

1829.

1889.

PAMPHLET SOUVENIR

—OF THE—

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY

—IN THE HISTORY OF—

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

—CONTAINING—

PAPERS READ BEFORE THE LANE CLUB.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

---

CINCINNATI, O.:  
ELM STREET PRINTING CO., 176 ELM ST.  
1890.

# Lane's Theologians and Their Theology.

BY PROF. E. D. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D.

(Read before the Lane Club, December 10th, 1889.)

TWENTY years ago, on the twenty-sixth day of November, the friends of Lane Seminary were gathered in these grounds to commemorate the close of the fortieth year in the life of this beloved Institution. A second reason for the assemblage and the celebration lay in the fact that on the tenth day of the same month the reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church had been formally consummated at Pittsburg. It was fitly remembered that, although the Seminary had for thirty years been affiliated closely with but one of these branches, it had been organized before the dark days of the separation; and might therefore be regarded as the creation and inheritance of the now united Church. It was also believed that the reunion, under conditions so cordial and auspicious, would open wider doors of service and usefulness to the Institution, and prove to be for it, as for the Church, the beginning of a larger, grander career.

Twenty years have passed, and we are here to celebrate with gratitude to God, the sixtieth anniversary in the life of the Seminary, and the twentieth in the organic existence of the great denomination for whose advantage it was founded, and with whose remarkable development it has had the privilege of being happily and vitally associated. In such celebration we have abundant occasion in both aspects to sing great songs of praise in memory of the past, and to frame new purposes of consecration, to gird ourselves for larger endeavors, in view of the expanding and attractive future opening alike before the Institution and the Church.

It is not my purpose at this time to tell the suggestive story of these twenty years; to speak of the general growth and progress of Lane Seminary during this somewhat critical period in its history, or of the

wonderful things which God has wrought in and for the Presbyterian Church. Among the many specific themes which this conjunction of historic events suggests, my mind has been turned toward one which has not hitherto received the connected treatment it deserves, and whose presentation at this time for several reasons seems to be fitly devolved upon me. That theme is *Our Theologians and Their Theology*; considered especially in their relations to the belief and the career of our united Church.

The first incumbent of the theological chair in Lane Seminary was Lyman Beecher, *clarum et venerabile nomen*. Born and educated in Connecticut, a graduate of Yale College and a student of theology under President Dwight; a young pastor first on Long Island; then for sixteen years a minister at Litchfield, where the foundations of his fame were laid; afterward for six years the occupant of an important pulpit in Boston, just at a time when evangelical orthodoxy was beginning to make successful headway against the dominating forces of Unitarianism, headed by the eloquent Channing; always in the forefront of the battle in behalf of what he conceived to be the faith once delivered to the saints; recognized as a writer of rare vigor, as well as a commanding preacher, Dr. Beecher came to this Institution after a first and then a second election, at the close of 1832, and three years after the Academic Department had been established. He became almost immediately, not only the President of the Seminary, but also the pastor of the Second Church in this city, and a welcome leader in all church affairs; entering thus, in the prime of his powers, on a career in which for eighteen years of mingled sunshine and shadow he won for himself his last, if not his highest laurels, as a teacher and preacher of righteousness.

It was the dream of Dr. Beecher after his retirement, that he might be able to prepare his System of Theology for the press; but that dream, like many others of like character, failed of realization. From the three manuscript volumes of his lectures, now in possession of the Seminary, it would be impossible to draw out such a sketch of his System as would do justice to his memory. These manuscripts are in such condition, from their obscure chirography, from the numberless erasures and alterations, from defective and shifting arrangements, and from general lack of method and order, as almost to defy the most loyal and patient attempts at interpretation. Furthermore, few men were less bound by manuscript or by strict rules of method,

or were readier at any time to make digressions from a preconceived line of procedure. One of his most competent and accomplished pupils (Rev. Dr. Tuttle), in an article on Dr. Beecher, written shortly after his decease, gives us some conception of his manner and mode of instruction in these words :

“ As a teacher, Dr. Beecher was not very systematic. \* \* \*

Our notes show that he began to lecture our class on the abstruse themes of Butler's Analogy. Among our most delightful hours were those spent in listening to his illuminated lectures on Butler ; and we hope to see these lectures in print, although it is certain that some of the best parts of them were never written. Then came his lectures on Existence, Cause and Effect, and Mental Philosophy, followed by the lectures on Conscience, by far the most thrilling discourses we ever heard from him. He first delivered them out of place, as to the System, to our class, and we heard them a second time in one of the Cincinnati churches. We regard the occasion when he spoke of the Power of Conscience as among the grandest exhibitions of his pulpit powers. After this splendid episode of lectures on Conscience, came his course on the Will, the Affections, and Moral Government ; and in the midst of a discussion of his favorite theories of Man's Free Agency, the whole course was dislocated by the introduction of his lectures on the Trinity.”

So far as his system of theology can be traced from his tangled and blurred manuscript, his instructions fell under two main divisions. The first of these contained what he describes as the elementary doctrines : the being of God, the divine attributes, the image of God in man, the law of God, the character of man, the divine decrees, the plan of redemption. The second division included the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the atonement, election and pardon, the work of the Spirit, the means of grace, repentance and faith, human responsibility under the gospel, the day of judgment, eternal life and eternal death. This, at least, was his general outline, though it is doubtful whether he followed it from year to year, without marked and sometimes startling variations. It was originally in substance the system which he had learned from his revered teacher, though Dr. Dwight, at least in the pulpit, gave much greater prominence to some single branches, such as the exposition of the moral law as revealed in Scripture. There were two special influences acting upon Dr. Beecher at later stages in his history, which had great effect upon at least the proportions, if not the substance of his theology. These came espe-

cially from his two great controversies with the Unitarianism of eastern New England, touching the sinfulness and depravity of man, and the full divinity and vicarious mediation of our Lord. In his efforts to defend against such antagonists as Channing, the evangelical doctrine as to man and his moral needs, he had been led to emphasize in his own mind, and perhaps unduly, the voluntary element in all sinning, and had consequently lost in some degree, the sense of what sin is as a state of the soul, involving some species of hereditary taint and of transmitted guiltiness. His strong and stirring conceptions of the moral government of God, derived partly from Butler and partly from Edwards, had doubtless strengthened and confirmed this tendency. So his profound belief in the divinity of Christ, in the necessity for his mediation, in the need of an atonement to satisfy justice and meet the claims of this divine government, in the moral ability and consequent responsibility of every sinner, in conversion on the part of man as correlative to regeneration as an act of God, gave a peculiar cast and tone to all he taught, even at some hazard of dislocation in his teaching and of incompleteness in his System as a whole.

Those who have read his famous sermon on the "Faith Once Delivered to the Saints," preached at an ordination in Worcester, two years before Dr. Beecher removed to Boston, will remember the remarkable summary of evangelical truth with which that discourse began. There can be little doubt that the author of that summary was a Calvinist, in whose very heart the great distinguishing features of the Calvinistic system were sacredly treasured. This judgment is confirmed by his able defense of his position against the criticisms of his Unitarian opponents. To class him among Pelagians or even among Arminians after that defense, would be impossible to any mind not influenced by the *rabies theologorum*. Nor was there ever a time when such a classification could be justified by fair and full evidence. It was true, as alleged against him in his famous trial, that in emphasizing the responsibility of the sinner, and the guilt which attaches to voluntary and personal transgression, he sometimes made too little of the doctrine of depravity in the nature, in some sense transmitted from our first parents, and the source of all actual sins. It was true, that in urging the guilt of every soul for its own sin, he seemed at times to make too little of the fact that we are by nature the children of wrath, and are by original sin as well as by actual transgression exposed to the divine judgment and condemnation. It is true, that in pressing sinners to the point of repentance and faith—in calling upon

them to work out their own salvation by the most strenuous efforts of which they were capable, taking the kingdom of heaven as by violence—he occasionally appeared to be laying too little stress on the helplessness of the soul apart from grace, and on the indispensableness of the work of the Spirit in order to salvation. But on the other hand, no one who candidly reads his discourses bearing on these great antithetic aspects of the gospel, or who studies his Views of Theology, which contains his defense of himself in the ecclesiastical trial through which he was compelled to pass, can have any serious doubt as to the sincerity of his convictions on these vital points of doctrine, or of his essential loyalty to that system of theology in which these doctrines figure as essential elements. That his thinking and teaching were somewhat one-sided and out of proportion, may readily be admitted; that it was heretical, few would now affirm.

That Lyman Beecher rendered valuable service to American Calvinism, and to the theological training of the Presbyterian Church, can not be denied. Unquestionably he did much, even by his exaggerations of the opposite, to arrest certain tendencies toward narrow and mischievous extremes in doctrine which had revealed themselves in some quarters—extremes which limited the range of the atonement, narrowed down the scope of election, denied the salvable condition of man, exalted the sovereignty of God to the point of arbitrariness, held to reprobation even from eternity, and, in a word, turned Calvinism into a species of Christian fatalism which was destructive not merely to sound belief but also to vital religion. From such liabilities, subtle and dangerous, it was his special mission to free the mind and the heart of the Church. In proclaiming with almost passionate zeal the pureness of the gospel, the adequacy of redeeming grace, the fullness of the Spirit, the world-wide offers of mercy, the guilt of the sinner for every instant of delay, he not only corrected certain injurious tendencies in the minds of men in those days, but also implanted the seeds of a younger and fresher type of Calvinism, whose rapid growth and influence are at this moment the wonder of us all. Thus, when for example, it is proposed to improve our Confession by the addition of "a full and definite statement of the love of God for all men, the free offer of salvation to all, and the obligation of the Church to preach the gospel of salvation to all the world," we can not fail to recognize in such a proposition the direct embodiment in confessional terms of what Dr. Beecher held and taught in this Institution fifty years ago. And when, for another example, it is proposed

to eliminate from the Confession the implication that there are infants not elect, and to declare that all infants dying in infancy are saved by the grace of Christ through the wonderful efficacy of the Spirit, we should not forget that among American divines it was Lyman Beecher who, before he became a teacher here, openly advocated this broader view, and gave it currency first in New England and then in the Presbyterian Church.

That the first occupant of the Chair of Theology in this institution was a great theologian, can hardly be claimed. Constitutionally he was builded for a great preacher, and there are those who regard his transplantation to another sphere and work at the age of nearly three-score as a mistake. What he might have become had he been called to the task of teaching divinity twenty years earlier, no one can well determine. As it was, the wonder is that, beginning at that late period of life, oppressed with a multitude of domestic cares, loaded down by the demands of a large parish, called in many directions to deliver addresses, organize churches, preach in revivals, and all the while weighted with burdens and perplexities connected with the Seminary in its impoverished condition, he was able to do half what he did in his difficult department of service. But besides all this, if there is one thing which stands especially in the way of calm, consecutive, successful study of divine things, it is the fact of being suspected and criticised by unfriendly minds—of having both ability and orthodoxy ruthlessly challenged—of being compelled, as he was, to enter on the pitiable task of ecclesiastical defense against the charge of disloyalty to the accepted faith. In such a world as this, it is the too frequent result of eminence, that one becomes an object of envious and carping criticism, and has his noblest feelings and aspirations repressed, and his best endeavors impaired and even frustrated at the hands of narrower and meaner minds. Dr. Beecher experienced all this in an unusual degree, and must have been conscious, even with his buoyant and generous nature, that his career in Lane was far from being what it might have been under more propitious conditions. And when, at length, at the ripe age of seventy-five, and burdened with the painful sense of failing powers, he retired from his post, there must have been an indescribable element of sadness mingling in his soul with the just consciousness that he had been permitted to do a great work here for the truth and for the Church of God.

On the retirement of Dr. Beecher in 1851, Professor Allen, who had for eleven years occupied the Chair of Sacred Rhetoric, was

transferred to the vacant post, and continued to serve the Seminary as a teacher of theology until 1867, when his health gave way entirely, and he removed to Granville, O., where, after a long period of progressive enfeeblement in both body and mind, he died in November, 1870. I have had an opportunity on another occasion to speak of the general services of Dr. Allen to this Institution during the twenty-seven years of his active connection with it, and especially during the sixteen years of his theological professorship, when the main burden of caring for its material interests rested far too heavily on his willing shoulders. What he was as a theologian it is now my privilege to describe, not in my own words, but in the language of a beloved colleague—Dr. Evans—who knew him intimately when a student under his instruction, and who afterward became still more fully intimate with him as an associate in the Faculty for the four years preceding his retirement. The following outline has been prepared by Dr. Evans at my request for this occasion :

Dr. Allen's pre-eminent merit as a teacher was clearness, and like water which is so clear that sometimes we take for granted it can not be deep, his treatment of great themes might at times leave the impression at first that it was marked by almost elementary simplicity. It was only as we reviewed the ground, or from some advanced vantage-point surveyed in their broad affiliations the well-defined, far-reaching, much-embracing statements which had seemed so simple, that we realized the full extent and value of our possessions. His method of teaching was by lectures. His own course was the best vindication of the method. No text-book certainly could have given us his system in its organic completeness, philosophical development and logical unity.

The lectures were so orderly and luminous that it was easy to take notes of them. Inability to report them would have been proof of dullness, which of itself should have been esteemed a disqualification for the ministry. One peculiarity may be noted here which, I found exceedingly helpful. In beginning the study of some great theme, e. g., the Atonement, the discussion would start from a tentative general statement, embodying the central idea or fact in its simplest protoplasmic form. This was then unfolded, point by point, part by part, in all their several implications and bearings, difficulties were stated and examined, qualifications were suggested and weighed, col-



lateral considerations presented and adjusted, until the end was reached in the shape of an enlarged and completed statement, in which all the vital factors of the discussion seemed spontaneously to crystallize. In a word, the inductive process which had been pursued in the study was reproduced in the lecture-room, so that each student could see the way to work out the problem for himself.

The first fifteen minutes of the hour were generally given to a review of the preceding lecture, and free conversation on the subject. This was always interesting and profitable, and not seldom absorbed the larger half of the hour. Dr. Allen's genial spirit, accessible, unassuming manner, and brotherly sympathy, invited confidence, and encouraged the independent expression of thought. The simplicity and sincerity of the man disarmed all idle and captious inquisitiveness, while every honest inquiry was entertained with frank hospitality. His remarks were short, clear, and always to the point. He was quick to see the weakness of a false position, and enjoyed beyond most men the logical luxury of a *reductio ad absurdum*. At the same time the kindly twinkle of his eye was no less persuasive than his logic or didactic was convincing; and to a company of theologues befogged with theological chimeras, his straightforward, homely common sense was like a stream of pure air and a river of sunshine to the stifled, bat-ridden prisoners of a cave. Especially considerate, cordial and helpful was he in dealing with the peculiar individual difficulties and struggles which were carried to the privacy of his own study, where, even more than in the lecture-room, the heart of the man, the deep experience of the theologian, brought not only mental relief, but spiritual benediction.

Dr. Allen's definition of Christian Theology is: "The Science of God manifested in Christ." The only safe method to be pursued in constructing it he believes to be the inductive. The constructive principle of unity for it he states to be "the incarnation and work of Christ, in order to render it possible that divine favor might be extended to the guilty consistently with the demands of sovereign authority;" or "more briefly, the incarnation and death of Christ for the purpose of harmonizing the justice and mercy of God." The system, it will thus be seen, is characteristically Christo-centric. "The essential features of a system constructed on this principle" are thus specified:

1. It will exalt the righteousness of God's law and government, placing holiness, or obedience to the law and government of God,

above everything else ; above happiness, station, fame, honor, or any other form of good.

"2. It will present the depravity of the transgressor so that it will be seen that, if a righteous law takes its course without mercy, he will perish.

"3. It will present the bearing of Atonement on the righteousness of the universe, or the sustaining of a righteous law.

"4. It will exhibit the consequent freedom of grace.

"5. Also the reinstating of the sinner who accepts the Atonement, both in a righteous state and in a holy character, as conditions of happiness.

"6. And finally, the abiding misery of those who reject the Atonement."

Along these fundamental lines the development of the system advances from beginning to end.

The two great divisions of the system are : *God as Supreme Ruler, and God as Redeemer*. In discussing the Being of God, the preference is given, as might have been expected from the author's Baconianism, to the *a posteriori* argument in its various forms—cosmological, teleological, moral, although the *a priori* (ontological) argument receives fair attention and close criticism. The Attributes of God, fitting him to rule, are defined and described with exact discriminations. The Chief End of God in Creation is defined to be the realization of his own glory as the sum of all excellence and blessedness, both for God himself and for all his creatures. The immortal analysis of the subject by Jonathan Edwards is indorsed, with thoughtful qualifications of his phraseology.

After the Ruler and His End, comes the Plan by which He rules, commonly, but as Dr. Allen thinks, less satisfactorily, designated the Decrees of God. The ground of this Plan is the Sovereign Will of God, thus defined : "A will uncontrolled by any higher power, and always acting in the light of absolute, infinite knowledge and benevolence." The vexed question of the relation of Divine Sovereignty to man's Free Agency is treated with humility, candor and due reserve, the key to the working solution of the problem being found in the distinction between necessity and certainty, a distinction more fully elaborated in the analysis of the Action of the Will, which is given further on.

The Execution of the Plan is then taken up in the two-fold sphere of Creation and Government. The former head introduces the discus-

sion of the history, order and time of creation, and the nature and properties of created things. Here the discussion, while embracing a brief outline of angelology, centres in Matter and Man. Under Matter the chief point of interest is the reality and potency of secondary causes, argued in the affirmative with vigor and acuteness. Here, as elsewhere in his philosophy we see distinct traces of the influence of Reid and Hamilton.

The doctrine of Man is elaborated with great fullness and profundity. Dr. Allen, at this point, introduces an admirable summary of his system of Mental and Moral Philosophy. This is fundamental to his theology as the science of God as Ruler and Redeemer. Stress is laid on the inductive method here again. The sources of our knowledge are found in the Bible in consciousness and in observation. The three departments of man's being are given as the Intelligence, the Sensibilities and the Will, representing the three-fold activity of Thought, Feeling and Choice. In the sphere of Intellect we find three distinctions of the mind as knowing: Consciousness, as knowing the Me; as knowing the Not-Me, Reason and Understanding; the former the organ of necessary truth, the latter of contingent ideas.

The validity of the deliverances of consciousness is strenuously maintained. This is characteristic of Dr. A.'s system everywhere.

The law of the reason's action is thus stated: "There must be in the mind an idea of an object or event, as the occasion of the mind's action in apprehending a necessary truth. Body, *e. g.*, suggests to the mind, or is the occasion of its having the idea of space." While certain ideas are intuitive and necessary when they exist at all, they do not come into existence in the sphere of consciousness or mental action, without an antecedent occasion, *not cause*. The term 'understanding' includes all the varied activities of mind which do not fall into the preceding categories, such as perception, conception, association, abstraction, deductive or inductive reasoning, etc.

"The primary law of the sensibilities is the law of necessity. By this is meant that the mind is so constructed that certain feelings result necessarily from the presentation of the objects to which they correspond. Appetite for food is instinctive or natural." But this law needs to be supplemented by another, to-wit, that it is within the power of man's will to control both the exercise or indulgence of these sensibilities, and the disposition or state of heart on which man's susceptibilities and affections largely depend. Hence, while on the one hand there is in the action of the sensibilities an element of constitu-

tional necessity, there is, on the other hand, a voluntary element which correlates them to the divine law.

Dr. Allen's treatment of the Will, which is of a special and elaborate character, is a fine example of masterly analysis. The preference is given to this definition: "Will is the power of an alternative election." The classification of choices is an important section of the discussion. They are divided into three classes: (1) Generic, "the act of the soul determining the chief end of its being." (2) Specific, "the executive volitions by which the abiding preference is expressed and carried out." (3) Irregular, "such as have no obvious connection with the governing, and may be in conflict with the generic." Here belong the bad actions of good men, or the relatively good actions of bad men.

But what is the relation of the will to the other powers of the mind? To the intellect it stands related thus: "There must be an intellectual apprehension of an object of choice." To the sensibilities thus: The object apprehended by the intellect must affect, move the sensibilities to or from itself. "The sensibilities are thus the link between the intellect and the will, the channel of influence," motive power, "from the one to the other." This combined action of the mind and sensibility constitutes what is commonly called a motive to a choice, understanding by motive—in the language of Edwards, "all that which moves, excites, or invites the mind to volition."

The strength of the motive depends on a variety of considerations: the nature of the object presented, the condition of the intellect and of the sensibilities, the governing or generic purpose, etc. The motive, however, is the occasion, the condition of the mind's action, not the producing cause of the choice. Here Dr. A. breaks with necessitarianism. The will, in responding to the motive, is left free. There is no compulsion, no such necessity as rules in the realm of matter. The essential idea which lies at the foundation of responsibility, is the power of alternative choice in respect to one's own end of being (generic choice). The idea of this liberty is a simple and necessary idea, having, indeed, like all simple and necessary ideas, its chronological antecedent, to-wit, the consciousness of conflicting claims, or of the conflicting influences of different motives or desires. The reality of the idea is attested by the sense of personal responsibility, the testimony of Scripture, and that of consciousness.

My limits will not permit even a summary of Dr. A.'s masterly

analysis of the relation of motive to the action of the will. Suffice it to state briefly the leading points.

We recognize in the history of moral, responsible action, the following stages :

*First stage :* The antecedents : partly external, objective, furnishing the occasion, and the material of the motive ; partly subjective, psychological, conditioning the strength of the motive, its moving power.

*Second stage :* The response of the mind : the movement of the sensibilities, accompanied by a comparison and balancing between the claims of the object with those of its opposite.

*Third stage :* The final, decisive act of choice. In respect to this choice, note the following points :

(1). The antecedents of choice are substantially the same in all, lying as they do on one side in the inherent qualities of the objects of choice, their attractiveness, their adaptations to our appetencies and needs, in a word, their moving power, and on the other side in the psychological conditions of the agent.

(2). The connection between the motive and the responsive action of the mind is accordingly that of antecedent and consequent, and partakes of the quality of law in the uniformity, universality and certainty of its operation.

(3). The connection, however, is that of antecedent and consequent, having for its exponent *certainty* ; not that of cause and effect, having for its exponent *necessity*. However uniform and certain the result, the mind acts as an independent, self-determining agent, always reserving to itself the power and the right of making the alternative choice. Without this there can be no such freedom as makes responsibility intelligible or possible.

These positions are fundamental and of supreme importance, as we shall see at the central and vital points of the system. Before leaving them let me call special attention to this entire scheme of Mental Philosophy as definitive of the broad, thoroughgoing and consistent Calvinism of the theology in the emphasis laid on the principle of certainty on the one side, correlating human actions to the decretive will of God, and in the emphasis laid on the principle of freedom and responsibility on the other, correlating human actions to the preceptive will of God.

Dr. Allen's Moral Philosophy is no less carefully and skillfully elaborated, and no less closely wrought into the very marrow of his

system. I can only touch on two or three points. The question, "What is Right?" is answered in two ways:

(1). Right in the abstract is defined to be "that quality of moral acts which excites the feeling of oughtness or obligation, which calls forth the mind's approbation, and excites the emotion of complacency and pleasure, and gives rise to the idea of good desert."

(2). Right in the concrete is defined to be Love. The argument to establish this conclusion is (whether it be deemed absolutely satisfactory or no) certainly the strongest I have ever met with, displaying the keenest psychological insight, and pregnant with practical significance.

The question, "What is Conscience?" is at the close of a long and profound analysis thus answered: "Conscience is a complex term under which are comprehended the following facts of our moral nature:

1. The intuitive apprehension of the rightness of benevolence in the broadest sense.

2. The feeling of oughtness or obligation to be benevolent.

3. The feeling of complacency or remorse, pleasure or pain, in view of oneself as being or not being benevolent.

The real intention and use of conscience, thus defined, is pronounced to be "simply to correlate the human mind to the law of God, to link intelligence and virtue together, to bind man with God." The judgment may be at fault in particular instances in determining what the law of love may require or prohibit; but whatever is believed to be so required or forbidden is of binding force, felt to be such. "Thus conscience binds man to virtue and to God. A law designed to bind all created mind together, and all to God, the Creator, would be of no use unless its binding force were recognized. There must be that in the mind on which law fastens, with which it can grapple. There must be correlation as of loadstone to iron. So conscience correlates free mind to the law of God."

The whole discussion of conscience and of morals is the product of a master mind, moving with the ease of conscious power in the realm of the central, eternal principles of the divine government, and of the laws and facts of human nature; and is throughout intended and calculated to establish the absolute, eternal, immutable factors of God's government, to account for the relative, the phenomenal, the variable in human nature and experience; to correlate man's moral being to God's law, to justify duty, to maintain and quicken the sense of

responsibility, to illustrate the processes of sin and of salvation, and to vindicate the claims of God to unconditional obedience, as these claims are urged upon us through nature, consciousness or revelation, through law or gospel.

In considering the execution of God's plan in government, the interest of the treatment centres in the moral administration of the plan. Here the New England elements of the system come into special prominence. Dr. Taylor's impress is noticeable, although some of that great theologian's leading theories and conclusions are vigorously and successfully contested. The following positions are laid down as fundamental :

"Law must be maintained by appropriate and adequate sanctions. The sanctions of law are the rewards of obedience in the form of enjoyment, and the penalties of disobedience in the form of suffering."

"The character or measure of the sanctions of law depends on the importance of the ends at which government aims. If those ends are of infinite value, then the rewards must be immeasurably precious, and the penalties immeasurably dreadful."

"It follows that the reward due to obedience is perfect happiness while obedience continues."

"It follows also that the penalty of disobedience must be perfect and endless misery. Nothing less can express God's estimate of the value of the end he seeks." And here we have the true measure of the ill-desert of sin.

Dr. Allen's Hamartiology is at once speculatively philosophical and profound, and concrete, psychological, practical. Dogmatic refinements and subtleties are brushed aside like so many cobwebs, and the realities of the situation are grasped and set forth with a firm hand. Note the following statements :

"Objectively : As related to law, sin is the voluntary transgression of it. As related to God, it is a personal affront to his authority ; it is opposition to his personal character ; it is revolt from his service.

"Subjectively : Sin is the abiding preference of the soul for what law forbids, or the abiding opposition of the soul to what the law requires. Or, in its concrete form, sin is selfishness."

In discussing guilt, the emphasis comes not on the legal sense of the term as represented by the Latin *reus*, but on the moral ; subjectively as the reaction of sin on the sinner himself in the personal conviction of wrong-doing ; objectively as the conviction of a wrong done to God, carrying with it still further the obligation to sustain law by rendering

satisfaction, or, in other words, by enduring punishment. Its measure has already been given in the measure of ill-desert.

In treating of punishment, Dr. Allen adheres throughout to the strict judicial sense of the term as "suffering inflicted for the transgression of law, by proper authority, in the execution of a judicial sentence, and for the purpose of sustaining and honoring the law."

In this strict sense punishment is not administered in this life, regarded as a period of gracious probation. The penalty is suspended for all by the Atonement; the sufferings of the present are *disciplinary*, not penal.

Dr. Allen's rigid insistence on these definitions of guilt and punishment was significant of certain essential features of his theologic thinking, as *e. g.*:

(1). His aversion to a theology which could not be preached, and commended to men's consciences.

(2). His conviction that a double sense of fundamental terms in ethics and religion, wherein the secondary sense involves not only a departure from the primary, but to some extent a contradiction of it, can only work confusion and mischief.

(3). His belief that the above definitions are essential to a true appreciation of the tragic fact of suffering in God's universe, and of its relations to sin:

*a.* On the part of men in this life—disciplinary, to purify from sin.

*b.* On the part of Christ—sacrificial, to atone for sin, by furnishing a divine expression or measure of the ill-desert of sin, which constitutes an equivalent of the expression or measure of ill-desert furnished by the endless sufferings of the transgressor.

*c.* On the part of the lost—penal, to punish sin.

The historical aspects of the fall are considered appropriately under the head of the execution of the divine plan in moral government.

In this connection the divine permission of evil receives attention.

While the essentially insoluble character of the problem is fully recognized, Dr. Allen is inclined to the statement that evil is—not as

Bellamy and others say, necessary, but incidental to the wisest administration of a moral system.

The second great division of the course introduces us to God as Redeemer.

Here first we have the ground of the possibility of Redemption in



the Trinity, which leads to the examination of the doctrine of the Trinity, and in particular of the person and work of Christ.

In considering the work of Redemption, our attention is directed first to the disease or the condition of the race in consequence of the fall. Throughout the discussion the emphasis is laid on the facts of Scripture and of consciousness, rather than on human speculations. The first sin was an act of free self-determination. It consisted in the choice of self rather than God, as the end of the life. It was thus a generic, permanent choice, decisive of character and of destiny. It brought our first parents under the condemnation of the law, and under the power of selfishness (self-indulgence), through the derangement of the sensibilities.

The fall having taken place, it was open to God to execute the sentence of death at once. But he suspended the sentence, inaugurated at once a system of Redemption, introduced a new form of probation, not legal as the former, but gracious, under which the curse of sin becomes disciplinary, especially under the reinforcing stimulus of the hope inspired by grace.

But Adam's Fall involves his posterity. The race becomes depraved. Two great laws co-operate to bring about this result: The Law of Descent—"like begets like," and here Dr. Allen is a Traducianist—and the Law of Social Liability. These two laws suffice to account for the facts, and meet all the requirements of Scripture teaching on the subject. The Manicheism, which derives sin from matter; the Realism, which attributes universal depravity to generic identity with Adam; the Federalism, which puts imputation before depravity; the Transcendentalism, which locates the Fall in a timeless pre-existence—all these theories are subjected to a rigorous examination, and rejected on scriptural and philosophical grounds; and universal depravity is referred to the laws of heredity and the social solidarity of the race. The depraved nature which we inherit from our first parents implies a diseased personal and social organism, the beclouded intelligence and the deranged sensibilities, which, as antecedents of volition, re-enforced by the moral chaos of the social environment, ensure for each and for every one the choice of self as the first, generic, abiding choice which determines character and destiny.

After a careful analysis of the nature and extent of the diseased condition, we are brought to the remedy—the work of the Redeemer, as Prophet, Priest and King. The interest here centres in Christ's work as Priest, or the Atonement, of which the following general

statement is given: "The Atonement is a government transaction, having immediate reference to the power and authority of moral government in view of the suspension of penalty, or offer of pardon, and the bestowment of pardon on certain conditions. Its immediate object is to sustain the law and government of God in another way than by executing the penalty on the transgressor. It does this by means of the sufferings and death of Christ as a substitute for the execution of the penalty, through the influence of those sufferings and that death on the sinner himself and upon the universe." It should be added that in Dr. Allen's intention this definition includes the satisfaction of justice, justice being the divine attribute specially concerned with the upholding of law and government, so that whatever secures that end satisfies justice.

The necessity of the Atonement is proved from the fact of its institution, from the necessities of law and government, from the requirements of God's justice, from the requirements of his benevolence, from the demands made by the greatest good of the universe, and is confirmed by the workings of conscience, by the experience of the race, and by the teachings of Scripture.

The universality of the Atonement is argued from Scripture, from its nature and design, from its relations to the universal benevolence of God, who loves all, desires the salvation of all, has provided an Atonement to make salvation possible for all, who offers salvation to all, who applies the motive-power of the Atonement to persuade all to accept this offer, who, on the ground of the Atonement, has already suspended the penalty, instituted a gracious probation for all, bestows on all the influences of his Spirit, through whom he draws all to himself, leaving the responsibility of not coming to him on the man himself. The Atonement being the condition of all this universal provision of grace is of necessity universal. The *alls* of the gospel are emphasized throughout with special earnestness and love.

The consideration of the conditions of the bestowal of the blessings of the Atonement leads to the doctrine of Justification by Faith. The discussion, I need not say, is clear and evangelical, but needs no special reference here.

The application of the Atoning Work of Christ brings before us first, the Agent—the Holy Spirit, and the Plan—Election. It is most interesting to note that Dr. Allen, besides decisively rejecting Supra-lapsarianism, prefers to the ordinary Infra-lapsarianism, which regards Election as subsequent to the Fall, a third theory which

might be characterized as Sub-infralapsarianism, which regards Election as coming not only after the Fall but also after the Atonement, and as designed "to honor the Atoning Work of Christ by giving [and securing] to him a reward of his sufferings." Election is thus pre-eminently an outcoming of Love—the love of the Father for the Son blending with the Divine Love for the elect. The definition given of Election is accordingly this: "By Election we understand that God, having from eternity purposed to provide a Savior for the human family, and foreseeing that not one of them self-moved would accept of him, determined to exert upon a certain portion of them by his Holy Spirit such influences as would certainly and infallibly result in their repentance and faith and perseverance unto eternal life; and that in the Covenant of Redemption these were given to Christ as the rewards of his sufferings."

In discussing the ground or reason of Election, not only are we referred to the sovereignty of God and to his purpose to manifest his glory in all that he decrees and does, but also to the great characteristic of the system of Redemption as operating through Jesus Christ. Election, as already defined, is the purpose to render the Atonement effectual in the case of those who are given to Christ. Election and Atonement both centre in Christ. Both are made effectual through the same means of grace—the agency of the Spirit, and the instrumentality of the truth. Both aim at the same result—holiness. Hence, while we know not what the reasons of election are, we may well believe that they are associated in the Divine Mind with the workings of the scheme of redemption. "We locate them in redemption rather than law." The number of the elect, according to Scripture, is immensely large.

The actual application of atonement takes place by regeneration, which is thus defined: "A radical change of a man's character, produced by the agency of the Holy Ghost, in which, from being supremely selfish and therefore totally sinful, he begins to love God supremely, and therefore begins to be holy." The character of this great change is considered, the agency of the Spirit as involving the application of truth, and the control of antecedent influences and conditions determining the will, so as to insure the result without impairing man's liberty, the homiletic use of the doctrine—all these and related points are discussed *con amore*. I doubt whether any department of theology enlisted Dr. A.'s heart so thoroughly as this. His analytic psychologism, his doctrinal evangelicalism, and his practical

revivalism, found here their largest and finest scope. This remark will also include the discussion of Sanctification, or the Christian Life.

The remainder of the course was devoted to "The Result of Christ's Atoning work; or, Christ as King": embracing Ecclesiology and Eschatology, and need not specially detain us now.

Let me under a few heads emphasize the distinctive features of the theology of which a sketch has been thus attempted :

1. It was a logical unit, a complete organic whole.
2. Its organizing principle was Dr. A.'s philosophy—fundamentally that of Reid, with large modifications from Sir Wm. Hamilton and Cousin, in less measure from Coleridge, but chiefly from Dr. A. himself.
3. A mediating influence was constantly exerted by his teaching—in that he was always careful to point out how divergent views in theology were largely due to the application of varying philosophies.
4. His method was thoroughly inductive, *a priori* assumptions or reasonings being, for the most part, carefully eschewed.
5. The data of its inductions were mainly biblical. The number of passages cited as proof-texts was extraordinary. Nor was the lecturer content with referring to them. There was no small amount of exegesis, and the final impression received was a scriptural Q. E. D.
6. The data of consciousness were also largely utilized. Hence, as we have seen, the theology is pre-eminently psychological.
7. While the system was thus thoroughly and profoundly philosophical, it was at the same time singularly popular and practical. Abstractions, technicalities, artificialities were as much as possible put aside. It was characteristically a theology of common sense. A sly query in the vein of Socrates, a shrewd maxim or jest in the style of Benj. Franklin, would prick many a theological bubble.
8. While Dr. Allen's culture was by no means narrow, his theology was far rather the product of individual thinking than of extensive reading.
9. While strong on the intellectual side, it was a theology of the heart quite as much as of the intellect. The vital connections of theology and experience were never overlooked. His logic often melted in tears. Christianity in the system is far more than a creed, it is a religion.
10. Scarcely more is it a theology of the intellect and of the heart than a theology of the conscience. The idea of RIGHT is everywhere pivotal: in God and in man, in government and in redemption.

11. It is characteristically a revival theology, fitted to be an inspiration rather than an incubus in a season of religious interest, and to help the preacher both to awaken and to deal with a spirit of anxious inquiry.

12. At the same time it is a theology of edification, eminently adapted to promote growth in the knowledge and grace of Christ, and to inspire the activity of that LOVE which, according to it, is the Alpha and the Omega of the Christian religion.

The third incumbent of the theological chair was Dr. Henry A. Nelson, who entered upon his duties early in 1868. It should be said here that, for two years previous to the retirement of Dr. Allen, he had been so far disabled as to need assistance in his work. That assistance was rendered in 1866, and again in 1867, by Dr. Henry Smith, Professor of Sacred Rhetoric from 1855, with two intervals, until his death in January, 1879. On the retirement of Dr. Beecher in 1851, Dr. Smith had been invited to become the Professor of Theology, and was eminently fitted as a scholar and teacher to give instruction in that department, as well as in the chair to which he was called four or five years later. Educated in New England, versed in that type of Calvinistic doctrine which, originating with Jonathan Edwards, was represented in his youthful days by men like Dwight and Emmons, he had framed for himself a theological system which he held tenaciously, and which under favorable conditions he might have set forth here with commanding power. One who knew him well, (Rev. President Tuttle), has said of Dr. Smith as a theologian :

“My judgment may be partial, but to me he seemed—by his intellectual endowments and learning, his rigid analytic and logical habits, his fidelity to truth, especially as revealed in the Bible, his great eloquence, as well in the class-room as in the pulpit, his magnetic enthusiasm in what he taught, and also in teaching it, and withal the supreme crown of all his qualities, his devout piety—by all these he seemed to me to have qualifications for the department of theology of the highest order. Eminent as he was in other departments of education, he would have proved himself preëminent in this.” Though Dr. Smith left behind him no printed expositions of his system, those of us who listened to his series of discourses on the moral law and the moral government of God, can well appreciate the justice of this exalted estimate.

Dr. Nelson came into the Seminary from a pastoral care of twenty-two years, in two extensive and important parishes. He brought with

him into this new sphere, as Dr. Beecher had done, those warm and practical conceptions of Christian theology which would naturally arise in any active and earnest mind under the influence of such an experience as the actual ministry affords. Trained in the Seminary by one of the most vigorous, acute, systematic and philosophical teachers of our Church (Dr. Hickok), he had also learned by thoughtful experiment in how many ways the teaching of the school must be modified and moulded afresh in order to adjust it to the needs of the pulpit and the pastoral work. His own mind had long been chiefly interested in such modes of stating and illustrating gospel doctrine as proved themselves valuable in persuading sinners, edifying saints, instructing and developing the Church. And herein appeared that special usefulness which so largely characterized his work here. In other words, his success lay mainly in the fact that, drawing from such a well of personal experience, he was enabled to send his pupils out into the great field, well supplied with the body and substance of the Gospel in forms immediately available in the pulpit. Following one who had never filled the pastoral office, as he in turn had followed a great preacher and an eminent pastor, Dr. Nelson may be said to have completed the symmetry of Lane theology, and given permanence and worth to it as a theology for the people. Dr. Allen had indeed preached much, labored much and successfully in revivals, and had imparted to his pupils in a rare degree a type of doctrine which they could preach, and preach with power. To his successor it was given to take up essentially the same doctrinal system, and so to clothe it with argument and illustration, and so to emphasize it with the results of large observation and of earnest personal reflection upon divine things, as to make it still more available in the myriad exigencies of the pastoral sphere.

Those who have read the brief treatise of Dr. Nelson, published since his retirement, and entitled "Sin and Salvation," will readily apprehend both the substance of his system, and the forms in which he specially delighted to frame it. Its practical presentation of sin as an act, sin as a state of the soul, sin as a disease for which man can provide no remedy, sin as an inheritance, involving guilt and the doom of separation from God even in this life, and ultimately an eternal banishment from His presence, is both clear and strong. In this treatise the author takes no decisive position respecting the various Calvinistic theories of sin and guilt as associated with the Adamic transgression, though he evidently prefers the Edwardean view of a divine constitution of things, by which sinfulness flows down by natural

processes through the blood and life of the race. His main stress, however, like that of Beecher and Allen, is upon that personal element which is essential in all sin — upon that immediate form of guiltiness which involves not only exposure to retributive consequences, but also individual criminality. The entire treatise may be described as a thoroughly Calvinistic statement of the essential facts in the case, not so much for the eye of the speculative theologian, but rather in their living relation to the needs of the preacher.

In like manner the correlative fact of salvation is presented as primarily an act, an act often varying in its aspects and conditions, but always spiritual in substance ; an act wrought through the energies of the Spirit of God, working upon and within the sinful and corrupt soul. The author follows the example of Chalmers in dwelling much on sin as a disease, and on the mediatorial work of Christ as a remedy, including deliverance from delusion and disorder as well as guilt, and involving a loving return to God through the ministries of his Spirit, and a complete and everlasting union with him in glory. The full divinity of the Mediator, the greatness and preciousness of his mediatorial work, the worth and scope of the atonement as adequate to meet every demand of redemption, the freeness of the gift of the Spirit, and the consequent applicability and universality of the gospel, are clearly and strongly stated, though always in language and imagery that harmonize with the practical aim in view. Had Dr. Beecher or Dr. Allen prepared a volume under such a title and with such an aim, it would have been very much what this admirable treatise is. It may be they would have laid less stress on sin as a *vitium*, and more on sin as a *culpa*—would have been somewhat more inclined to set forth the strictly personal elements in sin, and its consequent criminality, and somewhat less disposed to see sin in its deeper organic forms, as a quality of human nature from which all actual transgressions do proceed. Yet the differences would have been theoretical and secondary ; the harmony is fundamental, is complete. The voices of the teachers might differ in tone and volume, but the utterance is one.

It will be remembered that the reunion, of which this occasion is in part commemorative, occurred within eighteen months after Dr. Nelson commenced his theological work. As one of the conspicuous minds in one branch of the Church, he had been summoned while still a pastor to a special service in connection with that union. He watched every stage of the process with assiduous and sympathetic interest, and when

the event occurred, his vote and his heart were in it. No hand grasped more cordially the spade with which, on that November day, we planted the Reunion elm on these grounds, and no one entered more trustfully than he on the new alliance then formed. He saw instantly how indispensable to its success the confidence of all parties in each other must be; how much must be overlooked, how much must be borne with, how much must be patiently moulded into form, if the union was indeed to be a permanent and blessed thing. He especially saw that in the teaching of theology for the common Church, with its accepted varieties of stating and illustrating the common Calvinism, it was incumbent on the teacher to be thoroughly irenic in his expositions—to lay less stress than before on the differences, and emphasize his own specialties of opinion less tenaciously, and, above all, never to indulge in such polemic tempers as not infrequently manifested themselves on both sides in the old days of division. At the same time he had no principles to conceal or to sell, and no compromises to make; he consented to no sacrifice of valuable historic traditions, here or elsewhere. He held that the grand old elm which had been planted on this hill, should be and remain an elm still, and that it was absurd to wish it an oak, a maple or a hickory. In his judgment, it was better for every interest concerned that it should stand as before, a graceful elm, with its sturdy trunk, its broad branches and its welcoming shades, in the wide landscape of our common ancestral domain, while hickories and maples and oaks give mingled variety and beauty to the scene, and, at their own sweet will, grow and prosper wherever the good hand of the Master may have planted them.

Fifteen years and more have passed since Dr. Nelson returned to his loved work in pulpit and parish, and the present incumbent was transferred from another department to this responsible and difficult position. His study and teaching of Church History, and especially of the History of Christian Doctrine, during the seven years preceding, had in some measure prepared him to pass over into this new department with some knowledge of the kind of service to be rendered, but also with a keen sense of the perplexities and exposures involved in such a transplantation. In general, his task was simply to carry on, in their spirit and with like strenuous endeavor, the work which Beecher and Allen and Nelson had for more than forty years been prosecuting. The master hand of the first great architect had laid broad and deep foundations for a theological system; the second had elaborated the structure with more of scientific method and philosophic precision,



and with wider adaptations ; the third had contributed to its completeness by such additions and adjustments as a long and successful pastorate would supply. But three things remained to be undertaken, in order that the theological edifice should become, in the fine phrase of Tennyson,

\* \* \* " a tower of strength,  
That stood four-square to all the winds that blew."

Of these three things, the *first* grew out of certain current aspects and movements of unbelief which have made themselves specially manifest during the last quarter of a century, and through which the common Christianity has seemed to be exposed to new and strange perils. Skepticism has apparently been gathering strength for a fiercer onset, not against any specific element of the Gospel or any particular class or system of doctrine, but against the innermost citadels of our holy faith. It has hurled special challenges at Christianity in respect to the character and administration of God, to his relations to the universe natural and moral, to the proofs of his existence, to the fundamental facts of his supernatural and supreme personality. It has denied or questioned the possibility of our knowing anything concerning divine things, the validity of human reasonings in the sphere of theology, the nature and offices of the human conscience, the fundamental fact of immortality. It has assailed the Christian theories as to the origin of man and the material universe, has resolved all law and order into blind and characterless force, has affirmed that there is no pre-determined outcome to humanity or the world, and that the only alternative is either an endless succession with on consummation anywhere, or perchance a pitiless catastrophe in which man and the universe shall go down together into some eternal abyss of nothingness. It has challenged the possibility of revelation, spurned the Christian evidences, declared miracle and prophecy to be delusions, and scouted at the fundamental truth of an inspiration from God into the heart and life of men. In a word, unbelief has shifted its whole line of battle, and assailed Christianity by methods more radical, by postulates more destructive, than any heretofore known in the long struggle of the ages. And he who would be a faithful teacher of theology in the presence of such an emergency, must of necessity concern himself relatively less with that which has been elaborated so well by those who have gone before him, and become more extensively an apologist for the Gospel. He must devote himself with special zeal to the defense of those great and fundamental

verities of religion, without which there can be no Christian theology of any sort. In such an age as this, the exposition of the profound *Analogy* of Bishop Butler, however brilliant, would be insufficient. Man as a being rational and spiritual, and therefore capable of theologizing; nature in all her wonders of phenomenon and law and cosmic energy, bearing her living testimony to something beyond herself; God as a Personal Being, proved to exist in his supremacy and his perfection by lines of argument that can not be broken; Revelation as a true communication from God to man, and having in it the core of all knowledge, the sum of all hope, the pledge and assurance of an eternal salvation; *these* are the great underlying verities with which a wise and faithful teacher, be he Calvinist or Lutheran or Arminian, must first and chiefly concern himself in this age. If these are lost, all is lost!

A *second* special task to be attempted in this chair appeared in the providential necessity for a broader exposition of the system of theology here taught, in its very interesting relations to the faith and teaching of the universal Church. One who has learned to appreciate the grand organic developments of Christian thought as they appear through the ages—who sees how amid a thousand varieties and conflicts the one sublime unfolding has gone on and on toward some glorious unity, to be attained at last in belief as truly as in life, could never be content with the mere enunciation of his own personal or provincial specialty, as if that contained the entire and the completed gospel. Every student of Church History knows how disastrous to the best interests of Protestantism for the last hundred and fifty years have been the wranglings of theologians, the strifes of schools and sects, growing out of the failures to appreciate each other in this broad and irenic way. In this clearer and happier age such isolated and provincial exposition of divine things is no longer to be justified. Nothing is clearer now than the fact that no man can fully comprehend or utilize his own system of doctrine, until he has studied it under the revealing and rectifying lights which such cosmic investigation flashes down upon it—until he puts it to the crucial tests which the organic thought of the whole Church of God on earth supplies. As no one could comprehend the noble symbols of Westminster until he examined them in the light shed upon both their substance and their language by the antecedent creeds of the Reformation, so one who is set for the exposition of any specific type of the Protestant Theology, must measurably and perhaps sadly fail in his task so long

as he is absorbed and centered in that type, as a silkworm in its web. To see the particular system in its general relationships, and to interpret what is specific by what is universal ; strengthening, modifying, correcting and expanding the particular teaching in whatever way these broader relationships suggest, is a fundamental condition of safe, healthful, fruitful theologizing, at least in our times. If the particular teaching is wrong or narrow, defective in quality, or erroneous in tendency, such comparative investigation makes the fact as palpable as the day, and leads the teacher either to abandon his task in despair, or to search with an agonizing earnestness for some worthier conception of the common Gospel. On the other hand, these comparative studies may enable him to see, as never before, how thoroughly truthful his cherished system is—how tender and gracious are its affiliations with all other evangelical systems—and how safely and ardently he may proclaim it in his appointed place as containing in essence and substance, not only what his own denomination or school may hold, but the glorious Gospel in whose light all individual types of doctrine are harmoniously centered. To teach theology under the benign influence of such considerations as these, is—as a happy experience certifies to me—a privilege immeasurably superior to any which the intensest, narrowest, most pugnacious little dogmatizer on earth can enjoy.

The *third* and last special task which seemed to devolve upon the present instructor in theology has been already suggested: it was found in the new obligations springing out of the historic union of 1869. He who would be a teacher of the whole Church at such an interesting and critical juncture in its history, must of course adjust his teaching to these peculiar conditions. There was indeed little, if anything, in the Lane Theology to be thrown aside in consequence of that union; but there were directions in which what was held and taught in each Seminary should, so far as possible, be harmoniously correlated to what was held and taught elsewhere. Antagonisms of a formal sort were to be abandoned; differences in method and statement were to be minimized and harmonized; each point of recognizable unity was to be conserved; and that in which all were agreed, was to be pressed everywhere into the front. This was to be done, even at the hazard of seeming to be in some particulars indifferent, if not disloyal to the original system represented by the teacher. It was to be done even if the process should sometimes be misinterpreted as suggestive of incapacity or tending to indefiniteness or vagueness in the teaching; it

was to be done even if it was sometimes denounced by those who were more zealous for some favorite dogma than for the peace and unification of the Church.

Such a course was also indispensable to success in the training of a body of ministers, who should be in harmony with the spirit of the age, and with the temper of the reconciled denominations. For, a student taught to know nothing else than the *ipsissima verba* of some tenacious and litigious old theologian, who regards nothing as of value but what he himself holds and teaches, can become nothing but a young and narrow dogmatist after all, either growing narrower and more bitter like his master as he grows old, or waking up at last to find that his own little system is not the whole of things as he supposed it to be, and that he himself has no *raison d'être* as a minister in such a Church as ours, at such a magnificent period in its history. That Church needs no men of this class in her pulpits. The more carefully and widely her young men can be trained in her institutions to see divine things in broad relationships as history reveals them, and to see them also as the living cords and ligaments by which a great church like ours is to be held in unity through the generations, the more secure will such unity be, and the stronger will the Church become for her appointed work in the world.

If there has been any appreciable difference between the present and the past instruction in theology in this institution, that difference has manifested itself in these three directions and for these three ends. If there has been any change of aspect or color in that theology, it has become more rather than less Calvinistic, as the teacher has meditated with an ever-deepening interest on those great problems respecting God and his purposes and administration, and respecting man in his fallen and lost yet salvable condition, around which the profoundest thought of the Church has in all ages been centered. The conclusion of such meditations, carried on through many years under the illumination of the Word of God and in the light which the history of Christian thought supplies, is that no other system of theology proposed by man embodies the essential truth of Scripture so well as that formulated in our own church symbols, and that the Church needs no other theological equipment for its great work in the world, if only that system be broadly, generously, rationally set forth in her seminaries and her pulpits. How well this task has been done here during the past fifteen years, and in the presence of some peculiar embarrassments, it will remain for another hand to narrate.

For the present it is enough to see that the theology of Lane has been one theology from the beginning until now, with no essential principle or element sacrificed, though with steadily widening scope and aim, as the spirit of the age and the needs of the united Church, going out on its grand mission to humanity, have demanded. The essence and substance have been unchanged, though the one doctrine may have assumed some new aspects, and caught a fresh coloring under the special conditions which have been named.

As the present reverently carries the past in its bosom, it may also stand as a sure prophecy of the future. It is an authenticated fact that fifty years after the death of Melancthon, his successor in the chair of theology at Wittenberg, on an occasion when the authority of Melancthon was appealed to, tore down from the wall the portrait of the great reformer, and trampled it under foot in the presence of the assemblage. It is hardly to be fancied that the fifth occupant of the same chair in Lane should turn these speaking faces of Beecher and Allen to the wall before proceeding with his work of instruction in the place they occupied so well. The man who could dream of such wretched treachery as that, might well remember that the name of Melancthon grows more precious with the centuries, while the world has long ago forgotten the writings and the name of Leonard Hutter. The present stands as a sure prophecy of the future, and we may confidently anticipate that through many a decade the substantial Calvinism taught here from the beginning until now will continue to be taught, though we may hope with ever-widening adaptations, and in forms more and more comprehensive, more and more full of power and of grace.