

FAITH
AND
THOUGHT

1978
vol. 105
Nos. 1 & 2

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the
Christian Revelation and modern research

ALAN P.F. SELL

CONSERVATIVES, LIBERALS and the GOSPEL

In this article Dr. Sell characterises liberal and conservative tendencies in theology, and shows how those on either side could, and sometimes did, reduce the Gospel. He notes the subsequent changes of attitude, but suggests that in seeking to set forth the heart of the Christian gospel we may learn from, and be warned by, the older debates.

I

To those who have been brought up to regard the late nineteenth century as the hey-day of preaching — which, at least in some Anglican and nonconformist circles, it was — it comes as a surprise to discover that the prevailing homiletic assurance was set against a background of shifting landmarks, and of a degree of theological fluidity, the like of which had seldom if ever been known before. From the Renaissance onwards man had increasingly come to the fore. His autonomy, real or imagined, was extolled by many; to his possible achievements in scientific and other realms there seemed to be no limit. The attack upon the transcendent and the supernatural, and the rise of immanentist thought had provided soil in which modern biblical criticism could take root, and in which evolutionary thought could flourish. The concern with history and the idea of progress; the increasingly fashionable agnosticism and naturalism; the optimism of many, the pessimism of a few; the virtual demise of the old Calvinist-Arminian debate which, for all its discourtesies, had kept alive the question of the heart of the gospel — all these were factors which contributed to the nineteenth century ferment of thought. Anyone who, like Ritschl, sought to establish theological bearings could hardly avoid a measure of ambivalence, and could certainly expect fully to satisfy nobody.

Nor was it in the case of theologians as W.S. Gilbert said it was with boys and girls: that they were "either a little liberal, or else a little conservative". Theology produced no such tidy disjunctions. On the contrary, the terms "liberal" and "conservative" are so highly ambiguous that any attempt at stipulative definition is hazardous in the extreme.¹ We might, for example, wish to designate Ritschl a liberal; but the term requires immediate qualification, and its relativity becomes plain, as soon as we find Ritschlianism dividing, inconveniently, in a *threefold* right, left and centre manner, represented respectively by T. Haering (1848-1928), A. Harnack (1851-1930) and W. Herrmann (1846-1922). When we further consider the way in which Ritschlianism was more widely assimilated — by those, for example, who welcomed the emphasis upon God's Fatherhood as an antidote to what they understood as Calvinism's capricious deity; and by those Americans who extracted thence a theology of progress which seemed to undergird the "American dream" — it becomes clear that all manner of nuances are detectable in the Ritschlian phenomenon, and that many motives are at work.

We are not here dealing with doctrine alone. Thus, the liberal W.P. Merrill explained, "The liberal can never hope to state his views with the sharp definiteness that marks the theology of the older school. For he is dealing, or attempting to deal, with life, not with the forms it takes; with reality, not with theories about it".² (Though the Anglicans of the Churchman's Union, founded in 1898 and renamed the Modern Churchman's Union in 1928, were often more than a little intellectualist!) Lest anyone should think that by contrast *all* conservatives have ever been exclusively concerned with doctrine, we would draw attention to the political dealings of the anti-Marxist "fundamentalists of the far right".³ Confusion is worse confounded by the fact that some have variously allied themselves with both conservatives *and* liberals. Thus, with reference to three Anglicans: the self-styled Liberal Catholic Charles Gore, the protestant-evangelical H.C.G. Moule, and the liberal Broad Churchman Hastings Rashdall, Dr. J.K. Mozley wrote, "On the subject of the value to be attached to the miraculous in Christianity, Gore and Moule are near to one another, as neither of them is to Rashdall; in their general view of the nature and results of the inspiration of the Bible Gore and Rashdall adopt a position which Moule would not entertain; while in regard to their conception of the Church, the ministry and the sacraments, Moule and Rashdall, in their affirmations and denials, stand over against Gore."^{4a}

Again, there is the kind of complication represented by the fact that the liberal Dr. E.W. Barnes's definition of *evangelicalism* - "It is Christianity in its most simple and purest form, free from accretions, marvellously alive because it has escaped from the clutch of the dead hand of the past"⁵ - would be taken by many as an excellent definition of *liberalism*! As if all this were not enough, there are the manifold qualifications required by historical time-lags, and concerning geographical origins. Fundamentalism, for example, never made the orchestrated impact upon Britain that it did upon America; nor was the millenarian impetus as great in the former nation as in the latter; and within America itself the Mennonites, the Calvinists of the Christian Reformed Church, and the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod - all theologically conservative - were not shaken by the fundamentalist-liberal convulsions of the nineteen twenties and thirties to anything like the degree that the larger of the Baptist and Presbyterian Churches were.⁶ Our final cautionary point has already been alluded to in our reference to Dr. Barnes: we shall not be surprised to find those who claim the name "evangelical" within both of the blurred-edged tendencies ("groups" is too tidy a word) of which we speak. It remains only to add that some, during the heat of battle adopted the attitude, "A plague on both your houses!" Thus Bernard Manning declared, "It is a scandal that controversialists, degrading words like 'evangelical' and 'catholic', have given them the fustiness of party banners".⁷ Certainly it was not lack of personal conviction which prompted Dr. A.E. Garvie to say, "I disown any party labels for myself altogether".^{8a} But such men could usually be pigeon-holed fairly easily - at least by others. Our contention is that liberal and conservative were locked in combat over the fundamental question, "What is the heart of the Christian gospel?" Since that question is of perennial importance, their disputes, however hoary, are of more than passing interest, and may even - especially since pendulum-swings are not unknown in theology - hold warnings for their successors.

We shall first note some who were more or less conservative whilst decidedly evangelical (liberal evangelicals will engage our attention later). At once we come face to face with the disputed question, what are the characteristics of conservative evangelicalism? D.R. Davies argued that "Evangelicalism affirms that regeneration is an indispensable condition of the Christian experience of redemption and forgiveness...No redemption without second birth - this is the irreducible essence of Evangelicalism".^{9a} In similar vein P.T. Forsyth writes, "By an evangelical theology I mean any theology which does full justice to the one creative principle of grace".^{10a} On this definition Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Whitefield, Wesley, would be numbered among evangelicals,

though perhaps the "Pelagianising" C.G. Finney would not. On the other hand, if we take Finney as a pioneer modern revivalist, whose evangelistic methodology comes down through Billy Graham to the present day, then evangelicalism seems to be a more recent phenomenon, and Finney is its fountain head.^{11a} Again, to the material principle of regeneration, Dr. K. Kantzer would add the formal principle of biblical authority.^{11b} With this Dr. Gordon Clark would agree - indeed apart from the latter principle, he thinks, the Reformers could not have challenged the Romanists.¹² Then, in true Reformed fashion, Dr. Hesselink adds faith: "'sola scripture', 'sola gratia', and 'sola fide' ... Where these phrases are more than mere slogans, one does indeed find an evangelical faith".^{13a} The fact that so many find it necessary to refine our understanding of "evangelical" is a clear indication of the slipperiness of the term.

It would be broadly true to say that Anglican conservative evangelicals of the period 1850-1920 would have associated themselves with the traditional Reformed view. Those episcopalian Puritans who sought to reform the Church of England from within would certainly have done so, and so, in their wake, would Newton, Toplady, Venn and Grimshaw. Among their nineteenth century successors would be found Charles Simeon and Henry Martyn. Anglican evangelicals have traditionally defended the Establishment, and have been loyal to the *Book of Common Prayer*. At their best - witness the Clapham Sect - they have shouldered their responsibilities to the less fortunate in what some latter-day historians have been too ready to pronounce a patronising, paternalistic manner. A minority of conservative evangelical Anglicans has been vociferously anti-Roman. Few summed up the stance of this party so succinctly as Bishop J.C. Ryle (1816-1900) of Liverpool. He defined evangelical religion both positively and negatively. Standing by the absolute authority of scripture, it affirms man's corruption in sin, maintains the penal substitutionary theory of the atonement, and emphasises the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and in the life of grace. It is not anti-intellectual; it does not undervalue the Church, the ministry, episcopacy, the Prayer Book, good order, holiness or self-denial, though it does take a ministerial rather than a magisterial and sacerdotal view of the ministry; it denies that the sacraments convey grace *ex opere operato*; and whilst it believes that episcopacy is the most desirable form of church government, it does not deny the validity of non-episcopally ordained ministries.¹⁴ It is not hard to read a case against Anglo-Catholicism between some of Ryle's lines.

Conservative evangelicalism lingered in all the main nonconformist denominations of England, Wales and Scotland, and in the Church of Scotland too. The leadership of these bodies

moved increasingly towards accommodation with newer thought, both in respect of adjusting to biblical criticism, utilising the concept of evolution, heeding pressing social needs, and becoming increasingly silent on those profoundly doctrinal questions which had fuelled the older Calvinist-Arminian debates. C.H. Spurgeon was a lonely exception among the Baptists, and even he was sufficiently in accord with the predominant spirit of the age to say, "Every century sees a marked advance in the world's condition, and we shall proceed at a quicker rate when the Church wakes up to her responsibility".^{15a} Some conservative Methodists who stood, whether they all realised it or not, in the tradition of evangelical Arminianism, found a focus for their interests in Cliff College, a training centre for home missionaries which grew out of the vision of Thomas Champness (1832-1905), and whose first Principal, Thomas Cook, was appointed in 1903.¹⁶ Even so, Dr. Workman spoke for most Methodists when he said that "Methodism is rightly undisturbed by the higher criticism of the Bible".¹⁷ The mention of Cliff College, noted for its class meetings, its choruses, its evangelistic treks and the like, reminds us yet again that we are dealing with ethos and not with doctrine only.

This is not in any way to minimise the importance of doctrine. Some are *confessionally* conservative and evangelical, calling themselves Reformed or Lutheran. Among the former some, saddened by the way in which some professedly confessional churches have, in their view, lapsed, have taken to themselves the term "Orthodox". In Scotland we find the small Reformed Presbyterian Church (1743) which stands in the covenanting tradition; the continuing Free Church (1843); and the Free Presbyterian Church (1893).¹⁸ When the majority of the Free Church was on the point of joining with the United Presbyterians to form the United Free Church of Scotland (1900), the Free Church was congratulated on the impending union by the Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church. The Reverend James Hunter, however, was by no means in sympathy with his Assembly's resolution, and for many years he waged a battle in the interests of Calvinism, and against modernism. Matters came to a head when in 1927 he formally charged the Reverend J.E. Davey of the Irish Presbyterian College, Belfast, with denying *inter alia* the full inspiration of the scriptures. The Assembly found in favour of the Professor by 707 votes to 82, and Hunter felt that he could no longer remain a member of so compromised a Church. With other seceders he formed the Irish Evangelical Church, which on 26th March 1964 changed its name to the Evangelical Presbyterian Church. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland (Presbytery 1763; Synod 1811) continues in rather greater numerical strength than its Scottish Mother Church. In England Calvinistic conservatism is the continuing stance of the Strict Baptists, and of those Reformed

Baptist churches which have been increasing in numbers since the 1960s, and some of which are more overtly confessional in character.¹⁹ There are conservative evangelical individuals and groups in the mainstream denominations of Britain, and from some of these such interdenominational bodies as the IVF and the Evangelical Alliance draw some of their support.

In America conservative evangelicalism has ever been well represented among the major Baptist denominations, though vociferous minorities have seldom been wanting who have lamented the encroachment of liberal thought, and the departure from old standards. On occasion secession has resulted, as witness, for example, the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (1932) which came out of the Northern Baptist Convention, and which esteems the Baptist Confession of 1689; and the Conservative Baptist Association of America, which emerged from the same parent in 1947. However, the more consciously confessional Presbyterians have experienced the greatest strategic difficulties in their desire to be open to advancing thought on the one hand, and to prevent schism on the other. The Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. was particularly exercised in this matter. The attempts during the 1880s and 1890s of Professor Charles A. Briggs of Union Seminary New York to acquaint his Church with the *advantages* of the higher criticism led to his suspension in 1893. The General Assembly of 1892 and 1893 had meanwhile declared that the original biblical documents were devoid of error, and the 1892 Assembly refused the request of fifteen presbyteries that the Westminster Confession be revised. In time, however, the newer thought held sway within the Church until, conservative and fundamentalist opposition notwithstanding, those who felt that their Church was entering into an unholy alliance with non-Christian thought forms seceded in 1936. The leader of this secession was J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937), a Professor at Princeton Theological Seminary. Machen stood in the line of Charles and A.A. Hodge and B.B. Warfield (whose views, incidentally, of biblical authority had been attacked by T.M. Lindsey as being scholastic rather than Reformed²⁰), and although schism was not his intention, he and his supporters threw down the gauntlet to their Church with the establishment in 1933 of the Independent Board of Foreign Missions, and three years later the break-away Presbyterian Church of America was formed. In 1939, on the separation of Carl McIntire's more millenarian and separatist Bible Presbyterian Church, the PCA changed its name to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.²¹ Of the other American Presbyterian bodies we may mention two denominations which stand in the covenanter tradition: the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod. The latter is currently engaged in union conversations with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

We should not do justice to American conservative evangelical confessionalism were we to fail to mention such denominations as the Reformed Church in America (1628) and the Christian Reformed Church. These are of Dutch origin, the latter being formed in 1890 by the union of two secessions (1822 and 1857) from the former. To some extent the disputed issues were reflections of troubles in Holland, but the stand against Freemasonry, which those who joined the Christian Reformed Church took, was a further ingredient in the strife. Both Churches adhere to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession and the Canons of Dort.²² To the Missouri Synod Lutherans we have already referred, and it hardly needs to be said that there are numerous other conservative evangelical groups in America, concerning some of which the casual observer may be forgiven for thinking that they are distinct from their brethren as much because of pride as because of principle.

We can no longer delay our attempt to unpack that most emotive of terms, "fundamentalist". We have waited until now in order first to make plain that there is much conservative evangelicalism to which the term "fundamentalist" in the sense often assigned to it - aggressively evangelistic, highly emotional, lacking in clear doctrinal emphasis, decisionist - does not apply at all. Nor can we content ourselves by saying that a fundamentalist is one who subscribes to the five fundamental doctrines which collectively gave their name to the movement: the verbal inspiration of the Bible; the Virgin Birth of Christ; his substitutionary atonement; his bodily resurrection; and his imminent personal return. For not only is it the case that many Roman Catholics could assent to all five; but also, many conservative evangelicals of the confessional kind, though likewise eager to endorse these fundamental doctrines, were not able to acquiesce in the individualism, the millenarianism, and the evangelistic methodology which were the hallmarks of many fundamentalists. We shall proceed cautiously, therefore, by noting three strands which, in addition to the interest in scriptural authority and regeneration, helped (to varying degrees in varying places) to make fundamentalism into what it became. These strands are revivalism, the scriptural holiness movements, and the prophetic and millenarian movements. After an introductory paragraph we shall treat each in turn.

Like its Old World counterpart the Calvinism of the New World was not immune to tensions.²³ There was the antinomian controversy of the 1630s associated with Mrs. Anne Hutchinson. There was the denial by William Pyncheon as early as 1650 that Christ bore the Father's wrath.²⁴ Rationalistic Arminianism began to make its impact as witness John Wise's *Vindication of New England Churches* (1717); and America was not bereft of

Arians such as Jonathan Mayhew and Thomas Barnard. In 1784 Charles Chauncy wrote on the *Salvation of all Men*, by which time the impetus in the direction of unitarian universalism had already appeared in the person of John Murray, who arrived in America in 1770, having learned his theology from James Rely in London.²⁵ The seeds were thus already sown for the split between liberalism and evangelical revivalism which was to follow the Great Awakening.²⁶ The supreme challenge laid upon Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) was to prevent a landslide from the Calvinistic side of the ravine. He therefore staunchly upheld the view that man is morally unable to do the good, apart from regeneration by God; and that the only "freedom" natural man enjoyed was the freedom to follow a sinful course. The efforts of Edwards's disciples Joseph Bellamy (1719-90) and Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803), who were influenced by the governmental theory of the atonement and by Leibzizian theodicy, lay in the direction of a contemporary reassertion of Calvinism. In fact both Edwardean Calvinism and the Calvinism of the "Old Lights" who opposed the Great Awakening were modified to some extent by the revival. The modifications were carried further by Nathanael Emmons (1745-1840), Timothy Dwight (1752-1817) and Nathanael W. Taylor (1786-1858). Taylor maintained the equality of reason and revelation, and concerning what he took to be Edwards's faulty estimation of man's natural ability he expostulated, "it is an essential nothing".²⁷ Thus emerged the New Divinity.

Charles G. Finney (1792-1875)²⁸ was dramatically converted on 10th October 1821, and promptly became a revivalist preacher. Perhaps the best way of summarising his "offences" is to say that he was "Pelagian", latterly perfectionist, and given to non-scriptural evangelistic practices - his "new methods" which comprised appeals, the "anxious seat" and the like. As to the first, Finney, influenced by Taylor, denied that God's sovereignty extended to the physical realm. There man was free - indeed, the *a priori* intuitions of human reason are free of error.²⁹ God's omnipotence is thus limited by man's freedom. It follows that in theory every man is open to persuasion: hence the importance of preaching. There can be no such thing as moral inability. Man is under an obligation to surrender to God, and he can do it if he will. Depravity is a state of selfishness in which unconverted man *voluntarily* continues. All of which leads to a radical revision of the traditional doctrine of regeneration. By conversion now is meant a freely-chosen new direction: "The fact is, sinners, that God requires you to turn, and that what he requires of you, he cannot do for you. It must be your own voluntary act".³⁰ More strongly, he argued that conversion is not immediately by the Holy Ghost, but

by argument and persuasion.³¹ None of this met with Dr. Warfield's approval: "It is quite clear that what Finney gives us is less a theology than a system of morals. God might be eliminated from it entirely without essentially changing its character. All virtue, all holiness, is made to consist in an ethical determination of will".³² Consistent with this is Finney's view that election means God's foreknowledge of those who will be converted.³³

In later years Finney admitted that many of his converts had relapsed, and he attributed this to the inadequate doctrine of sanctification which, earlier in his career, he had espoused. Now at Oberlin College, he developed his version of perfectionism, building upon his own conversion experience which, he thought, had left him free of sin.³⁴ Certainly, to some of his converts "entire sanctification" was a real possibility - in which connection Dr. Opie rightly remarked, "Ironically, his critics condemned only his Pelagianism as an awful lapse. They would have been thunderstruck had they not missed his Gnostic streak entirely".^{35a} Finally we note those less able theologians, but considerable pragmatic revivalists, who stood in Finney's line. Pre-eminent among these was Dwight L. Moody (1837-99),³⁶ of whom the following sober, not to say caustic, assessment has recently been penned:

"'I am an Arminian up to the Cross; after the Cross, a Calvinist'. By 1875 Dwight L. Moody, the foremost revivalist of his day, could make a shambles of theological controversy with hardly a murmur of dissent. Evangelicalism, once a powerful theological movement, based on revivalism, had been shattered. In its place Moody offered an enthusiastic but comfortable moralism. The sovereign God of American religious awakenings before the Civil War had become by the Gilded Age a friendly personal counselor. Sin, once a truly awful condition, Victorian gentility translated into the social improprieties of laziness, drunkenness and poverty. Grace had been a marvellous last-minute rescue from the threat of eternal suffering and offered a vision of blessedness. Now grace provided for the pleasantries of self-confidence, comfort, and prosperity. Conversion, once the most shattering experience of man's short and harsh life, became the voter's judicious right to change his party affiliation. Moody's revivalism reached its climax not in mystical transcendence or intense piety, but in sentiment".^{35b}

We turn now to the holiness element in conservative evangelicalism. It may be contrasted with Finney's version of man's quest of holiness in that it was more traditionally evangelical than Pelagian, and there was often much less emphasis upon the mechanics of revivalism, and more on the original, and not just on the co-operative, work of God the Holy Spirit.³⁷ In a word, this strand of thought and experience is the heir of Wesley and of those Moravian pietists and those mystics from Tauler to Law, upon whom he drew. We may observe in passing that some pietists, horrified by the more barren tracts of Protestant scholasticism, became anti-intellectualist in rather the same way that some later fundamentalists who despised "book learning" did. But our main concern is to indicate that the Wesleyan holiness tradition, the classic expression of which is Wesley's *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (1766) was far removed in spirit and in doctrine from the Oberlin perfectionism of later times. Wesley did not teach the possibility of sinless perfection in this life; to him such perfection was possible for man only in eternity. Moreover (and here he was at odds with the Calvinistic doctrine of perseverance) the sanctified may yet fall and perish. The concern for scriptural holiness was continued within the Salvation Army, founded by the ex-Methodist William Booth (1829-1912); it is the *raison d'être* of the American Church of the Nazarene which dates from the late nineteenth century, and of its British counterpart, the Calvary Holiness Church; it fired the preaching of the Americans W.E. Boardman and Mr. and Mrs. R. Pearsall Smith; and it is the distinctive doctrinal feature of the Keswick Convention, the first of which was held in 1875, and among whose early leaders was Evan H. Hopkins.³⁸ Some of those associated with Keswick departed from Wesleyan perfectionism in this important respect: they separated sanctification from justification, and made the former a future prospect and the object of a second blessing.

Finally, we have the growing interest in millennial matters and prophecy. This element has been brought to the fore by Dr. Ernest Sandeen in particular.^{39a} Rejecting H.R. Niebuhr's sociological explanation of fundamentalism in terms of urban *versus* rural communities, he claims that the fundamentalist base of support was as bourgeois and urban and was that of liberalism.^{39b} Fundamentalist leadership was, however, characterised by millenarian and prophetic inclinations. Dr. Sandeen traces this interest from Daniel Whitby, Rector of Salisbury; he mentions the impetus provided by the French Revolution, and the growing concern for the fate of the Jews - a concern represented by the teaching of Lewis Way; he analyses the split between pre- and post-millenarians, the former of whom took a more pessimistic

view of the world; and he provides an account of the dispensationalism of J.N. Darby and his Plymouth Brethren,⁴⁰ distinguishing this from that native American dispensationalism whose leader was William Miller: "The Millerites did not accept the restoration of the Jews to Palestine as a part of the prophetic time-table, nor were they willing to admit that biblical prophecy had any further promises to keep so far as the Jews were concerned".^{39c} In addition to all of this there was the futurism of such groups as the Mormons and the Shakers — not to mention the power of the "American dream". Dr. Sandeen reminds us that Jonathan Edwards himself was the first post-millennial American theologian,^{39d} and Professor Harland has remarked that "Neither the American past nor the nature of her present bewilderment and frustration can be understood without taking fully into account how this strong sense of particular calling, of 'destiny under God' has remained a constant aspect of the ideological structure of the nation".⁴¹

Among the steps on the road to orchestrated fundamentalism was the series of Niagara Bible Conferences (1883-97). From the 1890 Conference there issued James Hall Brookes's fourteen-point statement in which scriptural inerrancy and the premillennial return of Christ were affirmed. Other leaders, drawn from a variety of denominations, included Arthur T. Pierson and William J. Erdman. In 1882 the first Bible School was founded at Nyack-on-the-Hudson, and there followed Moody's Chicago Evangelistic Society (later the Moody Bible Institute) in 1886. Many other such schools sprung up, and among their most important common features were the advocacy of interdenominational evangelism and the abhorrence of liberalism in theology. Then, between 1910 and 1915 was published that series of pamphlets to which we have already referred, whose collective title was "The Fundamentals". Sponsored by the layman Lyman Stewart, the series was enhanced by the contributions of such distinguished scholars as B.B. Warfield and James Orr. Advanced critical views were countered (though Orr, to the disquiet of some, gave a qualified welcome to theistic evolution as not necessarily undermining the faith); bodies such as the Mormons and the Christian Scientists were opposed; and the basic orthodox doctrines, and in particular the five fundamentals, were upheld. At the World's Bible Conference in Philadelphia in 1919, among whose leaders were R.A. Torrey and W.B. Riley, attention was focussed upon the fundamentals, and an attempt was made to place the apocalyptic element in perspective. There followed the stormy decade of fundamentalist *versus* liberal controversy. Trouble had been brewing for some years, but in May 1922 Harry Emerson Fosdick, the liberal Baptist, preached his celebrated sermon, "Shall the

Fundamentalists win?" In the following year the New York Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. — that body which only thirty-one years before had rejected C.A. Briggs's position on scriptural interpretation — caused offence to conservatives with its Auburn Affirmation. Elsewhere the issues which were to come to a head in the Scopes trial were being canvassed, and for all these reasons and others the question of biblical authority came to the fore once again. We can therefore understand why Dr. James Packer characterised fundamentalism thus: "What Scripture says, God says. This equation was the formative principle of fundamentalism, as it has been of all evangelicalism in history".⁴² On the other hand, in view of the varied assortment of available doctrinal options — revivalist, perfectionist, millenarian, holiness, prophetic — and more recently pentecostal — we can see why some have regarded fundamentalism as a distinctively modern phenomenon.⁴³ We can also understand why such a Reformed conservative evangelical as Dr. Machen disliked the term. To him it suggested a narrow, novel, sometimes anti-intellectualist and over-emotional movement, which was based upon an inadequate range of doctrine, and which frequently sat loosely to churchly allegiance.⁴⁴ Fundamentalism was an amalgum of old and new, and among its most acute latter-day critics have been some of the neo-evangelicals.⁴⁵

II

We turn now from the confused and confusing situation in conservative evangelical quarters, to the equally confused and confusing liberal-modernist scene. One way of highlighting the issues is to consider P.T. Forsyth's claim to be modern, but not liberal; and then to show how very different was his modernism from Catholic and other varieties of that plant. Of Forsyth it has been said that "He was liberal in his intellectual address and technique, and liberal, surely, in his repudiation of any authoritarianism that would coerce the judgment and conscience. But he was conservative of the Faith. And, for him, the Faith meant a theology only because it meant a gospel, *the* Gospel. If he appeared to be a Biblicist — a term which he would not have accepted — it was because he saw that Gospel and Bible were joined together and were not to be put asunder".⁴⁶ This is well said, but it should not allow us to overlook Forsyth's mistrust of the theological labels which some were all too keen to use. He was anxious to maintain that "the word which is employed to express the adjustments native to a positive Gospel is not 'liberal' but 'modern'. A modern theology is one thing, theological liberalism is another".^{10b} This understanding of liberalism seems at first sight to be in line with that of the

Anglican Modernist H.D.A. Major, who said that "the Modernist claims with conviction and humility that he more truly has his rightful home in the Church of Christ than has his Traditionalist brother, whose rightful home is really the Synagogue".^{47a} It further reminds us of Dr. Vidler's distinction between liberality, which signifies openness, freedom of enquiry and the like, and liberalism, which in theology means a body of nineteenth century doctrines and critical stances of a negative kind.^{15b} But when Dr. Major defines modernism as "the claim of the modern mind to determine what is true, right and beautiful in the light of its own experience, even though its conclusions be in contradiction to those of tradition",^{47b} he is defining what Forsyth shunned as liberalism:

"by liberalism I mean the theology that begins with some rational canon of life or nature to which Christianity has to be cut down or enlarged (as the case may be); while by a modern positivity I mean a theology that begins with God's gift of a super-logical revelation in Christ's historic person and cross, whose object was not to adjust a contradiction but to resolve a crisis and save a situation of the human soul. For positive theology Christ is the object of faith; for liberal He is but its first and greatest subject, the agent of a faith directed elsewhere than on Him. It is really an infinite difference. For only one side can be true".^{10c}

Again, Forsyth's modernism not only differed from Major's; both were in some respects poles apart from the contemporary Catholic Modernism.⁴⁸ Whilst Major distinguished between the English Modernists and the Liberal Protestants in that the former placed greater emphasis upon the Church and the concept of development than the latter — who, like Harnack, sought to locate the essence of Christianity by *going back* to a pre-Pauline gospel^{47c} — the Modernists stood sufficiently consciously in the Broad Church tradition not to accept Rome as the last churchly word. Many elements went into the making of Roman Catholic Modernism — or, as Pius X said in more evaluative terms, modernism was "a compendium of heresies". In fact, as Loisy, one of its leading exponents, declared, Modernism was the concern of "a quite limited number of persons, who share the desire to adapt the Catholic religion to the intellectual, moral, and social needs of the present time".⁴⁹ The Modernists sought institutional and societal reform, but they put forward no commonly agreed or intellectually coherent policies, though it might be said that their general adoption of a critical stance towards the Bible

was an important common thread uniting them. It remains only to advert to the immanentist thrust of Catholic modernist thought — yet another feature which differentiates them from Forsythian modernism. This emerges clearly in such a work as Loisy's *The Gospel and the Church* (1902), his rejoinder to Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (1900). Loisy opposed the manner in which Harnack minimised the eschatological, and maintained that the gospel cannot be understood apart from the concept of development. That is, it is not static, but dynamic. Thus the gospel cannot be considered properly in the absence of a consideration of what it has become in the life and experience of the Church, and in relation to the Church's eschatological goal. The immanentist thrust is clearly evident too in the philosophy of L. Laberthonnière who, notwithstanding the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1899), which advocated a Thomistic basis for Christian philosophising, and turned against Aristotelian staticism in favour of a neo-Kantian theory of knowledge, and a version of post-Hegelian dynamism. Other Modernists, such as M. Blondel, were influenced by pragmatism, and began to develop a philosophy of action which would make Christianity much more a matter of practice than of theory. Manifestly the Catholic Modernists were going a fair distance farther than the Anglican Liberal Catholic Gore in revising the content of the Christian message and not its shape only. It is also clear that in its basic immanentist thrust the New Theology of R.J. Campbell had more in common with Catholic Modernism than with Liberal Protestantism. It remains only to add that some Catholic Modernists, because of their immanentism and their adoption of advanced critical views, sat somewhat loosely to biblical history. Such would take encouragement from George Tyrrell's definition of a Modernist as being "a churchman, of any sort, who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity".^{50a}

Thus far we have Forsyth, modern (yet conservative!) in spirit — or, as Dr. Vidler might say, manifesting liberality if not espousing liberalism. We have English Modernists who valued the Church whilst endorsing the critical principle and occasionally becoming unnecessarily sceptical as a result. We have the Catholic Modernists who imbibed the spirit of the age and modified the Christian Modernists who imbibed the spirit of the age and modified the Christian message to some extent.⁵¹ And we have Gore, a Liberal Catholic if not in all respects a liberal man. We must face up to the fact which has already become plain, namely, that the terms "liberal" and "modernist" are sometimes used interchangeably; and we must then consider those who added "evangelical" to the former label.^{15c}

It goes without saying that the line of theological liberals is a long one; Origen, Erasmus, Socinus, the rationalistic Arminians, the Latitudinarians — all these and others are to be found in that succession. We recall, for example, Mr. Thomas's remarks on Philip Doddridge: "If we define a liberal in theology in terms of advanced ideas...Doddridge was no liberal...But if, more properly, we define a liberal in terms of an undogmatic temper of mind, then Doddridge was one of the most liberal Dissenters of the early eighteenth century".⁵² Modern liberalism, however, derives largely from Kant's epistemology percolated *via* Schleiermacher or Hegel in varying proportions: it flowers in an age in which old securities are being challenged by immanentist-evolutionary thought, and by the new historico-critical methodology; and it takes advantage of the demise of the old theological debate, highlighted by Calvinist *versus* Arminian which, however inadequately at times, had kept the central issues of the gospel before men's minds. Nowhere did the liberal stream flow more strongly than in America.

Two types of dissatisfaction with the New England theology had come to be expressed. On the one hand there was the protest of William Ellery Channing against Congregationalism's Calvinism which, he felt, both degraded God by overlooking his Fatherliness, and debased man by its doctrine of total inability. In the wake of Channing there came the Emersonian transcendentalists, the increasing universalist thrust, overt unitarianism,⁵³ and humanitarianism. On the other hand, there was that development of thought represented and inspired by Horace Bushnell (1802-76) whose emphasis on the personal, rather than the moral and governmental, in respect of the God-man relation gave relief to many. The influence upon Bushnell of Coleridge, Maurice and F.W. Robertson was clear. In addition to their personalistic immanentism Bushnell and those theologians who followed him — Theodore C. Munger, Washington Gladden and others, together with the great pulpit voices of the New Theology, Henry Ward Beecher and Phillips Brooks — maintained the progressive nature of revelation and, consistently with scientifically-inspired optimism, the "American dream", and the societal implications of Ritschlianism, sought to subdue the earth for God. Hence the Social Gospel, whose pre-eminent advocate was the Baptist Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918).⁵⁴ God was near to man; and man was under an obligation to be about God's business in the world — and that not only as an individual, but as a member of societies and corporations of all kinds. The Kingdom was realisable on earth, and sin comprised those remediable injustices and inequalities which stained society. The following words of Gladden capture something of the spirit of the men of the Social Gospel school:

"The idea of the immanence of God; the idea that God's method of creation is the method of evolution; the idea that nature in all its deepest meanings is supernatural; the idea of the constant presence of God in our lives; the idea of the universal divine Fatherhood and of the universal human Brotherhood, with all that they imply - these are ideas which are here to stay.... [God] is in the whole world...but he is also over it all...He is working in us, but...his working in us never overbears our choices...He is helping us all he can without undermining manhood; no more....*He is leading Humanity into the green pastures and beside the still waters.* That is the meaning of history".⁵⁵

However inadequate the theology of these liberals may now seem to be, it would be indefensible to overlook their genuine evangelistic passion. Nowhere is this more clearly affirmed than by Rauschenbusch, writing from hospital: "My life has been physically very lonely, and often beset by the consciousness of conservative antagonism. I have been upheld by the comforts of God...It has been my deepest satisfaction to get evidence now and then that I have been able to help men to a new spiritual birth. I have always regarded by public work as a form of evangelism, which called for a deeper repentance and a new experience of God's salvation".⁵⁶

By contrast, some of the writings of the harbingers of Dutch liberalism seem arid in the extreme, whilst some of the English authors seem relatively bloodless. As to the former, W.M. Horton has drawn attention to two rather distinct generations of modernists in Holland. The older men included Opzoomer of Utrecht, an empiricist in the Schleiermacherian sense; Scholten of Leiden, an Hegelian monist; and the Mennonite Hoekstra of Amsterdam, a Neo-Kantian. These were succeeded by the ethical modernists, led by Opzoomer's pupil Allard Pierson. He concluded that the concepts of sovereignty and fatherhood could not both consistently be applied to God. Whilst the philosophers paved the way for ethical humanism, the more extreme biblical critics such as Loman and van Manen joined Pierson in affirming that Christianity was "Idea" only, and that neither Jesus nor Paul ever existed.⁵⁷ In the light of such dilutions the Calvinistic revival led by Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920) is not hard to understand. Kuyper's testimony was as follows:

"There is no doubt..that Christianity is imperilled by great and serious dangers. Two life systems are wrestling with one another, in mortal combat. Modernism is bound to build a world of its own from

the data of the natural man, and to construct man himself from the data of nature; while, on the other hand, all those who reverently bend the knee to Christ and worship Him as the Son of the living God, and God himself, are bent upon saving the 'Christian Heritage'. This is the struggle in Europe, this is the struggle in America, and this also, is the struggle for principles in which my own country is engaged, and in which I myself have been spending all my energy for nearly forty years".⁵⁸

Returning to England we find that, as in America, one variety of Christian liberalism issued in modern Unitarianism. If we may attempt a one-sentence summary of a fascinating story, it is this: English Unitarianism is the product of a confluence of Establishment and Dissenting Arminianism and Arianism which made out its liberal theological case on the basis of a conservative use of scriptural proof texts; that it later, not least under the influence of Channing, adopted a less coldly rationalistic approach to worship whilst becoming ever more rationalist and less biblicist in defence of its distinctive emphases; and that from time to time it attracted to itself individuals and groups of other original persuasions.

The Anglican type was Theophilus Lindsey (1723-78) who became so zealous in his justification of his newly-claimed name "Unitarian" that some thought he must be a "methodist"! On the failure of the Feathers Tavern petition, presented to Parliament in 1772, and designed to relax the subscription laws which were enjoined upon Anglican incumbents, Lindsey left the Church of England.⁵⁹ The term "unitarian" had been used since 1682 to describe all who held to the unipersonality of the Godhead, but from 1774 it became the name of a distinct sect, and Lindsey's liturgy was designed in such a way that God the Father alone was worshipped. On 17th April 1774 Essex Street Chapel, London, was opened, the service on that day being attended by Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) — the latter being the type of the Dissenters to whom we referred. Dr. Gordon informs us that Priestley was an Arminian by 1751, an Arian by 1754; that by 1768 he had accepted Lardner's view of the simple humanity of Christ; and that in 1784 — much to Lindsey's surprise — he rejected the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.^{60a} In his works, *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1782) and *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus* (1786) he argued that the early Christians were unitarians, and that the orthodox worship of Christ was blasphemous. Meanwhile there had begun a protracted controversy with Archdeacon Samuel Horsley (1733-1805) whose general attitude to both rationalists and methodists may be

gauged from the following passage from his primary charge to the Diocese of St. David's (1790). He there declared that if more sound doctrine were preached "our churches would be thronged; while the moralising Unitarian would be left to read his dull weekly lecture to the walls of his deserted conventicle, and the field-preacher would bellow unregarded to the wilderness".⁶¹

Unitarians began to take tentative organisational steps - tentative not least because their doctrinal position was illegal. A Bible commentary which advocated their views was published by the Society for Promoting Knowledge of the Scriptures (1783), but it was Thomas Belsham (1750-1829) who did more than any other to weld unitarians into a denomination. He left the Independents in 1788 and was the main inspiration of the Unitarian Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue by the Distribution of Books (1791). An *Improved Version of the New Testament* (1808) was published; two erstwhile Baptists, Richard Wright and David Eaton, were converted to unitarianism and began home missionary preaching; and in 1806 the Unitarian Fund for Promoting Unitarianism by means of Popular Preaching was established. Joseph Cooke (1775-1811) adopted unitarianism and was expelled from the Wesleyan ministry in 1806, whereupon he became the leader of Lancashire's Methodist Unitarians.⁶² Later, in 1841, Joseph Barker (1806-1875) was expelled from the Methodist New Connexion, and the two hundred Christian Brethren congregations which he founded on an unsectarian basis eventually attached themselves to the Unitarian movement.^{60b} Meanwhile Scotland's first Unitarian building had been erected in Glasgow in 1811; on 21st July 1813 the Unitarians had been accorded civil rights, and in 1819 the Unitarian Association had been founded to safeguard them; the British and Foreign Unitarian Association came into being in 1825; the Irish Non-Subscribing Presbyterians constituted themselves a separate body holding unitarian doctrine in 1830; and there had been a number of legal battles over the tenure by Unitarians of (generally) erstwhile orthodox property.⁶³ Among such battles was that at Wolverhampton. There were financial wrangles too. In 1705 Lady Hewley had founded a Trust for the maintenance of "poor and godly" ministers serving north of the Trent. Resources from this being denied to Unitarians, Robert Hibbert (1770-1849) founded the Antitrinitarian Fund (subsequently the Hibbert Trust) in 1847.

The rise of modern biblical criticism, the spirituality of Channing, and the anti-supernaturalism of Theodore Parker (1810-60) influenced English Unitarians in a new direction. In this regard the undoubted leader was James Martineau (1805-1900). Whereas Priestley and Lindsey had upheld the evidential value of the biblical miracles, for example, Martineau's followers took

miracles less seriously, whilst not denying the supernatural. They sought a reasonable faith, not unduly reliant upon proof texts, but also a warm piety. Arianism was held in increasingly less favour; Jesus was exemplar only; and Romantic intuitionism came to the fore.⁶⁴

Among other English harbingers of modern theological liberalism we may note the Hegelian Congregationalist J. Baldwin Brown (1820-84), who challenged the penal substitutionary theory of the atonement in the interest of the concept of the divine Fatherhood; and John H. Godwin (1809-99) whose Congregational Lecture on *Christian Faith* (1858) gave publicity to the view that trust in Christ rather than belief in doctrines was of the essence of Christianity, and should issue in sincere discipleship. Godwin's distinction between the Jesus of History and the Christ of faith was later to be taken up by the Congregational minister Robert Roberts, whose *Hibbert Journal* article, "Jesus or Christ? An Appeal for Consistency" led to a controversy, and to the publication of the symposium *Jesus or Christ?* (1909) to which seventeen writers of all shades of opinion contributed. Some further "advanced" views were expressed by J. Allanson Picton (1832-1910) at the Leicester Conference of 1877. Religious fellowship should not, he thought, be determined by doctrinal or historical opinions — a view from which the Congregational Union dissociated itself in the following year. Meanwhile the term "Broad Churchman" was replacing "Latitudinarian" within the Church of England. It "has been attributed either to Arthur Hugh Clough or to W.J. Conybeare, who used it in his article on 'Church Parties' in the *Edinburgh Review*, for October, 1853. By the eighteen seventies the term 'Liberal Churchman' or 'Liberal Clergyman' was becoming common".⁶⁵ We should not suppose, however, that there were no differences between older Broad Churchman and later Anglican Modernist. Dr. Major has listed three ways in which their emphases differed; the Broad Churchmen were more Erastian, more inclined to a humanitarian utilitarianism, and "flaccid and unhistorical" in regard to doctrine and exegesis.^{47d} Dr. A.M. Ramsey, in commenting upon the liberalism of Rashdall, which was content with a symbolic incarnation and an exemplarist atonement, indicates something of the breadth of Anglican liberal modernism as he compares Rashdall with Gore and Inge. It was a favourite theme of Rashdall's "that the orthodoxy of teachers such as Gore presented the doctrine of the Trinity in a manner more tritheistic than S. Augustine or S. Thomas Aquinas would countenance. On the other hand, he was apart from Inge, and nearer to Gore, in a distrust of mysticism and a dislike of the appeal to religious experience".^{66a} Dr. Stephenson has summed up the things the English Modernists fought for during what he calls their "great period" thus:

"They fought, above all, for a supernatural, but non-miraculous, Christianity — or, rather, a Christianity where miracles were not *contra naturam*. They fought for a degree Christology, i.e. they believed that all men were sons of God but Christ pre-eminently so. This led them to the dangerous corollary that not simply Christ, but man, was consubstantial with the Father. They held strongly to the doctrine of the Incarnation but they were unwilling to insist that the Incarnation necessarily involved the Virgin Birth or the physical Resurrection".^{67a}

The main thrust of Liberal Protestantism at large was provided by the more or less left wing disciples of Ritschl. Supreme among these was Harnack. There can be no doubt that in removing what he regarded as Pauline and Hellenistic accretions from the simple gospel he emphasised the ideas of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is, however, an oft-committed error to suppose that this slogan (for that is what it became) exhausts his teaching. He was equally in earnest in propounding his view of the Kingdom of God, with all that that entailed concerning the commandment of love. Further, as J.K. Mozley pointed out, he did recognise "the mystery inherent in the Person of Christ" but he "refused to accept the historic account of the Person of Christ as given in the doctrines of His divinity and incarnation. His deep reverence for Jesus as the supreme Teacher and the Revealer of God did not lead him to the acceptance of the Pauline and Johannine Christology and to the affirmations of the Nicene Creed".^{4b} To none was Harnack's position more unsatisfactory than to the Catholic Modernists. We have already mentioned Loisy's reply; but Tyrrell's words were no less severe: "The Christ that Harnack sees, looking back through nineteen centuries of Catholic darkness, is only the reflection of a Liberal Protestant face, seen at the bottom of a deep well".^{50b} But to many the power of the Harnackian Jesus was considerable, and a prominent British exposition of this type is that of the Baptist T.R. Glover: *The Jesus of History* (1917).

Many theological liberals would have agreed with the American Leighton Parks that "Modernism is not a body of doctrine. It is a state of mind. It is an attempt to 'justify the ways of God to man', that is, to man in the twentieth century".^{68a} Not the least of the liberal-conservative frictions arose because of the difficulty the latter had in persuading the former not only that their position was wrong, but that it was dogmatic! But — yet another qualification! — not all liberals were professedly undogmatic. Some were anxious that the term "evangelical" should be added to their designation, and to these we finally turn.

Dr. Storr provides us with a definition of Liberal Evangelicalism with which many of his contemporaries would have agreed: "Liberal Evangelicalism emphasises the primacy of spirit and idea, and is always on the watch lest any outward embodiment of organisation, or rule or order, should usurp the place which rightfully belongs to what is inward".^{69a} He proceeds to show that Liberal Evangelicalism is "suspicious of all cut and dried schemes of doctrine";^{69b} that it upholds belief in the progressive revelation of truth; and that it is heir to Schleiermacher in its conviction that "the dogma should grow out of the experience, and, if necessary, be modified as the experience developed".^{69c} Storr does not wish to imply, however, that liberal evangelicals do not know where they stand, and have no positive gospel; so he begs some important questions in affirming that "Liberal Evangelicalism finds its ultimate ground of authority in the Mind and Spirit of Christ".^{69d} The liberal Congregationalist C.J. Cadoux was a little more specific in averring that the use of the labels 'liberal' or 'modernist' "presupposes belief in the existence, sovereignty, and goodness of God, in the Lordship and Saviourhood of Jesus Christ, and in the reality and power of the Christian Gospel of Salvation".^{70a} The use of the terminology of orthodoxy did little to reassure some, and when Fosdick declared that *he* was a Liberal Evangelical — and not one of the unthinkingly optimistic kind either — the conservatives were appalled, and the Unitarians pressed him to shun hypocrisy and come over.^{71a}

We have attempted to chart troubled waters. The legacy of the nineteenth century to theology was confusion — though in fairness we must confess that that confusion was not entirely the fault of the nineteenth century. The roots of the theological predicament of the early twentieth century go a long way down the centuries. The nineteenth century is the period during which the cumulative effect of older tendencies and newer methodologies is felt with tremendous force. The legacy of that century is the question "What *is* the heart of the gospel, and how may we best express it?" It might be said that every age has to face that question; and that is true. But we have to face it in a post-Christendom period. Our situation is in certain important respects more like that of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement and Tertullian, than it is like that of Augustine, Aquinas, Luther or Calvin — all of whom could easily make the assumptions of Christendom. It thus transpires that prominent among the questions freshly to be addressed is the methodological question, Jerusalem or Athens?

III

It is our conviction that notwithstanding changing times, circumstances and modes of expression, God's holy love does not change; the prime needs of man concerning sin and salvation do not change; the fundamental gospel message does not change; and the ways in which that message may be distorted display an almost monotonous likeness through the ages. Notable amongst these ways are the several varieties of Pelagianism, with which so much of the churchly debate on the God-man relation has been concerned; and the long-standing tendency towards unhistorical mysticisms coupled often with a blurring of the Creator-creature distinction, to which their philosophical commerce has led some Christians. Both tendencies posit understandings of the nature and relations of God and man which ill accord with the basic thrust of the gospel. We may therefore say that although the particulars of the modern conservative-liberal debate — the modern understanding of history and criticism, evolutionary-immanentist thought, and so on — were new, the main issues in the debate were venerable indeed. We shall attempt to isolate some of these perennial themes as they emerge in the debates of the early twentieth century. We shall show that the hands of neither conservative nor liberal are entirely clean when it comes to distorting the gospel (nor are those of self-appointed adjudicators, no doubt!); and we shall end by drawing a moral which is none the less important for being couched in general terms.

We return first to the liberals — and at once we enter a caveat. We have been at some pains to point out that between those liberals who advocated at this-worldly "get up and go" version of Christianity which took its cue from the historical Jesus *qua* exemplar, and such philosophical immanentists as T.H. Green, who sought to safeguard Christianity from historical relativities and criticism, there is a great gulf fixed. Hence any list of liberal distortions (and likewise of conservative distortions) will be generalised. So, for that matter, will be any account of liberal and conservative virtues.

It can hardly be denied that some liberal critics of the Bible adopted an unduly sceptical attitude towards the scriptural texts. Strauss eventually concluded that the only honest thing to do was to deny that he was a Christian. Many, however, anxious to love God with all their minds and to exercise responsible stewardship over their personal resources, applied themselves reverently and with the best possible motives to be sacred text:

"They...read the Bible, not merely for personal edification, like many of the older men, who put more gospel into the Book of Leviticus and the Book of Judges than some people now-a-days can find in the Epistle to the Romans; not merely for the purpose of collecting fresh materials to use for the conversion of sinners; but to discover what the Bible really meant. And that was surely admirable. The gentle — the violent — pressure which used to be put on reluctant texts by theologians and preachers of all creeds to *make* them *say* the right thing or to *prevent* them from saying the wrong, was as bad as the gentle or violent pressure put on obstinate heretics by the Inquisition with precisely the same object".^{72a}

In the course of their work such men received as new light the deliverances of the anthropologists, psychologists and students of comparative religion — more often than not being inspired by the thought that if they were indeed handling *God's* Word, no scientific advance could undermine it, but that if it became clear that they had been bound to superstitions, the sooner they discarded them the better. In their theologising they eagerly took a leaf out of Plato's book and determined to follow the argument wherever it might lead. Further, they were especially concerned to ensure that it was a *moral* God with whom they had to do. Not for them the God of caprice; not for them the God who required the murder of his Son before he could be induced to forgive (truth to tell some of them thus parodied all but the most brazen of conservatives in making their points). Again, since God's revelation was couched in moral terms, those who responded to it must be moral too. Erskine of Linlathen was among those who early emphasised this point: "The reasonableness of a religion seems to me to consist in there being a direct and natural connection between a believing of the doctrines which it inculcates, and a being formed by these to the character which it recommends. If the belief of the doctrines has no tendency to train a disciple in a more exact and more willing discharge of its moral obligations, there is evidently a very strong probability against the truth of that religion".⁷³ This ethical emphasis was later taken up with other than individual reference, and the idea that the Church could sit up prophetically by whilst unjust social structures were allowed to exploit the masses (however much private beneficence there may have been), was severely and rightly trounced by the men of the Social Gospel school.

Yet the very zeal with which some of these ideas were pursued led to imbalance; and the liberal C.J. Cadoux had to agree that

there were individual modernists and groups of modernists (however unrepresentative they were) against whom the charges which he lists could justifiably be levelled;

"Modernism today unduly exalts man, and teaches him to deify himself, to emancipate himself from God's authority, and to believe that he is completely self-sufficient: it therefore largely ignores the problem of sin and evil, and has an unwarranted confidence in the certainty of human progress. It is accused also of rejecting the authority and witness of the Bible, dishonestly misdating its documents, denying the Lordship, Divinity, and saving power of Jesus, denying the Incarnation and Resurrection, having no place for sacrifice, and in general abandoning the Christian Gospel. It is branded as individualistic, intellectualistic, rationalistic, humanistic, and optimistic in the wrong senses, subjective and anarchic, proud, foolish, poisonous, and even Satanic. It is held responsible for the decline of the churches, and having been weighed in the balance and found wanting, may be pronounced dead".^{70b}

We shall provide evidence to show that some liberals, in their desire to reduce the burden of belief, did threaten the gospel; that they were encouraged in this direction by an optimism in man inspired by evolutionary-immanentist thought of various hues; and we shall cite the Social Gospel school as bearing clear marks of those attenuations of the gospel which concern us, whilst recognising their genuine and major challenge to Christian ethical theory. While we note their inadequate diagnosis and prescription, we shall not fail to applaud their proper moral concern for man in society..

Few liberals assailed the doctrinal undergrowth as zestfully as the Dutch. Professor Bavinck of Kampen lamented thus:

"It is a slow process of dissolution that meets our view. It began with setting aside the Confession. Scripture alone was to be heard. Next, Scripture also is dismissed, and the Person of Christ is fallen back on. Of this Person, however, first His Divinity, next His pre-existence, finally His sinlessness, are surrendered, and nothing remains but a pious man, a religious genius, revealing to us the love of God. But even the existence and love of God are not able to withstand criticism. Thus the moral element in man becomes the last basis from which the battle against Materialism is

conducted. But this basis will appear to be as unstable and unreliable as the others".⁷⁴

Undeterred by such warnings, some preachers joined the liberal theologians in their quest of a naturalistically-honed Ockham's razor. Frank Lenwood, pastor of a busy Leeds Congregational church sought a principled approach to a situation in which a quiet revolution was taking place — "so quiet that most of the congregations do not notice the alteration, and go on repeating the hackneyed arguments in a vain attempt to satisfy the restless younger minds".^{75a} Lenwood was convinced that "until we clear away the condemned building, we shall never get room for the new architecture which we plainly require."^{75b}

For most liberals the new architecture was most desperately sought in relation to the doctrines of God, sin and atonement, and many thought they had found it. Thus, the Unitarian Dr. S.H. Mellone declared, "We have now affirmed our faith in the essential humanity of God and the native divine spark in the spirit of man [no novel idea this!]. The idea of the one now helps to say what we mean when we try to define the other".⁷⁶ Contemporaneously, across the Atlantic, Leighton Parks was rejoicing in the passage "from the thought of the Sovereignty of God to the Fatherhood of God. As a dogma, that has always been accepted; as a living truth, it is the discovery of the nineteenth century".^{68b} In the thought of Dr. A.E. Garvie we see the old struggling with the new in such a way as to raise a serious question concerning God's sovereignty:

"We now all believe in the universal Fatherhood of God, the love which wills not the death of any sinner, but wills that all should be saved, if they themselves will. But we must beware of treating that truth as though it were a doctrine of natural theology, a matter of course, a truism, a commonplace. It is revealed and realised in Jesus Christ, His redemption of man from sin, and His reconciliation of man to God. Men are not by nature the children, but only the creatures of God... What destiny will and can Divine love appoint for man? The doctrine of eternal punishment in its crude form is impossible for any enlightened Christian conscience. To assert that all will be saved is to ignore the possibility of the persistence of sin and unbelief in some men, and the impossibility of God saving any but by moral and religious means. For persistent defiance of grace there can be only Divine judgment. If we are to believe in God's Fatherhood we shall

believe that He will do all He can do as love, as holy love, to save all men; but should any refuse salvation, such penalty will fall on them as love, holy love, appoints".^{8b}

Qualifications notwithstanding, how far is this last sentence from the view of some liberals and, oddly enough, of some fundamentalist evangelists, to the effect that "God will save you if you let him?" What does that imply concerning God's sovereignty? The danger is that we pass from saying that God is, strictly, pitiful, to saying that he is pitiable — because he would save, but cannot.

No doubt there were ways of speaking of God which made him appear to be an arbitrary tyrant, but in reacting against such views many liberals verged upon the sentimental, and, unlike Garvie, overlooked the *holiness* of God's love. As a chastened modernist put it, modernism's "doctrine of God has not been big enough".^{77a} In similar vein the authors of a report on "American Congregational Theology" noted that "The substitution of the New Testament doctrine of God as Love, in place of the Old Testament idea of Sovereignty [an inaccurate dichotomy this] ...has been made 'an occasion of the flesh' on the part of those whose only idea of love is that of a weak, indulgent, sentimentalism, instead of the most searching and sincere of all passions, compassionate but never compromising, sacrificial but severe".⁷⁸ In H.R. Niebuhr's classic phrase, "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a Kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross".⁷⁹ The positive point was finely put by Robert Mackintosh: "God's love is the radiance of His righteousness; God's justice is the sternness of His love".⁸⁰

In the absence of the note of holiness much liberal theology devalued the doctrine of the atonement. Undeniably there had been immoral representations of that doctrine which deserved demolition, but in many quarters the pendulum swung so far that there was resumed in modern dress the Bernard *versus* Abelard dispute. If God loves all men; if he is Father of all; if all men are his children [a term which some liberals took to mean "sons", thereby overlooking the fact that in the New Testament sonship comes by adoption]; then God will so desire fellowship with men as to provide an exemplar Christ who will show men how to live; and this he has done. On this view sin is something less than radical; man is something more than unable; the atonement is an example given rather than a price paid. In fact the doctrine of sin which some liberals espoused

was as atomistic as that of Pelagius. It well accorded with the contemporary anthropocentric subjectivism which some learned from such psychologists as J.B. Pratt, for whom the crucial matter was not the restoration of a right relationship with God, but "the achievement of a new self" which it is the *individual's* task to create.⁸¹ One of the most surprising features of some liberal theology is that for all its emphasis upon the pressing need to secure social justice and to ameliorate conditions in society at large, it entertained for the most part the most individualistic understanding of sin and atonement. The individual had only to imitate Christ, and all would be well.⁸² (Not indeed that all liberals were thus at fault: Charles Gore for one neither exalted man nor minimised the importance of sin. We speak of general tendencies only).

The temptation unduly to exalt man's competence to live aright is of long standing. We find it not only in the more formal context of "Pelagian"- "Augustinian" debate, but also in such a one as the provocative Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) who was persuaded that man's natural ability to improve was such that his progress in this regard would continue until the millenium dawned. But it was the evolutionary-immanentist strain of nineteenth century thought which really launched latter-day optimism in man. The hellenistically inclined followed F.D. Maurice in holding that the Incarnation testifies to the fact that man is already redeemed;⁸³ J.R. Illingworth regarded the Incarnation as the "guiding star" of every phase of progress;^{86b} and whilst few went as far as Bender of Bonn in holding that "Not God but man is the central element in faith; man is the sun round which circles the world of religious thought",^{84a} popular lyricists did not lag far behind:

"I am the master of my fate
I am the captain of my soul"

sang W.E. Henley in his *Invictus*; whilst Swinburne eulogised, "Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the master of things". In some quarters pulpit banality was rife, so that Mandel Creighton, writing of Dean Stanley's sermons, said, "There was a certain amount of moral enthusiasm, to the intent that it was desirable to be good rather than bad; but I had previously gathered that from other sources".⁸⁵ But the tide could not be held back. To Walter Rauschenbusch the "swiftness of evolution" in America *proved* "the immense latent perfectibility in human nature";⁸⁶ Albert Peel reassured his fellow English Congregationalists that any dismay occasioned by the higher criticism should be offset by confidence in the progress of the

human race — he said that as late as 1923;⁸⁷ and Rhondda Williams stood the seventeenth century John Robinson on his head when he averred "there is still more light and truth to break forth through the souls of men".^{88a}

Many of the tendencies we have noted found their natural home in Social Gospel theory. Not indeed that such theory was the inevitable consequence of liberalism in theology. On the contrary, although there were echoes of Social Gospel thinking in, for example, Anglican Modernism ("The ideal ever before the Church must be that of efficient service for the bringing in of the Kingdom of God"⁸⁹), Dr. A.M.G. Stephenson, himself a Modern Churchman, had to admit that "Some of them were uninterested in social problems".^{67b} The Social Gospel was, however, of considerable importance. It administered a much needed jolt to an American religiosity which had preached the moral values whilst ignoring the unjust social structures which threatened those very values. It stood, moreover, in the tradition of the Pilgrim Fathers, of whom it was said that "they applied the principles of the Gospel to elevate society, to regulate education, to civilize humanity, to purify love, to reform the church and the state, to assert, to defend and to die for liberty, in short to mould and redeem by its all-transforming energy everything that belongs to man in his individual and social relations".⁹⁰ With such declarations as this the Social Gospel movement was heralded; it gathered momentum during the 1870s and 1880s and thereafter, for three decades, it was a principal constituent of America's "Age of Crusades".⁹¹

The immanentist philosophy had taught men that God needed them and was close to them; evolutionary thought had popularised the concept of progress; and undoubted scientific and technological marvels had encouraged man to exult in his prowess. Older understandings of man's nature and lot had been shown, so it was thought, to be partial, threadbare, and even repellent. The spotlight was taken off sin as an affront to God's holy love, and turned upon sin as social injustice:

"It is impossible to lead a Christian life except in a Christianized society. Yet if we accept the thought of divine immanence, sin and evil cannot be quite so bad as they seem to be. Considered from the viewpoint of the social gospel the thought that God would damn a man because of sin is offensive.

Since man is inherently good and all men are God's children, there is in modern religion no place for individual salvation...In a word, the social gospel

addresses itself to the task to make the world a decent place to live in...What was formerly spoken of as religious is of value only in so far as it serves social ends".⁹²

Thus some came to speak of "a hell frozen over or turned to innocuous ashes";⁹³ and of the liberal doctrine "surround the individual or community with a good environment and salvation will result" the *Watchman Examiner* declared that "No greater or more insidious heresy ever issued from hell than this..."⁹⁴ Most Social Gospel thinkers, however, would have endorsed the Englishman John Clifford's view that the Social Order is the burden of Jesus's teaching.⁹⁵ Many too would have supported his plea for more social missionaries, and would have applauded his complaint that "The Church has made too much of theology".⁹⁶ Many, but not all. Dr. D.W. Forrest remained convinced that "ministers of the Gospel should aim first at being professional theologians rather than amateur sociologists"⁹⁷ — and with him we agree. So many Social Gospel men seemed to think that they could do God's work for him: "The strength of evil institutions need not dismay us. All that is needed for their removal, and for rearing upon their ashes the structures of a new world, is new thought and new feeling".^{88b} All? But the Kingdom is God's gift, and as far as *man's* credentials as architect of it are concerned, we cannot but agree with D.R. Davies that after two World Wars "Social salvation, which was always a chimera, is now trailing the whiskers of senility".^{9b} Many thus came to feel the inadequacy of the Social Gospel diagnosis of man's disease — and none more acutely than Reinhold Niebuhr:

"It is not moral complacency of which liberal Christianity stands convicted but moral superficialityWhat is lacking is the realization that even the best human will in the world has the corruption of sin in it....Our whole difficulty in American Protestantism is in having so long regarded Christianity as synonymous with the simple command to love God and our fellow men, that we have forgotten that the Christian religion is really a great deal more than this....the divine mercy revealed in Christ is on the one hand a power which overcomes the contradiction between what we are and what we ought to be, and on the other hand a pledge of forgiveness for this sinful element which is never completely overcome short of the culmination of history. Only such a faith can disclose the actual facts of human existence. It alone can uncover the facts because it alone has answers for the facts which are disclosed".⁹⁸

In saying that immanentist thought was a powerful impetus to theological liberalism, we do not overlook the fact that some liberals so shunned philosophy as to place themselves in a positivism of experience no less constricting than the biblical positivism which they scorned. Ritschl and Harnack had no patience with Hegelianism, for example. But for all their overt hostility to the immanent Absolute, their methodological presuppositions were congenial to the general immanentist mood if only in the negative sense that they seldom employed the concept of transcendence, or invoked that of the supernatural. We would go so far as to say that most of the recoils from intellectualism that the late nineteenth century witnessed were inspired by one variety or another of immanentism. Where philosophy was shunned, what was viewed with suspicion was monism rather than immanentism, and this owing to the inadequate attention to value, experience and history which monism was held to pay. We may thus accept Forsyth's generalisation, "Liberal theology...views the course of religion as an immanent evolution accounting even for experience".^{10d}

As we have seen, the climate of immanentist-evolutionary thought provided fertile soil for many fresh expressions of Spinoza's belief that "whatever is, is in God".⁹⁹ This soil was congenial both to those who wished to avoid the perils of historicity on the one hand, and the more mysterious reaches of theology in the interest of practical Christianity on the other: seldom had a philosophical stance proved to be so contradictorily adaptable. Of the more practical expressions we have already spoken. It remains to note, as a rider to our earlier discussion of immanentism, some further examples of the impact of that variety of thought upon theology itself. Immanentism enabled the philosopher Bosanquet to affirm, "We are spirits, and our life is one with that of the Spirit which is the whole and the good".¹⁰⁰ It enabled Rhondda Williams to sermonise thus: "Every new discovery brings a new world, but all such discoveries pale to insignificance before the crowning discovery that man is spirit, and that the human spirit is one with God...In every human birth a part of God...is enfleshed, incarnated".^{88c} H.D.A. Major could point out that "The modern Churchman differs from the Chalcedonian Fathers by holding that the substances of Deity and of Humanity are *not two*, but one".¹⁰¹ If in Jesus the liberal Congregationalist T. Wigley saw "the highest expression of the law of our evolution, an example of the true order of divine humanity",¹⁰² to Lowes Dickinson the existence or non-existence of Jesus in history was immaterial.¹⁰³ Finally, immanentism gave a licence to many Incarnational theologians to remodel that doctrine so that even the Unitarian Martineau could declare, "The Incarnation is true, not of Christ exclusively, but of man universally and God everlastingly".¹⁰⁴

The criticisms of the above positions are now quite familiar to us, and can simply be listed and endorsed. The first point is the ontological one. The blurring of the Creator-creature distinction which immanentism entails encourages idealism rather than religion. This is so whether we think of monism or of experienced values. In the former case we have "an infinite extension of our horizon or our self-consciousness"^{105a} but nothing of the transcendent majesty of God. In the latter case, as Dr. Quick said of Ritschlian theology, it "can only excuse us for treating our Lord as God on the ground of his goodness: it cannot justify us in affirming that He is God on the ground of His being, unless it proceeds further to assert that all Godhead is but a quality of man".¹⁰⁶ But the most serious criticism of immanentism is that all too often it makes theologians unable or unwilling to take adequate account of God's nature and demands, and of man's nature and needs. In consequence it all too often leaves us with worthy aspirations which we are impotent to realise, with undifferentiated mysticism or humanism; or with a religion of ungrounded charity which — especially if the prevailing climate be optimistic — all too easily unwholesomely exalts man and demeans God, encourages works and sits light to grace.

In a not untypical piece of liberalism K.C. Anderson, having declared against ecclesiasticism and theological obscurantism, waxed lyrical:

"What are the reports that are coming in from all parts of the world to-day? They all tend to one announcement, they all unite their voices to preach one mighty Gospel, the essential goodness of the world and of life: that the universe is cradled in love; that it is not only a unity, but a beneficent unity; that the life of man, the child of the universe, lies embosomed in one great Life; that the essence of things is good, and the purpose and the outcome good. But what is this but a confirmation of the essential Gospel of Jesus Christ?"¹⁰⁷

We can well imagine what P.T. Forsyth would have said in reply to that question. Indeed, he said it in an article on "The reality of grace" which immediately precedes that of Anderson in the journal in question — never were two articles more engagingly juxtaposed. He there castigated preachers who "coo over the people the balmy optimisms of a natural and unconscious Christianity which makes no call upon the will for positive belief, but delights those who are only at the aesthetic stage of life".¹⁰⁸ As he elsewhere said, "There is a liberalism whose badge is redemption *from* an Apostolic Gospel, and not *by* it".^{105b}

B.C. Plowright came to the same rueful conclusion and confessed, what is more, that the practical benefits expected of liberalism had quite failed to materialise:

"We believed with a *naïvete* which at this distance of time has something sadly humorous about it, that we had but to recast our theological thinking and re-phrase our theological vocabulary, and hey, presto! our church doors would be crowded once more with multitudes of men and women who had been put off religion simply because its theology was old-fashioned and had been exploded by modern science. How could the modern man trained in evolutionary thought be expected to believe in the Fall, in the literal inspiration of the Bible, in the Virgin Birth, a substitutionary theory of the Atonement, and so forth? Whereupon we proceeded to rationalize religion in the conviction that that was all that the modern man needed or desired. Religion became simple commonsense, and whether we intended to do so or not, we left the modern man with the impression that it was all plain sailing, that there neither was nor could be in it either mystery or marvel or anything before which he need bow in the wonder of worship".^{77b}

P.T. Forsyth put the tendency we have been discussing into historical perspective thus:

"The Gnosticism of the second century, the Spiritualism of the sixteenth, and the Protestant liberalism or Roman modernism of the twentieth all represent outcrops of the same pagan tendency to replace faith by insight, to make mere inspiration do the work of revelation.... The Reformers lived with the note of revelation, on a theology of facts; the Anabaptists with the note of inspiration, on a theology of consciousness...as the vice of the one was to dry into a hard orthodox severed from experience, the vice of the other was to deliquesce into a vagrant experience on whose bogs flitted the enticing firebrakes of subjective whim".¹⁰⁹

What now of "hard orthodoxy"? We have said that there are conservative no less than liberal ways of distorting the gospel, and Forsyth has put his finger on one way in which conservatives are guilty. But before we proceed to investigate conservative distortions it will be instructive, by way of a bridge, to see how a recent writer, whose Reformed and conservative credentials are impeccable has set matters down. Professor-emeritus R.A. Finlayson enquires whether modernist belief and

evangelical faith are the same — and the fact that he enquires as recently as 1973 suggests that to some at least the issue is still a live one. Mr. Finlayson's answer is, not surprisingly, negative: modernism is "another gospel", and this for the following reasons:

"Evangelical Christian belief holds that true religion is from God in the sense that the initiative is with God...Modernism holds that...all religion...is a movement from man to God...Evangelical belief holds that man has reliable authority for his faith in the Holy Scriptures. Modernist belief holds that a man's authority for his faith must be found in his own consciousness...Evangelical faith holds that in Jesus of Nazareth God became man. Modernist belief holds that in Jesus of Nazareth man became God...For the evangelical Christian the Cross of Calvary represents an act of God for the redemption of mankind. For the modernist the Cross points the way by which man can save himself...Evangelical faith is that moral character is the permanent quality in life and that it determines our destiny after death. Modernist belief is that life after death is uncertain, but that if the human soul survives, the All-loving Universal Father will treat all His children alike".¹¹⁰

If we qualify Finlayson's "modernists" by "some" we can accept much of what he says. But there is nothing in the article to suggest that conservatives too can be guilty of reducing the gospel. We shall now make good that omission; and we shall discover that whilst some conservative errors are the obverse of liberal virtues, others are the peculiar contribution of the conservative mentality.

IV

At the outset we must observe that if anything conservatism presents more internally contradictory gospel-distorting possibilities than liberalism. We do not, therefore, have a straightforward conservative-liberal dichotomy on our hands; we shall often find conservative against conservative. Thus on the one hand there are conservatives who emphasise system, and who tend towards intellectualism in theology and legalism in morality and ecclesiology; on the other hand there are conservatives whose emphasis is upon heart rather than head, who suspect scholarship, sit loose to churchmanship, and can become antinomian. As we look at each of these very generalised

groups in turn we shall discover that each has its own way of being "Pelagian".

Some conservatives, Dr. G.H. Clark among them, set great store by the fact that Christianity is a system. Among others who have adopted this position are Professors Louis Berkhof and Cornelius Van Til. Invariably this position is associated with the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible — a doctrine which all the writers here named are anxious to distinguish from a "dictation" theory of inspiration. What they seek is the happy concord of faith and reason; what they oppose is unbiblical rationalism in all its guises. What concerns us is the fact that in the hands of some this approach can lead to a gospel-denying scholasticism: to the view that Christianity is a philosophy before it is a religion. Thus D.B. Stevick has criticised Van Til on the ground that "The God of [his] formulations (i.e. "a self-complete system of coherence") is one God; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is another.... no one [according to the position criticised] can understand the Gospel except through skill in using the thought-forms of Western culture. This, in turn, means that the more philosophical skill a person shows, the better Christian he is — a kind of modern Gnosticism".^{111a} We do not find that in fact Van Til makes so aristocratic a claim as this. But an impression of undue intellectualism can all too easily be created, even if philosophical skill is not held to be the mark of the top-grade Christian. Thus Professor Young has argued that some "hyper-covenantists" such as Hermann Dooyeweerd, who have exploited certain strands of Kuyper's thought, have disparaged piety and vital religion.¹¹² It is doubtless because of similar apprehensions at this point that, having maintained that in the interests of rationality and of the objectivity of religious truth conservative Protestants uphold the authority of the divinely inspired Bible against ecclesiastical or subjectivist authority, Dr. Henry proceeded to say that "Evangelical Christianity is not, however, mainly a revealed metaphysic or systematic exposition of supernatural reality; rather, it is the personal assurance of forgiveness of sins and of divine redemption through faith in Christ's mediatorial work for sinners".¹¹³ Our question is, "If Christianity is the latter, can it at all (not "mainly") be the former?" And our answer is that it cannot. The gospel implies a system, but in itself it is not a system. Systems have an educational and expository role — even if they cannot guarantee orthodoxy — but in the last resort, "It is not mere truths or doctrines, not even if they were guaranteed by a perpetual Divine miracle, that can generate

and nourish Christian life, but the personal action of the personal God, rendered possible through Christ's work and through faith in Christ".¹¹⁴ As H.R. Mackintosh said, "Theologies from the first have perished; they wax old as doth a garment; as a vesture Time folds them up, and lays them by. Nothing save the Gospel is abiding, and its years shall not fail".^{84b}

Now it is not simply that some conservative theologians emphasise system *per se*; it is that in practice they have to exalt one of a number of *competing* systems, all of which claim to be scripturally based. The Calvinist-Arminian debate is a classic illustration of this fact. Moreover *within* the broadly Calvinistic position there were gospel-denying possibilities. Thus, for example, some found themselves holding that since the elect alone could be saved, and since salvation was the work of God alone, there could be no general overtures, or "free offers" of the gospel. Hussey typified this position, and it survives among the Gospel Standard Baptists to this day.¹¹⁵ It is not difficult, however, to find numerous examples to show that this is a minority view among Calvinists — indeed that one Calvinist's systematic meat is another Calvinist's systematic poison. Thus Zanchius, Calvin's younger contemporary, exhorts his readers to emulate Christ and the apostles "who all...took every opportunity of preaching to sinners and enforced their ministry with proper rebukes, invitations and exhortations as occasion required".¹¹⁶ Again, the first chapter of the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), prepared by Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75), contains a classic statement of the duty of freely offering the gospel, and of the distinction between the preacher's external call to all hearers and the Holy Spirit's internal call to the elect. "Beloved", cried Tobias Crisp to his flock, "will you starve in a cook's shop, as they say? Is there such plenty in Christ, and will you perish for hunger?"¹¹⁷ Robert Trail expounded the free offer in masterly fashion;^{118a} John Mason appealed to sinners, "Come as you are; come poor, come needy, come naked...His heart is free; His arms are open; 'tis His joy and His crown to receive you";¹¹⁹ Horatius Bonar reminded his hearers that "the Gospel is not, 'Christ died for the elect'; neither is it 'Christ died for all'. But it is 'Christ died for sinners'".¹²⁰ Finally, in our own time, Professor John Murray and others have defended the free offer of the gospel.¹²¹

When the contrary position is taken numerous difficulties ensue. How does the preacher know to whom to offer the gospel? What of the perils of undue introspection to which believers are liable when they have so regularly to look within to ensure that they are indeed the "sensible sinners" for whom Christ died?

Small wonder that one of the main questions at issue in the Marrow controversy was that of assurance. Thomas Boston and his colleagues contended that men had the right to know that they had a saving interest in Christ, and they set themselves to defend the free offer of the gospel, thereby becoming the harbingers of revival and missionary zeal in Scotland. Historically, the situation was complicated by a contractual, rather than a truly covenantal theory of grace, and it was against this that McLeod Campbell protested in the nineteenth century. He claimed that the doctrine of limited atonement undermined the free offer of the gospel (whereas the orthodox distinguished between the external and the internal calls¹²²), and focussed attention not upon what Christ has done, but upon the contractual duties the sinner needs to have performed — repentance, obedience — and the inward feelings he needs to have, in order to be assured of his right to the gospel. All of which is one conservative variety of "Pelagianism": God alone elects us, but we have to fulfil certain conditions, *and keep on fulfilling them* if we would be sure of it.¹²³

The resultant legalism has persisted in some conservative circles, and that long after the explanatory theology has been forgotten by many. As D.B. Stevick observed of fundamentalism, "There is a long heritage...of inflamed attacks on the theater, John Barleycorn, tobacco, dancing, cardplaying, and other sinful indulgences — in other words, a long heritage of fiddling while Rome burns".^{111b} On which mentality the conservative Dr. Carnell made the proper comment:

"Fundamentalists defend the gospel, to be sure, but they sometimes act as if the gospel read, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, don't smoke, don't go to the movies, and above all don't use the Revised Standard Version — and you will be saved'. Whenever fundamentalism encourages this sort of legalism it falls within the general tradition of the Galatian Judaizers".¹²⁴

Finally, preoccupation with system can foster that totalitarianism spirit which has caused so much anguish in Christian circles, and which has all too often disrupted the household of faith. It comes as no surprise to discover that one of the factors in giving a new lease of life to the old conservative-liberal disputes is the modern ecumenical movement as represented principally by the World Council of Churches, a body which sits far too loosely to the Bible and to doctrine for the liking of the more thoroughgoing conservative systematisers.¹²⁵

But not all conservatives are system builders. Far from it: some of them abhor systems. Just as some liberals denigrated theology on the ground that it unnecessarily impeded social action, so some conservatives have despised "book learning", applauded the "old-time religion" which was good enough for Moses *et al*, and regarded theological seminaries as inventions of the devil designed to drive the last vestiges of faith out of erstwhile "Bible-believing" ordinands. Such are the results of a *warped* pietism — of a pietism with which Spenser and Wesley would by no means have felt at ease.¹²⁶ They were neither anti-intellectualist nor individualistic in the pejorative sense.

Conservative individualism shows itself in a variety of ways. It can lead to an anti-Church mentality. This may arise either because the existing churches have become so schismatic in the name of conservative confessionalism that gentler spirits cry "We are of Christ" and resign; or because the more evangelistic members, having failed to move their fellows to mission, inaugurate separated, and often inter-denominational agencies to meet the need. On occasion both motives may jointly be present. As to the former R.W. Dale rightly advised that "Evangelical Christians should remember that Individualism involves a suppression of half the duties and a surrender of half the blessedness of the Christian life. The children of God belong to 'the household of faith'".¹²⁷ Concerning the latter Robert Mackintosh regretted that all too often "Evangelicalism does not wish to be distracted by any wider moral outlook than the desire to save one's own soul in the first place, and, secondly, to promote the salvation of the souls of other individuals... Infant baptism is the great rock of offence to the triumphant revival [because it places the infant individual within a covenanted fellowship]".¹²⁸

Next, the methodology of individualistic, broadly Arminian Christianity can carry "Pelagian" overtones no less than the exaggerated Calvinism to which we have already referred. William Cunningham detected such overtones in the Morisonianism of his day; the Finney-influenced revivalists of the later nineteenth century further popularised the questionable approach; whilst the contemporary "voice over" decisionism has, we may hope, carried the technique to its technological limit. The error amounts to the view that the individual's action in making a faith commitment is the truly decisive thing. Hence such appeals as, "Only believe..."; "God wishes to save you — will you let him?" "Why not decide for Christ now?" These all fail to state (if those who employ such slogans do not fail to believe in) the priority of God's regenerative work; they make it appear that man holds the key to his salvation; and at their worst they

present the pitiable, rather than the sovereign, God who cannot make a move without the sinner's permission. None of which is to deny that proper synergism in which God does all and man does all;^{129a} it is only to disallow that synergism which proclaims that God does part and man does part, but that the former cannot do his part until the latter has done his. Trail rightly expostulated, "How abominable it is to Christians ears, and how much more unto Christ's, to hear a man plead thus for pardon: 'Here is my repentance; where is thy pardon? Here is my faith; where is thy justification?'"^{118b} Toplady was nearer the mark, "Nothing in my hand I bring, Simply to Thy cross I cling".¹³⁰

The emphasis upon the believer's feelings has not only encouraged anti-intellectualism in some varieties of conservatism, it has also spawned antinomianism in ethics; but although the teaching of some veered in an antinomian direction it is not easy to find practical exponents of utter licence who claimed the protection of divine grace.^{131a} For all that, P.T. Forsyth's warning stands against any who would easily set aside law in the supposed interests of grace: "So many converted lives go wrong and relapse because their conversion has not given them a Sovereign but only a Saviour. And the Christian life is not only gratitude for blessing received, but absolute obedience to a claim that we must own as holy just and good, whether we feel it is our blessing or not".^{105c}

Of more practical consequence has been the unfortunate inhibiting effect of conservative individualism upon Christian social ethics. Here we have the obverse of the Social Gospel. There is, of course, no necessary connection between social unconcern and theological conservatism. The Reformed tradition has had its Prime Minister Kuyper, and many of the pietists made a valiant contribution to the social welfare of their fellows: "Few movements in church history and few schools of theological conviction have been, in proportion to population, so productive of institutional inventiveness and cultural creativity as have been the Moravians, the Methodists, and their counterparts within the larger churches".¹³² Wesley's schools, Whitefield's orphanage, the Clapham Sect, the Salvation Army, the missions of the nineteenth century, the multitude of philanthropic, sometimes quite localised, institutions - all these sought in their several ways to fulfil the Christian hope of a world reconciled to God.¹³³

In this last phrase we have the clue to the conservative suspicion of the Social Gospel men. The conservatives could not make any easy identification of progress in the world with the

coming of the Kingdom; and many of them, since they thought in terms of an aggregate of saved souls who together would renew the world, could not challenge those diseased systems which were the cause of the symptoms against which they so zealously battled. So great had the severance of practice from Christian thought been that some concluded that Wesley and Jonathan Edwards were, as regards socio-political thought "rationalists, sons of the Enlightenment".¹³⁴ Dale had made a similar diagnosis sixty years earlier:

"Although [the leaders of the Evangelical movement] insisted very earnestly on the obligation of individual Christian men to live a devout and godly life, they had very little to say about the relations of the individual Christian to the general order of human society, or about the realization of the kingdom of God in all the various regions of human activity. As the Revival had no great ideal of the Church as a Divine institution, it had no great ideal of the State as a Divine institution; nor had it any great ideal of the Divine order of the world".^{72b}

When to this was added the later individualistic thrust of revivalism and fundamentalism, the prospect of lively Christian social ethics emanating from the conservative side receded still further. Some indeed saw the need: "if [the Church] is to retain its ascendancy over the minds of men [it must] bring Christianity to bear as an applied power on the life and conditions of society...I look to the twentieth century to be an era of Christian Ethic even more than of Christian Theology".¹³⁵ But the renewal was a long time coming. Professor Jellema has accurately analysed three ways in which conservatives rationalised their avoidance of ethical questions: they exalted separation from the world; they over-simplified the gospel so that it had to do only with personal salvation; and they formally repeated the formulations of Christian ethics of an earlier generation, thus "evading the problems of a contemporary society by giving a series of irrelevant answers".¹³⁶

To end on a more hopeful note: the year 1947 saw the publication of Carl Henry's *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. In this book and in many since Dr. Henry has urged his fellow conservatives to develop a doctrine of redemption adequate to the needs of the whole man in all his personal and societal relations. Again, the eighteenth General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches produced a paper of "The Reformed Faith and the World of Today" in which aloofness from the world was confessed, and amendment sought.^{131b} The evangelicals who met at Lausanne in 1974 declared that

"Reconciliation with man is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation. Nevertheless, it is our duty to be involved in socio-political action... For both active evangelistic and social involvement are necessary expressions not only of our doctrines of God and man... but also of our love for our neighbour and our obedience to Jesus Christ".¹³⁷ Would it be fair to say that thus far there has been more talk than action? Some conservatives think so, and President I.J. Hesselink diagnosed the situation as follows:

"one of the main reasons for this lack of progress, despite an awareness of the problem, is the unevangelical, i.e. unbiblical, view that social, political, and economic problems are of secondary importance and that these problems can be solved by redeemed individuals without attacking the structures of society which are unjust.

The real problem is that some 'evangelicals', like old-time liberals, have operated with a truncated Bible, despite their formal acknowledgment of its authority. They have rung the changes of John 3: 16 and Acts 16:31 - 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall be saved' - but they have conspicuously ignored the social significance of the Magnificat and the Beatitudes. They have reveled in passages like Isaiah 1: 18 - 'Though your sins be like scarlet, they shall be white as snow' - but have paid little heed to a major motif in the prophets as summarized in Amos 5: 24 - 'Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an everflowing stream'".^{13b}

All of which is an attentuation of the gospel.

It is a chastened liberalism that now confronts us. It is fashionable to say that Barth's *Romans* (1919), appearing as it did in the wake of War, was instrumental in effecting this change in liberals. But Gore, Inge and Temple, Forsyth and Oman, were well aware of man's disease before that catastrophe overtook the nations. On the other hand some, like Peel, decided *not* to be unduly influenced by Barth, and maintained their liberal optimism until the 1930s. But that there was a change cannot be denied. Many came to feel that undue confidence in progress and in man was not something any longer to be indulged in. As well as war there were depressions, and the rise of modern totalitarianism. Who was sufficient? Theologians began to rehabilitate the concept of transcendence. Among the leading figures in this reappraisal were Reinhold Niebuhr, W.M. Horton and John C. Bennett. In 1934 Horton declared with respect to liberalism that

"Disintegration is not too strong a word. The defeat of the liberals is becoming a rout".^{138a} A further sign of the times was Fosdick's sermon of 1935, "The Church must go beyond modernism". He here argued that modernism had failed in being unduly occupied with the intellect, in being too sentimental, in diluting the idea of God, and in seeking a too ready accommodation to the prevailing culture.^{138b} To the same period belongs D.R. Davies's *On to Orthodoxy* (1939) the powerful testimony of a convert from liberalism.

Conservatism too has changed, and that in two main ways. Those in the tradition broadly represented by Carl Henry — the neo-evangelicals — have urged a reappraisal of older attitudes. A catalyst in this regard was Harold J. Ockenga's negative reply to his own question of 1947, "Can fundamentalism win America?"¹³⁹ These men are open, rather than closed; systematic rather than idiosyncratic. Others, under such leaders as Carl McIntire, have pursued the separatist path, have vehemently opposed the World Council of Churches and, it would seem, have been more than a little involved in right wing politics.¹⁴⁰ As Dr. Henry said, "By mid-century fundamentalism obviously signified a temperament as fully as a theology".^{71b}

A further contemporary debate in conservative circles is between those who wish to maintain the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and those who wish to advocate the modified view that it is the biblical doctrines which are inerrant.¹⁴¹ It cannot yet be said that conservatives have made significant contributions to ecclesiology or to sacramental theology — still less to the question of the theological response to non-Christian religions. They are, however, as we have seen, becoming more ethically conscious, and herein lies hope.

"Rabbi" Duncan may put into words the chief lesson we have learned from picking our way across the conservative-liberal theological minefield:

"Some persons preach only doctrine; that makes people all head, which is a monster. Some preach only experience; that makes the people all heart, which is a monster too. Others preach only practice; that makes people all hands and feet, which is likewise a monster. But if you preach doctrine and experience and practice, by the blessing of God, you will have head, and heart, and hands, and feet — a perfect man in Christ Jesus".^{129b}

NOTES

- 1 To this extent we agree with Professor Welch. But when he says, "No significant theological programme is *as such* an attempt to be liberal or conservative, to go left or right (or to stay in the center)" we pause. If by "significant" is meant "widely influential" agreement becomes easier; but such a definition strikes oddly on the ear of those who do not employ a *quasi*-quantitative criterion of significance. Certain it is that some "Old Lights" in every generation have set out to be conservative, and they have often said highly significant, if not generally accepted, things. On the other hand, kite-flying liberals who take a devilish glee in disturbing the faithful are not unknown either. They, however, are not usually significant. See Claude Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, New Haven & London: Yale U.P. 1972, I p.20.
- 2 William P. Merrill, *Liberal Christianity*, New York 1925, p.36.
- 3 For whom see E. Jorstad, *The Politics of Doomsday*, Nashville & New York: Abingdon 1970.
- 4 J.K. Mozley, *Some Tendencies in British Theology*, 1951, (a) p.70, (b) p.29.
- 5 E.W. Barnes, "The future of the evangelical movement" in *Liberal Evangelicalism*, n.d., p.288.
- 6 Professor R.J. Mouw, to whom we are indebted for this point, further notes that in eds. David Wells and John D. Woodbridge, *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing*, Nashville: Abingdon 1975, "no attention is given...to the fact that the Missouri Synod Lutherans, and to a lesser degree the Christian Reformed Church, have been recently having their own 'fundamentalist-modernist' debates, fifty years later than the traumas of the more Anglo-American groups." See his review in *Calvin Theological Journal* 1976, 11, 263.
- 7 B.L. Manning, *The Making of Modern English Religion (1929)*, 1967, p.78.
- 8 A.E. Garvie, "Fifty years' retrospect," *The Congregational Quarterly* 1929, 7, (a) p.18, (b) p.22.
- 9 D.R. Davies, "The essence of Christianity," *The World Christian Digest* Nov. 1953, (a) p.41, (b) p.45. His book *On To Orthodoxy* (1939) is also very much to the point. For earlier hesitations see P.T. Forsyth, "The insufficiency of social righteousness as a moral ideal," *The Hibbert Journal* 1909, 7, 596-613

- 10 P.T. Forsyth, *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* (1907), 1964, (a) p.139, (b) p.142, (c) p.143, (d) p.150. The saying comes to mind, "the rationalist blows cold, the mystic hot; warm up a rationalist and you get a mystic; cool down a mystic and you get a rationalist." For this we are indebted to S.G. Craig, *Christianity Rightly So Called*, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed 1976, p.248.
- 11(a) On this point contrast the positions of John H. Gerstner and Sidney Ahlstrom in eds. Wells and Woodbridge, *op.cit.*; and see James A. Hedstrom, "A bibliography for evangelical reform," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 1976, 19, 225-238, (b) p.38.
- 12 G.H. Clark, "Evangelicalism," in *The Encyclopaedia of Christianity*, Marshallton: National Foundation for Christian Education 1972, IV p.121.
- 13 I. John Hesselink, "Toward a seminary that is Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed," *Reformed Review* 1974, 27, (a) p.107, (b) pp.108-109.
- 14 See J.C. Ryle, *Knots Untied* (1877), Cambridge: James Clarke 1977, pp.3-12. For Anglican Evangelicalism see G.R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England*, 1908 etc.
- 15 (a) Quoted by A.R. Vidler, *Essays in Liberality* 1957, p.13 (b) p.21. Cf. I.T. Ramsey's opening sermon in *Liberal Christianity in History*, Modern Churchmen's Union 1969. A similar plea in face of "that wholesale condemnation of liberalism in theology which is now in vogue" was earlier entered by W.B. Selbie, *Freedom in the Faith* 1944, preface. Selbie said that his work was "not an attempt to defend the liberal Protestant theology of the nineteenth century, but rather to distinguish between the liberal spirit and that particular form of its application." (c) pp.126-151. Dr. Vidler finds that whereas Gore's beliefs qualify him for the Liberal Catholic name — he accepted the principles of modern biblical criticism, he was alive to the social implications of Christianity, and he was advanced in his view of the eternal destiny of those outside the Church — his temperament was aristocratic rather than liberal, Dr. Vidler has lucid chapters on Liberal Protestantism, Roman Catholic Modernism and English Liberal Catholicism in his *20th Century Defenders of the Faith* 1965.
- 16 See Amos Cresswell, *The Story of Cliff*, Culver, Sheffield: Joyful News Bookroom 1965.
- 17 H.B. Workman, "The place of Methodism in the life and thought of the Christian Church," in eds. W.J. Townsend et al., *A New History of Methodism* 1909, I p.30.

- 18 The Free Presbyterian Church denies that the Free Church of Scotland is in truth the continuation of the 1843 Disruption Church; "That the present Free Church, which we can never allow to be the Church of the Disruption, is very much on the down-grade, can easily be proved." In evidence the writer quotes Kenneth A. MacRae of the Free Church, Stornoway, who criticised some of the younger ministers of his Church on the ground that "a robust Calvinism has given place to a colourless presentation of the doctrines of grace, which will neither satisfy a Calvinist nor offend an Arminian." See John Colquhoun, "The present position and prospects of the Reformed Church in Scotland," in *Papers Commemorating the Quarter-Centenary of the Scottish Reformation*, read to the F.P. Synod at Edinburgh, May 1960, p.66.
- 19 Since about 1960 some interesting developments towards increasing confessional consciousness have taken place amongst this sturdily independent group of churches. In 1966 they published *We Believe*, an affirmation of faith; and in 1974 there appeared *A Guide for Church Fellowship* which set down "biblical standards for the help and guidance of the local church in the ordering of its Worship, Discipline and Witness." *Grace Magazine*, the successor of *Gospel Herald* (1833-1970) and *Free Grace Record* (1920-1970) is widely read among Strict Baptists. Again, since 1960 a number of Reformed Baptist churches have been founded *de novo*, and some others have seceded from the Baptist Union. Many of these honour the Particular Baptist Confession of 1689, and *Reformation Today* circulates among them. The Gospel Standard Baptists, who stand in the line of William Gadsby, continue to maintain their distinctive witness on such matters as the gospel offer. Their medium is *The Gospel Standard* (1835-). In an editorial in this magazine (1926, 92, 5-19) the status of the G.S. churches as a distinct denomination was clearly defended. See also S.F. Paul, *Historical Sketch of the Gospel Standard Baptists* 1961; P. Toon, "English Strict Baptists," *The Baptist Quarterly* 1965, 21, 30-36. For the other Churches mentioned in this para. see J.H.S. Burrell, *A Church History of Scotland* 1960; M. Hutchison, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland*, Paisley 1893; W.J. Coupar, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland. Its Congregations, Ministers and Students*, Edinburgh 1925; G.N.M. Collins, *The Heritage of Our Fathers*, Edinburgh: Knox Press 1974; ed. A. McPherson, *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, Publications Committee of the F.P. Church 1975; W.J. Crier, *The Origin and Witness of the Irish Evangelical Church*, Belfast n.d. but preface has 1945.

- 20 T.M. Lindsay, "The doctrine of scripture. The Reformers and the Princeton School," *The Expositor* 1895, 5th series 1, 278-293.
- 21 See E.H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict*, Grand Rapids 1940; L.A. Loetscher, *The Broadening Church*, Pittsburgh 1954; N.B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen, A Biographical Memoir*, Grand Rapids, 2nd edn. 1955; *Collected Writings of John Murray*, Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust 1976, I chs. XI-XV. Machen, Stonehouse and Murray all served on the faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary, as did R.D. Wilson, O.T. Allis, C. Van Til, R.B. Kuiper and E.J. Young.
- 22 See D.H. Kromminga, *The Christian Reformed Tradition*, Grand Rapids 1943; Peter Y. De Jong, *The Christian Reformed Church*, Grand Rapids 1967. For the outworking of Dutch ecclesiastical tensions in South Africa see Peter Hinchliff, *The Church in South Africa* 1968, chap. IX.
- 23 See H.F. Foster, *A Genetic History of New England Theology* 1907; G.N. Boardman, *A History of New England Theology*, New York 1899; J. Haroutunian, *Piety Versus Moralism*, New York 1932. The contention of these books that a line can be drawn from Edwards to Bushnell has been questioned by Sidney E. Mead. He holds that "the line can be drawn from Puritanism to Old Calvinism [i.e. that Calvinism which opposed the Great Awakening] to Taylorism, each the system of the dominant party of its era. It is possible, in brief, that the Edwardeanism or consistent Calvinism was never the New England Theology." See his *Nathanael William Taylor*, Chicago 1942, p.ix.
- 24 See W. Pyncheon, *The Meritorious Price of Our Redemption* 1650.
- 25 See the works on the New England Theology at n.23.
- 26 See James W. Jones, *The Shattered Synthesis*, New Haven & London 1973.
- 27 N. Taylor, *Lectures on the Moral Government of God*, New York 1859, II p.134.
- 28 For American revivalism see e.g. Bernard A. Weisberger, *They Gathered at the River*, Boston 1958; William G. McLoughlin Jr., *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*, New York 1959; Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America: From the Revolution to the Civil War*, New York 1965; George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*, New Haven: Yale U.P. 1970. For Finney see his *Memoirs*, New York 1876. For a critique of Finney's theology see B.B. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, Philadelphia 1958. We have found the following articles illuminating on the theological issues: D.M. Lloyd-Jones, "Revival: an historical and theological

- survey," in *How Shall They Hear?* 1960, pp.38-56; Melvin L. Vulgamore, "Charles G. Finney: catalyst in the dissolution of American Calvinism," *Reformed Review* 1963-4, 17, 33-42; P.E.G. Cook, "Finney on revival" in *One Steadfast High Intent* 1966, pp.4-16; James E. Johnson, "Charles G. Finney and a theology of revivalism," *Church History* 1969, 38, 338-358; John Opie, "Finney's failure of nerve: the untimely demise of evangelical theology," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 1973, 51, 155-173; D.M. Lloyd-Jones, "Living the Christian life. 5. New developments in the eighteenth and nineteenth century teaching," in *Living the Christian Life*, London: The Westminster Conference 1974, pp.82-99.
- 29 C.G. Finney, *Systematic Theology*, London 1851, p.3.
- 30 C.G. Finney, *Sermons on Important Subjects*, New York 1836, p.28.
- 31 C.G. Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, London 1838, p.153.
- 32 B.B. Warfield, *Perfectionism*, p.193. From the other side Finney was criticised by the Unitarians for his lurid descriptions of hell, and for his methods of evangelism. See J.E. Johnson, *art.cit.*, pp.345-346. Among Finney's defenders was George F. Wright. See his "Dr. Hodge's misrepresentation of President Finney's system of theology," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 1876, 16, 381-392.
- 33 See e.g. his sermon on "The doctrine of election".
- 34 C.G. Finney, *Memoirs*, p.23.
- 35 J. Opie, *art.cit.* (a) p.160. These critics were to be even more stunned by the counterblast to revivalism in Bushnell's *Christian Nurture* (1847). Bushnell argued that a child should grow up a Christian and never know himself to be anything other than a Christian. (b) p.155. Among Moody's contemporaries John Kennedy of Dingwall, ever loyal to Calvinism, and Robert Mackintosh, a refugee from Calvinism, criticised revivalism trenchantly. Kennedy complained that "this proud resolve to make a manageable business of conversion-work, is intolerant of any recognition of the sovereignty of God"; quoted in Ergatees, *Arminianism - Another Gospel*, Gisborne N.Z. 1965, p.11. For Mackintosh's views see his *The Insufficiency of Revivalism as a Religious System*, bound with *Essays Towards a New Theology*, Glasgow 1889. For his spiritual pilgrimage and work see A.P.F. Sell, "The life and work of Robert Mackintosh (1858-1933)," *The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 1973, 1, 79-90, and Robert Mackintosh: *Theologian of Integrity*, Bern: Peter Lang 1977.
- 36 For Moody see James F. Findlay Jr., *Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist*, Chicago 1969.

- 37 A.M. Hills criticised the Oberlin theology on the following grounds *inter alia*: it locates all sin in the attitude of the will; it confounds consecration and sanctification, making the latter a matter of growth. See his *Holiness and Power*, Manchester 1913. For the American Holiness movement see D.W. Dayton, *The American Holiness Movement: A Bibliographic Introduction*, Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary 1971.
- 38 For Booth see (Edward) H. Begbie, *Life of William Booth*, 2 vols. 1920; Richard Collier, *The General Next to God*, London: Collins Fontana 1970. For the Church of the Nazarene see T.L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness*, Kansas City 1962. For Keswick see W.B. Sloan, *These Sixty Years*, n.d. but 1935. For a somewhat fuller treatment of the material in this para. see D.M. Lloyd-Jones, "New developments", *op.cit.* He points out that Bishop Ryle never addressed the Keswick Convention, and that his book *Holiness* was a rebuttal of Keswick teaching. Likewise Spurgeon never spoke at Keswick, and G. Campbell Morgan gave Bible readings only there. See also E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, Chicago: Chicago U.P. 1970, pp.178-181. D.D. Bundy's *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements*, Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury Theological Seminary 1975, may also be used with some caution.
- 39 (a) See E.R. Sandeen, *op.cit.* He has been criticised by some, however, for attaching too much significance to these themes. Donald Bloesch, for example, has fundamentalism sired by latter-day pietism (rather than dispensationalism) out of Reformed and Lutheran scholastic orthodoxy. See his *The Evangelical Renaissance*, Hodder & Stoughton 1974. (b) p.xii. For Niebuhr's opinion see his article "Fundamentalism" in *The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, New York 1937. Among many other studies of fundamentalism see Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (1931), Westport: Greenwood Press 1971; Edwin H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict*, Grand Rapids 1940; Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*, New Haven 1954; Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement*, The Hague 1964; Daniel B. Stevick, *Beyond Fundamentalism*, Richmond Va. 1964. For a recent British view see James Barr, *Fundamentalism*, SCM 1977, and for a spirited reply to this from the Reformed standpoint see the editorial, "Fundamentalism Barred" in *The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*, December 1977, pp.191-193. (c) p.52, (d) p.43, referring *inter alia* to C.G. Goen, "Jonathan Edwards, a new departure in eschatology," *Church History* 1959, 28, 25-40.

- 40 For whom see F.R. Coad, *A History of the Brethren Movement*, Exeter 1968; H.H. Rowdon, *The Origins of the Brethren, 1825-1850*, 1967.
- 41 Gordon Harland, "The American religious heritage and the tragic dimension," *Studies in Religion* 1973, 2, 279. It is interesting to observe how this aspect has influenced such people, otherwise so different, as conservative millenarians and Social Gospel liberals.
- 42 J.I. Packer in *The Word of God and Fundamentalism*, the addresses given at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen 1960, 1961, p.115.
- 43 J. Opie Jr. writes in *The Christian Century* 1965, 82, 608-611 on "The modernity of fundamentalism." But to him its modernity lies in its rationalistic scholasticism. Carl F.H. Henry criticised Dr. Opie in *Catholic World*, June 1967, pp.145-150, and Opie responded in the same issue, pp.151-156.
- 44 For Machen's own words on the subject see C. Allyn Russell, "J. Gresham Machen, scholarly fundamentalist," *The Journal of Presbyterian History* 1973, 51, 49-50.
- 45 E.g. E.J. Carnell, *The Case for Orthodox Theology* 1961; C.F.H. Henry, *Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology* Grand Rapids 1957 chap. II. The latter claims that fundamentalism became reactionary, it unthinkingly blended Arminianism and Calvinism, it neglected thorough exegesis, it veered towards anti-denominationalism, it neglected the doctrine of the Church, it frequently identified Christianity with premillenarianism, and it overlooked the cultural mandate.
- 46 G.O. Griffith, *The Theology of P.T. Forsyth* 1948, p.15.
- 47 H.D.A. Major, *English Modernism*, Cambridge Mass. 1927. (a) p.53. Dr. Major had earlier made this point when he provided a modernist's answer to those, both within and without the Church of England, who felt that the modernists should "come clean," secede, and join the Unitarians. See his "Modern Churchmen or Unitarians?" *The Hibbert Journal* 1922, 20, 208-219. (b) p.8, (c) pp.31,32; cf. Harnack's *What is Christianity?* (1900) E.T. 1901. (d) pp.25-28.
- 48 Though at this point we can see some justice in B.M.G. Reardon's remark concerning Liberal Protestantism and Catholic Modernism: "viewed in the perspective of our age they show up as only slightly differing aspects of a unitary tendency away from traditional Christianity altogether and towards the Christianized humanism to which theology has now largely succumbed." See his "Liberal Protestantism and Roman Catholic Modernism" in *Liberal*

- Christianity in History*, p.72; cf. his *Liberalism and Tradition*, Cambridge: CUP 1975.
- 49 Quoted by B.M.G. Reardon, *art.cit.*, p.81.
- 50 G. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Crossroads* 1909. (a) p.5, (b) p.44.
- 51 Among other works on Roman Catholic Modernism see A.R. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church*, Cambridge 1934; B.M.G. Reardon, *Roman Catholic Modernism*, A. & C. Black 1970.
- 52 R. Thomas, "Philip Doddridge and liberalism in religion," in ed. G.F. Nuttall, *Philip Doddridge* 1951, p.122.
- 53 Boston was the liberal town *par excellence*. In 1804 only one out of nine Congregational churches there remained trinitarian. See Conrad Wright, *The Beginning of Unitarianism in America*, Hamden: Shoe String Press 1976, p.253.
- 54 For Beecher see L. Abbott, *Henry Ward Beecher* 1903; W.G. Beecher and G. Scoville, *Biography of Henry Ward Beecher* 1888. For Brooks see A.V.G. Allen, *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks*, 2 vols. 1901; R.W. Albright, *Focus on Infinity: A Life of Phillips Brooks*, New York 1961. For Gladden see J.H. Dorn, *Washington Gladden: Prophet of the Social Gospel*, Ohio State U.P. 1968; R.D. Knudten, *Systematic Thought of Washington Gladden*, Atlantic Highlands N.J. 1968.
- 55 W. Gladden, *A Modern Man's Theology* 1914, pp.6-7, 14, 15.
- 56 Letter to L.C. Barnes in D.R. Sharpe, *Walter Rauschenbusch*, New York 1942, pp.434f. Cf. R.T. Handy, "Walter Rauschenbusch in historical perspective," *The Baptist Quarterly* 1964, 20, 313-321.
- 57 See W.M. Horton, *Contemporary Continental Theology* 1938, pp.174-5.
- 58 A. Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism*, Grand Rapids n.d., p.8.
- 59 In 1865 the law was finally amended in such a way as to require assent to the articles, rather than to *all* the articles. William Robertson (1705-1783) had resigned his Irish living in 1764, but did not continue in the ministry. For fuller accounts of the matters briefly referred to here see Alexander Gordon, *Heads of English Unitarian History* 1895; C.G. Bolam *et.al.* *The English Presbyterians* 1968; for the impact of English Unitarianism on society see R.V. Holt, *The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England* 1952; for an example of the impact of Unitarians on one town - and for material unmentioned by Holt - see A.P.F. Sell, "The social and literary contribution of three Unitarian ministers in nineteenth century Walsall," *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* 1973, 15, 77-97.

- 60 A. Gordon, *op.cit.* (a) pp.39-40, (b) p.49, where Gordon says that Barker "originated several congregations in the North of England." Indeed he did, but his causes were to be found as far south as the West Midlands. After adventures in radical politics Barker went to America, eventually returning to the Methodist fold. See *DNB*.
- 61 Quoted by V.F. Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century* 1913, p.41n. As he reflected on the age of rationalism H.R. Mackintosh wrote, "It is easy to imagine how on these terms the majesty and power of the Christian Gospel vanished. There is little to produce 'joy unspeakable and full of glory' in a form of Christianity which, with half a sheet of notepaper and a spare hour, the average man can construct for himself... It is by no means surprising that the clergy who proclaimed such a message frequently exhibited a keener interest in sport or agriculture than in the cure of souls." See his *Types of Modern Theology* 1937, p.15.
- 62 See H. McLachlan, *The Methodist Unitarian Movement*, Manchester 1919.
- 63 We say "generally" because it has been argued that at least one congregation, that at Kendal, was only doubtfully orthodox in the first place. See F. Nicholson and E. Axon, *The Older Nonconformity in Kendal*, Kendal 1915, chap. XXIV.
- 64 It is not without significance that Coleridge joined the Unitarians for a time, and contemplated entering their ministry.
- 65 A.M.G. Stephenson, "Liberal Anglicanism in the nineteenth century," in *Liberal Christianity in History*, p.87. Cf. J. Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century* (1885), Leicester 1971, pp. 260-261.
- 66 A.M. Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple* 1960. (a) p.67. Dr. Ramsey also points out with respect to Modernism that "Where there is an underlying philosophy it is commonly that of the identity of the natures of God and Man, and where there is an underlying assumption it is commonly that of the uniformity of nature." (P.74). With further reference to the difficulty of labelling theologians, and with reference to Dr. Inge, J.K. Mozley writes, "One who can say that he has 'a great admiration for the old Catholic philosophy of religion, of which St. Thomas Aquinas is the most learned exponent,' is at that point, which is not situated on the circumference of religious belief, as far removed from some who would claim the name of 'modernist' as he is from Karl Barth." See his *Some Tendencies in British Theology* 1951, p.57. (b) p.5.

- 67 A.M.G. Stephenson, "English Modernism," in *Liberal Christianity in History*, (a) p.148. Although, like Harnack, the English Modernists tended to minimise the miraculous, they were not generally, like some Liberal Protestants, anti-supernaturalistic. However, Gore felt that B.H. Streeter's paper on "The historic Christ" in *Foundations* (1912) and J.M. Thompson's *The Miracles of the New Testament* were so sceptical concerning miracles that they came near to undermining the Faith. (b) p.150.
- 68 L. Parks, *What is Modernism?* New York 1924. (a) p.5, (b) p.138.
- 69 V.F. Storr, *Freedom and Tradition* 1940. (a) p.159, (b) p.169, (c) p.169, (d) p.172; cf. the Anglican symposium *Liberal Evangelicalism*, n.d., pp.vi-vii.
- 70 C.J. Cadoux, *The Case for Evangelical Modernism* 1938. (a) p.10. Elsewhere Cadoux confessed, "it is doubtless true that some theological thinkers are infected with a desire resembling the political habit of which Cromwell complained: 'Nothing was in the hearts of these men except Overturn, overturn.' The temptation to abandon beliefs because they are traditional is pernicious; and modernists must, of course, resist it, if it arises." See his "A defence of Christian modernism," *The Congregational Quarterly* 1927, 5, 164-5. Albert Peel's reflections on the 1928 Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales are not without interest: "It is clear that, so far as the Chair is concerned, Modernism, for the moment, has its hand on the helm. Mr. Wrigley's address...was, in itself, the best possible denial that there is any necessary or congruous connexion between a modern outlook and cold or destructive intellectualism." See his editorial in *The Congregational Quarterly* 1928, 6, 273. (b) pp.8-9.
- 71 See C.F.H. Henry, *Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology*. (a) pp.21-22. We recognise that the growth of the *Religionsgeschichtliche schule* led by Ernest Troeltsch (1865-1923) fostered the spirit of relativism among some, and we are aware of the continuing naturalism of some of the new psychologists which was, on occasion, turned against religion. But to most of those who participated in the conservative-liberal debates between, say, 1870-1930, these were not the immediate foci of attention. More crucial ingredients were immanentism, modern biblical criticism, evolutionary thought, and Ritschlianism. (b) p.45.
- 72 R.W. Dale, *The Old Evangelicalism and the New* 1889. (a) pp.25-26, (b) pp.18-19.
- 73 T. Erskine, *Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion* 1820, p.59.

- 74 Quoted by James Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, Edinburgh 1897, p.399. From the many contemporary analyses of liberal reductionism we note C. Gore, *The New Theology and the Old Religion* 1907, and W.L. Walker, *What About The New Theology?* Edinburgh, 1907.
- 75 Frank Lenwood, *Jesus - Lord or Leader?* 1930. (a) p.21, (b) p.29.
- 76 S.H. Mellone, *Liberty and Religion* 1925, p.231.
- 77 B.C. Plowright, "The misgivings of a modernist," *The Congregational Quarterly* 1931, 9, (a) 293, (b) 290.
- 78 See *Proceedings of the International Congregational Council* 1920, p.255. A.E. Garvie was concerned lest the idea that all men were God's children should dampen missionary enthusiasm. See his *The Missionary Obligation and Modern Thought* 1914, p.34.
- 79 H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America*, Hamden 1956, p.193.
- 80 R. Mackintosh, *Essays Towards a New Theology*, p.426. See also Charles S. Braden, "How liberal Christianity conceives of salvation," *The Journal of Religion* 1937, 7, 12-29.
- 81 See J.B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, New York 1920, p.123.
- 82 Thus in his book *The Strangest Thing in the World* (1891), Charles Bullock criticised Henry Drummond's *The Greatest Thing in the World* (1890 and many edns.) for being "The Gospel with the Gospel omitted." C.H. Spurgeon opined that Bullock "has done grand service by laying bare the device of deleting the atonement with the idea of promoting the imitation of Jesus." See *Sword and Trowel* 1891, p.340.
- 83 F.D. Maurice, *Theological Essays*, Cambridge 1853, p.162.
- 84(a) Quoted by H.R. Mackintosh, *Some Aspects of Christian Belief*, n.d. but preface has 1923, p.131. (b) p.176.
- 85 Quoted by L.E. Elliott-Binns, *Religion in the Victorian Era* 1936, p.280.
- 86 W. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, New York 1907, p.422.
- 87 A. Peel, *The Congregational Quarterly* 1923, 1, 230.
- 88 T. Rhondda Williams, *The Working Faith of a Liberal Theologian* 1914. (a) p.xiii, our italics. Robinson, it will be recalled, believed that the fresh light and truth would break forth out of God's holy Word. (b) p.147, (c) pp.140, 142.
- 89 H.D.A. Major, *Basic Christianity*, Oxford 1944, p.57.
- 90 The second report on a Declaration of Faith submitted to the National Congregational Council of 1865.
- 91 G.G. Atkins, *Religion in our Times*, New York 1932, p.156.
- 92 Quoted by John Horsch, *Modern Religious Liberalism*, Chicago 1920, pp.127-8.

- 93 *Proceedings of the International Congregational Council* 1920, p.255.
- 94 Quoted by S.G. Cole, *History of Fundamentalism*, p.83. It was interesting to hear Baroness Wootton, now an octogenarian, confess in a radio broadcast on 11.6.1977 that whereas in her earlier days she would have subscribed to the doctrine here castigated, she now saw more point in the notion of original sin – or, at any rate, ineradicable human nastiness. Cf. R. Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* 1945, p.10.
- 95 J. Clifford's numerous writings on this theme are listed by J. Marchant, see next note.
- 96 James Marchant, *Dr. John Clifford* 1924, p.81.
- 97 ed. J.H. Leckie, *Professor D.W. Forrest, Memoirs and Discourses* 1919, p.85.
- 98 Quoted by Gordon Harland, *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr*, New York 1960, pp.45-6.
- 99 B. Spinoza, *Ethica* I, p.15.
- 100 B. Bosanquet, *What Religion Is* 1920, p.25.
- 101 H.D.A. Major in *The Modern Churchman*, Sept. 1921, p.196, quoted by O.C. Quick, *Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition* 1922, p.18; italics his.
- 102 T. Wigley in *A Re-statement of Christian Thought*, reprinted from *The Christian World* 1934, p.7.
- 103 See E.M. Forster, *G. Lowes Dickinson* 1938, p.212. Cf. H.G. Wood, *Belief and Unbelief since 1850*, Cambridge 1955, pp. 72-74. The criticism of this view by the Unitarian James Drummond is revealing: to the great mass of believers "a Christianity without Christ would be something fundamentally different from that by which they have lived. He is bound up in their religious affections, and his is the quickening breath which turns into living creatures the cold forms of truth...Nor have they seen in him only Man ascending to the pinnacle of human goodness, but the grace and love of God coming down to reconcile and save an estranged and sorrowful world." See his Hibbert Lectures, *Via, Veritas, Vita* 1894, pp.291-2.
- 104 J. Martineau, *Essays, Reviews and Addresses*, London: Longmans 1891, II p.443. Into the ecclesiological implications of immanentism, and in particular into the view of the Church as being the extension of the Incarnation, we cannot now enquire.
- 105 P.T. Forsyth, *The Principle of Authority* (1913) 1952. (a) p.171, (b) p.177, (c) pp.389-390.
- 106 O.C. Quick, *Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition*, p.18.
- 107 K.C. Anderson, "Why not face the facts?" *The Hibbert Journal* 1906, 4, 860.
- 108 P.T. Forsyth, "A rallying ground for the Free Churches. The reality of grace," *The Hibbert Journal* 1906, 4, 825.

- 109 P.T. Forsyth, *Faith, Freedom and the Future* (1912) 1955, p.96.
- 110 R.A. Finlayson, "Modernist belief and evangelical faith: are they the same?" *The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland* Sept. 1973, pp.142-144.
- 111 D.B. Stevick, *Beyond Fundamentalism*, Richmond Va. 1964 (a) p.173, (b) p.59.
- 112 William Young, "Historic Calvinism and Neo-Calvinism," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 1973-4, 36, 48-64 and 156-173. For clear evidence that Mr. Young's criticism could not be levelled against all earlier Dutch Calvinists see M. Eugene Osterhaven, "The experimental theology of early Dutch Calvinism," *Reformed Review* 1974, 27, 180-189.
- 113 C.F.H. Henry, "Fundamentalism," *Catholic World* June 1967, p.149.
- 114 D.W. Simon, "The present direction of theological thought in the Congregational churches of Great Britain," *Proceedings of the International Congregational Council* 1891, p.79. We do not stay to consider the ecclesiological-catholic equivalent of conservative intellectualism. It is, of course, that the gospel requires the protection of orders, sacraments, or what not. We simply side with Bernard Manning: "The grace of God...needs no legal machinery to protect it...What is it that makes the Church different from all other societies, that makes the preaching of the Word different from all other speech, that makes the sacramental rites different from all other significant acts? It is grace. Then it is not episcopacy or the lack of episcopacy." See his *Essays in Orthodox Dissent* 1953, pp.114-115.
- 115 For the Gospel Standard Baptist position see B. Honeysett, "The ill-fated articles," *Reformation Today* no.2, summer 1970, pp.23-30, reprinted under the title *How to Address Unbelievers*. The four anti-free offer articles were added to the G.S. trust deeds in 1878. See further William Wileman, "The secret history of the four 'added' articles; 32, 33, 34, 35," *The Christian's Pathway* 1921, 26, 206-210. These articles have recently been discussed by David Engelsma in his series on "Hyper-Calvinism' and the call of the gospel" which commenced in *The Standard Bearer* in April 1974. He argues that the G.S. articles are hyper-Calvinistic, but that the testimony of the Protestant Reformed Church which, led by H. Hoeksema, came out of the Christian Reformed Church in 1924, is not. On the contrary, he maintains that his Church upholds the free offer, whilst the position approved by the Christian Reformed Church in 1924 in respect of common grace threatens the doctrine of particular redemption and therefore denies

the sovereignty of grace. The C.R. Church adopted a view of common grace according to which there is "a certain favour or grace of God which He shows to His creatures in general" and this grace includes "the general offer of the gospel."

- 116 J. Zanchius, *Absolute Predestination*, Grand Rapids: Sovereign Grace Publications 1971, p.87.
- 117 T. Crisp, *Christ's Pre-eminence*, reprinted Sheffield: Zoar Publications c. 1974, pp.13-14.
- 118 R. Trail, *Works*, Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust 1975 I. (a) sermon II, (b) p.31.
- 119 J. Mason, *Mason's Sayings*, reprinted Sheffield: Zoar Publications c. 1974, p.14.
- 120 H. Bonar, "God's will, man's will and free will," Wilmington: Sovereign Grace Publications 1972, p.30.
- 121 J. Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust 1976, I chap. XVII.
- 122 See J. Calvin, *Institutes* III xxiv 8.
- 123 See further J.B. Torrance, "The contribution of McLeod Campbell to Scottish theology," *The Scottish Journal of Theology* 1973, 26, 295-311. Writing of conversion under the Puritans R. Mackintosh said that although the convert "had nothing to do with the law as the source of 'justifying righteousness,' he was bidden to use the law as the 'rule of his life.' Doctrinally and emotionally he was to live by grace; but his conduct was to be exactly the same as if he expected to be justified by works." See *The Insufficiency of Revivalism as a Religious System*, p.8. For the view that covenant theology need not become a new legalism see Donald MacLeod, "Federal theology - an oppressive legalism?" *The Banner of Truth* no.125, Feb. 1974, pp.21-28. The historian of the Brethren movement has detected a "hint of Pelagianism" in J.N. Darby's view that "unity is not seen as the result of God's work in the death of Christ, so much as a result of the Christian's conforming to that death." See F.R. Coad, *A History of the Brethren Movement*, p.33.
- 124 E.J. Carnell, *The Case for Orthodox Theology*, p.121.
- 125 Carnell and Stevick have chapters on separation. The Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod, has recently given detailed consideration to the matter. See *Minutes* of the 153rd General Synod, 1975 pp.59-80. Among many conservative evangelical critiques of modern ecumenism see Donald Gillies, *Unity in the Dark* 1964, and David Hedegard, *Ecumenism and the Bible* 1964.
- 126 See Donald G. Bloesch's illuminating chap. V, "The legacy of pietism" in his *The Evangelical Renaissance*.

- 127 R.W. Dale, *The Evangelical Revival 1880*, p.33.
- 128 Robert Mackintosh, *The Insufficiency of Revivalism*, pp.13, 27; cf. D.B. Stevick *op.cit.*, pp.25-26.
- 129 (a) Cf. John "Rabbi" Duncan: "There is a true and a false synergia. That God works half, and man the other half, is false; that God works all and man does all, is true." See ed. W. Knight, *Colloquia Peripatetica*, Edinburgh 1907 p.30. (b) p.167.
- 130 From the hymn "Rock of Ages, cleft for me."
- 131 (a) For a recent review of the position see M. Eugene Osterhaven, *The Spirit of the Reformed Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1971, pp.132-137. (b) p.147.
- 132 John H. Yoder, *The Christian Witness to the State*, Newton, Kansas 1964, p. 85, quoted by D.G. Bloesch, *op.cit.*, p.124.
- 133 For social contributions of American conservatives see e.g. G.H. Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse 1830-1844*, New York, new edn. 1964; John R. Bodo, *The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues, 1812-1848*, Princeton 1954; C.C. Cole, *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists 1826-1860*, New York 1954; Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth Century America*, New York 1957; Charles I. Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*, Chapel Hill 1960; Clifford S. Griffin, *Their Brothers' Keepers*, New Brunswick 1960; E. Brooks Holifield, "Thomas Smith: The social ideas of a southern evangelist," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 1973, 51, 24-39.
- 134 *Democracy and the Churches*, Philadelphia 1951, quoted by M.E. Osterhaven, *The Spirit of the Reformed Tradition*, p.153.
- 135 J. Orr, *The Progress of Dogma* n.d. but preface has 1901, p. 353.
- 136 Dirk Jellema, "Ethics," in ed. C.F.H. Henry, *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, Grand Rapids 1968, p.111.
- 137 As expounded by John Stott, *The Lausanne Covenant*, Minneapolis: World Wide Publications 1975, pp.27-28. Cf. also articles by Elton M. Eenigenburg, Robert A. Coughenour and Hugh A. Koops in *Reformed Review* autumn 1974, 28. This issue also includes "A declaration of evangelical social concern" (1973) among whose signatories was C.F.H. Henry. For further illustrations of the changing mood see e.g. Richard J. Coleman, *Issues of Theological Warfare*, Grand Rapids: Erdmans 1972 chap. V.
- 138 (a) Quoted by W.M. Horton, *Realistic Theology*, New York & London 1934, p.2. Cf. H.P. Van Dusen, "The sickness of liberal religion," *The World Tomorrow* no.14, Aug. 1931, pp. 256-259; John C. Bennett, "After liberalism - what?" *The Christian Century* no.50, 8.xi.1933, pp.1403-6; G.G. Atkins, "Whither liberalism?" *Religion in Life* 1934, 3,

- 335-339; Wilhelm Pauck, "What is wrong with liberalism?" *The Journal of Religion* 1935, 15, 146-160; H.S. Coffin, "Can liberalism survive?" *Religion in Life* 1935, 4, 194-203. See too the 1939 series in *The Christian Century* on "How my mind has changed." For this list of references we are indebted to Dennis N. Voskuil, "The emergence of American neo-orthodoxy," *Reformed Review* 1976, 30, 35-38; and see his unpublished doctoral dissertation, *From Liberalism to Neo-Orthodoxy: The History of a Theological Transition, 1925-1935*, Harvard University 1974. For a critique of what he calls neo-liberalism see Robert Lightner, *Neo-Liberalism*, Nutley N.J.: The Craig Press 1970. We have already referred to B.C. Plowright's contemporary "Misgivings." (b) p.4n. Dr. Horton says of liberal concepts that "it must now be announced, as an accomplished fact, regrettable but duly certified, that their vital sap has departed from them", p.8.
- 139 *Christian Life*, June 1947, pp.13-15.
- 140 See Erling Jorstad, *The Politics of Doomsday*. For recent developments within conservatism see e.g. Louis Gaspar, *The Fundamentalist Movement*, The Hague 1963; Ronald H. Nash, *The New Evangelicalism*, Grand Rapids 1963; Millard Erickson, *The New Evangelical Theology* 1969; George Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Greenville: Bob Jones U.P. 1973; D.G. Bloesch, *op.cit.*; eds. D.F. Wells and J.D. Woodbridge, *op.cit.*
- 141 Thus, for example, in *The Battle for the Bible*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1976, Harold Lindsell laments that such conservatives as Daniel P. Fuller, George E. Ladd and Paul King Jewett no longer defend the inerrancy of scripture. For recent defences thereof see e.g. Clark H. Pinnock, *A Defense of Biblical Infallibility*, Philadelphia 1967, and ed. J.W. Montgomery, *God's Inerrant Word*, Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship 1974.