as the cause they were forced to serve retreated so did these documents, for they were the only single statement in such detail that Victorian evangelicalism had produced. In that fact alone evangelicalism was much behind Victorian liberalism, and that situation lasted for three decades following the War.

There can be no doubt that what had been produced most obviously in response to history had been abused in response to insecurity, deficiency, crisis, and for an arrogant claim to hold the only answer. What is more, the name of this collection lent itself so easily to connotations of obscurantism, bigotry, and hard-core attitudes and the relation was often made. This in no way says that some of that is not present in the essays, as it is, but how naturally when the subjects and authors are so varied. Post-War religious conservatives, to give them a neutral name and include both groups, and their critics seized upon this the

only guide and weapon they had, apart from the Bible itself, and used it to their own selfish advantage. Often it was a form of sacrilege. Of course, The Fundamentals could in themselves add fuel to those new fires in parts, but lastly they can be exonerated as a collection because of their original intention and meaning, and majority viewpoint. To provide proof for all these claims would be nothing short of embarking on another long study, that is, to determine any relationship between The Fundamentals and Fundamentalism. A legitimate inquiry that is, but the subject of the present study is much more so, historically speaking, and is not open to the conjecture that would have to be part of the former. Moreover, even to suggest such a possibility is also to admit that the two are not the same, and indeed how could they be when as many as forty and fifty years intervened, not to mention the eighteenth-century essay. Scholarship will never be able to correct this great error quickly, but most certainly it is worth the attempt in order to put the case right. The ecclesiastical record demands this, to say nothing of preserving these essays from an association that was at best an adoption. Such monuments and testaments cannot so easily be moved.

All that has been said applies to America alone, for Britain quite literally was without the curse. To understand why that is true would also take some lengthy study, going much beyond the one or two reasons already offered. Britain and her colonies account for the largest number of

recipients of The Fundamentals outside America, and they were not abused in any way. It was the American situation solely wherein that occurred, as Fundamentalism was peculiarly American. It was not until decades later that Britain even used the term, and then mostly for extra-mural references. As for Germany and the Continent, that was another situation entirely. With the mid-century, however, American conservative religion was to find itself in other hands. The fundamentalists continued and still do, but decreasingly, though they are militant. Many concerned evangelicals through those decades held on to their classical inheritance and waited patiently for such time to put it forward once again. That came once the effects of the second War had subsided. By no means were all conservatives in those decades fundamentalists, but as that aberration sounded so loudly then, it was only natural to lump them all together. Theological distinctions are often too subtle for the popular mind.

Names of any kind will not be given here to demonstrate exactly what took place in the 1950s. Again, that is a complicated subject in itself and is only here noted to suggest the outline. However, it is worth mentioning one name only in order to stake down a rallying point for this new theological shift, that is the fortnightly periodical Christianity Today, which was started in the mid-1950s. To name that alone is to draw to mind nearly an endless list of persons, organizations, and institutions from across the

world, literally, which would claim to stand for classical evangelicalism, with its roots firmly in the Reformation. While it is an American publication, a great attempt has been made for it to reflect and appeal to the world-wide evangelical establishment. Also, it has tried to speak to a great number of issues that are not purely theological and ecclesiastical. Interestingly enough, it has itself published a series of thirteen booklets entitled "Fundamentals of the Faith", which bear many similarities to, though are only a fraction of the size of this collection. The theological emphasis of this periodical, and hence rather representative of the evangelical constituency, is very like that of The Fundamentals, except that dispensationalism is much less an issue, if at all. Indeed, it would be highly questioned. Other differences there are, but admittedly both have sought to extract the best principles from their opposition and include them together with a strong biblical loyalty, thereby to continue in that long tradition of evangelical concern for the soul as well as the body. That was most certainly true with the tradition of The Fundamentals. But, again, when Fundamentalism neglected that, it became all too easy to believe that any theology so biblically centered would do so necessarily. For that reason alone, the revived evangelicalism in America has had a long battle to convince that it, too, is most concerned for this immense lack. And that will never stop because of the nature of the subject.

Indeed, the evangelical humpty-dumpty was broken in countless pieces by Fundamentalism, and American evangelism has had to spend so much of its time with repair before it could even begin to deal with the current issues which faced it. Just as formerly, so too with the current movement, there has been and will be criticism from many quarters, but that is to be expected. This new evangelicalism, and it is often referred to as that by writers, has tried from the outset to disassociate itself from bigoted Fundamentalism. At best, it would claim somewhat the same biblical loyalty, though not an absurd literalness, with the accompanying emphasis on personal salvation. In terms of social, intellectual, and ecclesiastical concerns, there is hardly a comparison, as these were considered worldly and unrelated. They have a most marked interest in ecumenism, which Fundamentalism abhors, and which several of the authors of The Fundamentals had a great concern for, especially at Edinburgh. When the one or two similarities and countless dissimilarities are set down, it is instantly obvious that both the seed-bed of and The Fundamentals themselves missed out a generation or two in the birth of true heirs. For the association with the intervening Fundamentalism made for only an illegitimate family.

In briefest outline such is the story from 1918 to the present, which does round off the study of The Fundamentals themselves and why they were written. Throughout the thesis has been clearly to demonstrate that these were

written in response to history in order to aid a cause, and by pointing up these post-War factors in relation has hopefully freed them from direct implication therein, which situation in itself contains two or three more theses to be demonstrated. It would not be at all surprising to discover that from the second War on these documents were virtually unknown, certainly in terms of the numbers and calibre of those who formerly knew them. Because they responded to their own situation so absolutely, in another age they could well be automatically anachronistic in detail, though not in spirit. Their spirit is easily identified after the first six volumes, to say nothing of twelve, and to place that alongside the spirit of Fundamentalism is only to try to mix what essentially will not. An open mind and a closed one occupy two different worlds. That is definitely not the case come mid-century, and how enlightening to discover that evangelicals today speak of The Fundamentals as a standard and breadth of view worth having again. This collection has been considered in the light of the philosophical discussions of history earlier in this chapter, and their contribution to and outgrowth from ecclesiastical history cannot be disputed.

The criticism can be levelled that in these last pages much has been said without documentation. Perhaps that is legitimate in this instance, when such comment has been given only in order to bring the entire study from its own limits into focus with the present, when after all Victorian Christianity is still within living memory. And

Victorian Christianity is the correct label for The Fundamentals, and not Edwardian and Georgian, because it was to Victorian situations that they addressed themselves, and their authors were eminently Victorian men. To append a glimpse of the future which unknowingly was to be theirs to a study of them seems only fitting, especially when they held fast to a subject and faith that knows not boundaries. Further concluding remarks should not be necessary, as the story has been unfolded with every attempt to treat the issues and questions as they arose and within that immediate context. In that way, as the study proceeded compounded questions could be met with, thus making each part complete in itself and not kept waiting for some kind of clearance in the end, when the issues have gone stale. The Fundamentals have been discussed in themselves from beginning to end, contextually and individually and corporately. Their place in modern Protestant church history has been noted throughout, both explicitly and implicitly.

In those words of the prophet Isaiah (VIII: 20), "To the Law and to the Testimony", which was the guiding text for this entire venture, having been printed at the front of each volume, the study of The Fundamentals has reached its own natural completion. To the law of history they spoke appropriately and convincingly, and to the testimony of the Word of God magnificently. In no case could there have been one without the other if reason and understanding there was to be. The Fundamentals are an admirable

piece of ecclesiastical history, and that they have been silenced by the normal flow of history is reason enough to uncover them again, even to see if they might contain a word for another time. Because they were concerned with the soul and the mind, they do. What is more, because they are truly a product of history their word will not wither, but take its place in the chronicles of men as well as the providence of God.

