

Lord'. The requirement for the original justification of a sinner is faith alone. But the requirement for full sanctification and final justification is faith working by love. Sanctification is part of the complete whole of God's salvation, which must end in final justification—that is, in heaven itself. This life is a necessary preparation for that ultimate end. The beginning of the process of salvation is pardon; its end is to see the Lord in glory. Thus Wesley writes: 'God hath joined from the beginning pardon, holiness and heaven' (S. 42, II.4). As usual, Charles Wesley expresses this in memorable words over and over again. From the many possible examples we choose the following, taken from a hymn no longer sung among us:

*Physician of souls unto me,
Forgiveness and holiness give;
And then from the body set free,
And then to the city receive.* (H. 70, 3)

WILLIAM STRAWSON

¹ This paper does not attempt to evaluate or restate Wesley's views; the intention is to set out those views with as little interpretation as possible.

² The abbreviations used in the references given in this paper are as follows: S=sermon; St. S.=*Standard Sermons*; H.=hymn (all hymns, except where stated otherwise, are quoted from the 1780 *Hymn Book*); W.=*Wesley's Works* (5th ed.).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY IN AMERICAN METHODISM IN THE NINE- TEENTH CENTURY

THE TOPIC assigned for this paper is restricted to Methodism in the United States and may seem to many, as it did to the writer, somewhat inappropriately provincial under the sponsorship of this Institute and only very obliquely related to our general theme. The Committee may, however, have been wiser than they knew. The theology of American Methodism in the nineteenth century, so determinatively significant for an understanding of contemporary *motifs* and of the uncalculated assertions of Methodists from the United States, has, with one exception to be noted, never at any time been brought under constructive, critical scrutiny. It may not therefore be amiss for

those from other lands to 'listen in' as this act of penance seeks to enlist others in the work of academic restitution.

In writing to James Hervey, John Wesley asserted, 'I look upon the world as my parish'. The context reveals that he was referring to the parochial ecumenism of the early Church. He regarded the wide world as a rightful field of summons and service. Every human being, potentially, might claim of him every service a parishioner needs from his pastor.

American Methodism was, from the beginning, committed to her Lord through this Wesleyan legacy. But Methodism at the turn of the nineteenth century had an actual world close at hand. (To avoid needless repetition, the term 'Methodism', unless otherwise indicated, refers to Methodism in the United States.) In 1801, eighty per cent of Continental United States was uninhabited. By 1851 this territory was occupied, and the ministry of Methodism to the summoning need of such rapid expansion, including the ministry to the Indians in their continued exile to the West, had been given through the establishment of churches contiguous with every wave of frontier development from the Appalachians to the western slopes of the Sierra Nevadas—including Texas.

This fact of a connexional structure of Societies over so vast an area in so short a time shows the effectiveness, under God, of Methodism's vocation in the first half of the nineteenth century. So rapid an expansion had not been equalled in Christendom since the Apostolic Era. Such were our Fathers, and we know ourselves unworthy of them. Perhaps we should recall the words of Goethe, in spite of his naturalistic romanticism:

*Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast;
Erwirb es, um es zu besitzen.*

(What you have inherited from your fathers; Earn it, if truly you would possess it.)

While fulfilling the gigantic mission of those pregnant decades, Methodism had little time or opportunity for creative theologizing. (In certain regions of the United States this frontier mandate is still a palpable excuse for the neglect of theology.)

In addition to the complex of problems endemic to the frontier, there was the continuous element of schism tearing at the heart of Methodism. Thirteen groups separated from the Church in the nineteenth century—most of them with both moral and legal justification for their action. These do not include the grievous partition of Methodism in 1844 into the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

This study is limited to the main body of Methodism until 1844 and to developments in the two major divisions of the movement after that date. It is further limited to the primary task of studying the works of the theologians in each of the seminaries or theological schools established in the nineteenth century, with the exception of Iliff Theological Seminary in Denver, Colorado, founded in 1892, and the Maclay School of Religion in Southern California, founded in 1887—the theological publications of these two schools having had to await the claims of the twentieth century. Original sources have been used, along with the indispensable aid of an unpublished doctoral dissertation

investigating the theology of Methodism in the nineteenth century presented to Yale University in 1955 by Professor Leland H. Scott. This work is used by permission and credit is recognized by documentation.

EARLY AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

At the time of the 'Christmas Conference' (1784) the only academically trained scholar in Methodism was Thomas Coke. Two of his sermons delivered at that Conference, *The God-head of Christ* and *On the Ordination of Ministers*, were published in the U.S.A. The latter work represents ideas uniquely his own rather than those representative of either Anglicanism or the position of Wesley. Later, Coke's *Commentaries* on the Old and New Testaments were made available, but were not commended for study.

In 1789, John Dickins was placed in charge of the publication of books sponsored by the Conference. The first books issued under his editorship were European in origin—for example, à Kempis's *On the Imitation of Christ*, Richard Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted* and *Saints' Rest*, J. Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism*, the Wesleyan Hymn-book and Wesley's *Notes on the New Testament* (cp. N. Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, New York: Mason & Lane, 1840, II.67ff.).

Nathan Bangs (1778-1845) was a prolific writer. He is to be honoured for two significant contributions made in the nineteenth century. He was the first historian of the American Methodists and he became in 1820 the dynamic Editor of Methodism's first journal of theology—*The Methodist Magazine*—since the attempt to start an American *Arminian Magazine* had met with failure. In the first issue he wrote of Methodism:

During a number of years it appears that education of all sorts, as well as writing for the public eye, was laid aside as useless, and we seem to have come to the strange conclusion that we had naught else to do but simply to preach the Gospel . . . Hence the Magazine has been discontinued for more than twenty years and scarcely anything issued from our press except what was imported from Europe, and much of this was brought before the public eye through other *media* (Nathan Bangs, op. cit. II.318).

Wilbur Fiske (1792-1839) is important to Methodism for several reasons. He was, indeed, the first Methodist theologian to receive major recognition among the theologians of other denominations. Secondly, he served as the principal administrator of two of Methodism's earliest educational institutions—the Wesleyan Academy (Wilbraham, Massachusetts), and Wesleyan University (Middletown, Connecticut). This latter school, of which he was the founder-president has the prestige of being Methodism's first permanent college.

Fiske was the first Methodist clergyman to receive a full baccalaureate education (two years of study at the University of Vermont and two years at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, from which school he received the Bachelor of Arts degree). In passing, it may be noted that the degree was conferred by a Baptist University.

The chief contribution of Fiske is his learned exemplification of the growing concern for a more contemporary theological methodology expressed in the oft-repeated plea for an adequate philosophical approach to theology—a concern of Methodism to the present day.

Without abandoning, verbally at least, the need for biblical foundations of theology, he insists that Christian theology, in order to avoid erroneous conclusions from biblical data, especially respecting such problems as moral agency and responsibility, requires the 'analytical elements of philosophy both moral and mental'. But he modifies this view later on as he recognizes that not all philosophies are amenable to the Christian view of revelation, however interpreted. He writes:

But especially is this philosophical examination necessary whenever a superficial or an erroneous philosophy would force upon us an erroneous theology. . . . True philosophy is an analysis of constituent principles but the origins of these principles is in relation to the will of the Creator. . . . And the nature of these relations is beyond the reach of the human mind (*vide* W. Fiske, *Calvinistic Controversy*, N.Y.: Mason & Lane, 1835, pp.156ff.).

Careful study of Fiske on the drive for an adequate philosophy reveals his dependence upon the 'Common Sense' school at Princeton University, whose views were enunciated by James McCosh and later brought to elaboration by Sir William Hamilton in Scotland. In addition, and perhaps even more decisively, he was influenced by the writings of Bishop Joseph Butler, especially his *Analogy of Religion*, which was circulating among American Methodists well into the second half of the nineteenth century.

As indicated above, our chief concern is to be with the works of the first systematic theologians of the newly established theological seminaries, but the facts require the parenthetical statement that the dominant influence on Methodism *at large* was not the works of Methodist seminarians but rather the continued authority of Richard Watson's *Theological Institutes*. In the Conference Course of Study, this work imported from Britain was the 'standard' source of theological thought for the decades between 1840 and 1870, as it had been, in so far as sources apart from Wesley and Fletcher were recognized, in the preceding decade. As late as 1877 an eminent Methodist minister commented:

To no other single agency is the continued doctrinal unity of Methodism so much indebted as to the extensive use of Watson's *Institutes*. . . . This great work has been the standard Methodist systematic theology for a full half century; and, in respect to the substance of Christian doctrine, it was never more thoroughly acceptable than at the present time (Daniel Curry in his Introduction to Miner Raymond's *Systematic Theology*, Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1877, p.72).

The influence of Watson in this era, however, was not without its critics. One such was the Reverend B. F. Cocker, later a professor in the University of Michigan, who had read the *Critique of Pure Reason* and other Kantian writings. In an article published in 1862 in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* (the later name of the *Methodist Magazine*), Professor Cocker writes concerning Watson's *Institutes*:

He affirms with earnestness and emphasis, that we have no idea of God, of right or wrong, except as derived from *without* by *instruction* and *verbal revelations*; indeed that we have no *faculty of knowing* on any of these subjects, except faith. . . . Reason is not, with him, an intuitive but a discursive faculty. It does not apprehend *a priori*,

self-evident truth. . . . It is therefore but natural that he should enter his solemn protest against the attempt to construct a science of natural theology (*M.Q.R.*, XLIV, 1862, p.184).

The article goes on to show Watson's uncritical acceptance of John Locke's empiricism without attention to what happened to empiricism at the hands of Berkeley and Hume—and does Methodism want Hume to undergird the continuing influence of Thomas Paine?

The founding of the Methodist seminaries in the nineteenth century is an illuminating narrative in itself, but it cannot be indulged in at this juncture. Suffice it to say that no seminary was founded by action of the General Conference and each had only nominal recognition from the contiguous Annual Conferences. Each had also to make its way completely alone and not without opposition (occasionally bitter) from some of the leadership of Methodism.

We now turn to the first seminary and a determinatively significant American Methodist theologian.

WILLIAM F. WARREN, 1833-1929

(The first and only full-length scholarly appraisal of Warren's theological work is an unpublished doctoral dissertation presented at Boston University by Dr Howard Hunter of Tufts College.)

William F. Warren graduated from Wesleyan University in 1853 and spent the following year establishing a classical school in Mobile, Alabama. In 1855 he returned to New England and entered the Methodist Conference. The same year he began his studies in the Andover Theological Seminary of the Congregational Church. From Andover he matriculated in the University of Berlin and subsequently in the University of Halle, being one of the first American Methodists to study in Germany. In 1858 he returned to America, serving pastorates in New England, where he remained until 1861, during which time he published numerous sermons and articles in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*.

In 1861 Warren was appointed professor of systematic theology at the newly established Methodist seminary in Bremen, Germany. (Again in passing, we may note that the first American Methodist to take up the vocation of a systematic theologian did so in Germany.) While in Germany, Professor Warren published in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* (July 1863) a study of 'The Impending Revolution in Anglo-Saxon Theology'. In the article he envisages the necessary alteration in the methodology of theological apologetics involved in the changes in the science of physics from a mechanical to a dynamic theory. Warren also asserts that the change in theoretical physics will bring about 'the entire supplanting of natural theology in its old-fashioned sense, by a fresh, vigorous and sound philosophy of religion'. The following quotation from the article exemplifies his ingestion, at Halle, of Schleiermacher's new theological method. The change, he says, will mean, among many things,

. . . the frank and formal abandonment of all endeavours to demonstrate, logically, the existence of God on principles independent of the moral and religious nature and history of man, and the equally frank and formal substitution of a defence of religion,

based upon itself and its own phenomena, supported by collateral evidence only so far as such evidence may incidentally accrue to it in the consistent carrying through of a theistic philosophy.

Here is complete abandonment of the 'classical arguments' for the existence of God and the expression of New England Methodism's enduring involvement with the philosophy and psychology of religion.

Two years later, while still at Bremen, Professor Warren published a single volume entitled an Introduction (*Einleitung*) to a projected complete *Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt*. Further volumes were prevented by other duties. This theological discourse has never been translated from the German.

In his discussion of theological method Professor Warren rejects the idealistic (or intuitional), the Lockean (or empiric), and the mystical methodologies. He espouses what he calls 'Christian Realism', by which he ascribes reality to the thinking subject as well as to the world of nature, and hence is a striking precursor of Boston University's late ontological and epistemological 'Personalism'. But man's faculty of knowledge (*die Vernunft*) is limited, he says, and needs divine illumination. This illumination is revelation. Though manifest in history, nature, and the human spirit, it is most definitively articulated in God's extraordinary verbal revelation in the Scriptures (*Wortoffenbarung*). All systematic theology, accordingly, must assent to the normative Scriptures (W. F. Warren, *Einleitung, Systematische Theologie*, Bremen, Verlag des Trachthausen, 1865, pp.86ff.)

The *Einleitung* may be cited once more on what Warren calls Methodism's definitive or 'material' principle, namely, that man depends solely on his own free will with respect to the enlightening and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. Man is free. But freedom is a gift of grace; it is not of nature. Man is born under the aegis of God's objective restoration of freedom and conscience, through the universally efficacious atonement in Christ Jesus. This is reminiscent of the precise words of John Wesley, who wrote:

Both Mr Fletcher and Mr Wesley absolutely deny natural free-will. We both steadily assert that the will of man is by *nature* free only to evil. Yet we both believe that every man has a measure of free-will restored to him by grace (*Wesley's Works*, 3rd Edition, X.392)

and who stated in another context:

There is no man . . . that is wholly void of the grace of God. No man living is entirely destitute of what is called *natural conscience*. But this is not natural; It is more properly termed, *preventing grace*. Every man has a greater or less measure . . . of that light . . . which, sooner or later, . . . lightens every man that cometh into the world (J. Wesley, *Works*, Sermon LXXXV, VI.512).

Accordingly, with all his concern for *natural* theology and the philosophy of religion, Professor Warren returns to an essentially Wesleyan statement of theological anthropology. It is put with precise clarification in an article (1891) published simultaneously in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* and the *Methodist Quarterly Review, South*. Methodism's 'impartial evangelical, irrepressibly

optimistic' spirit is based on the conviction that universal efficacious grace restores human personality to native dignity and human perfection to gracious possibility (*vide M.Q.R.*, 'Methodist and Pre-Methodist Principles of Education', *M.Q.R.S.*, XXVIII, 1891, p.381).

In 1866, one year after the publication of the *Einleitung*, Warren became Professor in the Methodist General Theological Institute, founded by John Dempster in 1847, which was then moving from Concord, New Hampshire, to Boston, Massachusetts. He became the first Dean of the Boston School of Theology (1867-73) and later the first President of the University, chartered in 1869. His theological work from this date on is limited to occasional articles in journals of theology and published sermons.

The Garrett Biblical Institute on the Campus of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, was in 1855 also founded by John Dempster, whose illustrious achievements cannot here be recounted. The first Professor of systematic theology at Garrett was Miner Raymond.

MINER RAYMOND, 1811-97

Raymond graduated from the Methodist Academy in Wilbraham, Massachusetts, in 1833, at which time he joined the faculty. He taught rhetoric and composition until 1838, when he transferred to the chair of mathematics. The same year he was admitted to the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, leaving Wilbraham to serve pastorates in the environs of Boston. In 1848 (ten years after leaving) he returned to Wilbraham Academy as Principal and remained there for sixteen years. In 1864 he was elected to the chair of Systematic Theology at Garrett Biblical Institute. Unlike William Warren, Raymond was without formal collegiate study. He remained at Garrett for thirty-two years, retiring in 1895.

Raymond's text-book is the first in the Methodist Church of the United States to bear the title *Systematic Theology* (M. Raymond, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1877-9). For the purposes of this discussion attention will be called only to four of its divisions—Apologetics, Anthropology, Soteriology, and Ecclesiology—for these have most direct relevance to the Wesleyan heritage.

In apologetics Raymond's views are patently ambivalent. He places primal importance on so-called objective evidences, namely miracles and fulfilled prophecy. To these are added ponderous quotations from Joseph Butler and Paley, especially the latter's *Evidences of Christianity* (1794). But this, he says, does not suffice; final appeal must be made to private religious experience:

The Bible commends itself acceptable as credible because of what it is in itself. . . . It sustains its claim to inspiration by the indubitable proofs of miracles and prophecies. The commendations and claims are . . . corroborated by all testimonies bearing upon the case from whatsoever source these testimonies come, and are demonstrated in the personal experience of all who submit to its claim (M. Raymond, op. cit. I.224).

Incongruously, in the light of his methodology, Raymond affirms that the idea of God is a natural intuition:

When . . . it is said . . . that the idea of God is an intuition or idea of the reason, the most intelligent interpretation of such language is that it is intended to affirm that this

idea, on the occurrence of the appropriate occasion, arises in the mind . . . (M. Raymond, op. cit. III.12).

This statement would seem to indicate acquaintance with the writings of Kant, but Raymond did *not* read Kant; he took this interpretation from a volume by M. Hopkins, *Outline Study of Man*.

In the field of theological anthropology Raymond accounts for the origin of man in strictly literalistic Biblical terms:

The Bible stands or falls with the theory that the Adam and Eve of Genesis were the first and only created members of the human family—that the race has existed only about six or eight thousand years and that all men and women . . . are descendants of that one sole pair.

The first review of Raymond's work in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* written by Daniel Whedon objects strenuously:

We can hardly think that Dr Raymond has fully analyzed the subject. . . . The Bible will no more fall by the adoption of evolution than it fell by the adoption of the antipodes. . . . We do not believe in the evolutionary creation of man. We shall believe in it when it is proved. And we shall then read certain texts and explain certain doctrines by the light of that discovery (D. Whedon, *M.Q.R.*, LIX, 1877, p.736).

In his discussion of man's moral condition and original sin, Raymond appears to have abandoned completely the Wesleyan view of a free agency restored by God's grace through the efficacious, universal atonement in Christ. Instead he recognized the traditional forms for asserting human depravity. Original sin is 'the most marked and the most deplorable' consequence of the sin of Adam and Eve. But this original sin does *not* affect, crucially, the freedom of the will, for man is never totally depraved (M. Raymond, op. cit. II.59, III.63ff.). Yet, illogically, he asserts, as a somewhat parenthetical comment, the Wesleyan view of a graciously restored moral ability (Raymond, op. cit. II.348).

With respect to the theory of the atonement, there are again two kinds of emphases in Raymond's theology. Asserted first is the traditional Anselmic view of an expiatory substitutionary atonement (M. Raymond, op. cit. II.308ff.) But to this view is added the rudiments of the Grotian governmental theory, with no reference, however, to Grotius. God's essential glory is conserved by the vindication of His rectoral righteousness. 'Through the sustentation of the ends of the divine government, Christ's death makes possible the non-execution of penalty without any compromise of law . . . and without any sacrifice of the ends for which government is established and maintained' (M. Raymond, op. cit. II.304).

Raymond's study of ecclesiology refers to the problems of Church polity and ministerial orders. He notes, somewhat incredulously, that the New Testament gives no guidance respecting orders of the ministry. There may be just as many *orders* as the Church understands to be necessary for its efficient functioning. But the Methodist Church, he holds, is 'a true and valid *episcopal* church', its bishops are set apart by 'three distinct elections and ordinations'. If we Methodists insist on using the term *order* 'and may say we have two orders in our ministry, we must, for a stronger reason, say we have three orders; for the

episcopacy is differentiated from the eldership by an incomparably greater difference than the eldership is from the diaconate' (quoted in L. H. Scott, *Methodist Theology in the Nineteenth Century in America*, p.659, an unpublished manuscript). Professor Raymond, however, writes here in direct contradiction of the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which clearly stated that Bishops are *not* of a different or higher 'order' than elders.

'For over a decade, Raymond's remained the only *complete* system of theology indigenous to American Methodism' (L. H. Scott, *op. cit.* p.316). Yet its influence apart from students in Garrett remained almost negligible. The reason is that the three-volume Systematic Theology of William Burt Pope, of Didsbury College, then of Manchester, England, was selected by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1880, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1882, to replace the *Institutes* of Richard Watson in the Conference Course of Study. *Thus from the beginning until 1890 American Methodism was continuously tutored by English Methodist theologians.*

The discussion now turns to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Without question the writings and lectures of Thomas O. Summers were the most pervasive influences in Southern Methodism in the nineteenth century.

THOMAS O. SUMMERS, 1812-82

Thomas O. Summers was born in Dorsetshire, England, and was reared in the Congregational Church. In time he rebelled against the extreme doctrine of the divine decrees and divine reprobation taught in his home-town chapel. This rebellion led to an adolescent agnosticism from which he was retrieved by the thorough reading, at the age of fifteen years, of the complete edition of Adam Clarke's *Commentaries*. He wrote: 'When I emerged from skepticism, engendered by Calvinism, I naturally joined the Methodists. I studied their confession, Hymnal, and Discipline, and was pleased with all three' (*M.Q.R.S.*, XIX, 1882, p.173).

At eighteen years of age, he came to America, and his career called him eventually to direct the thought of Southern Methodism's first theological school—as the first Dean of the School of Theology, and Professor of Systematic Theology in the newly established Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee (1870).

Summers entered the Methodist ministry through admission to the Baltimore Conference in 1835. He served rigorous circuits in Maryland, Virginia, and Texas. During this time, without academic training of any kind, he continued an intensive programme of biblical and theological studies. He became a well-educated man in the same sense that Abraham Lincoln was well educated.

Transferring from Texas to Alabama in 1844, he stood firmly with the Southern (or, as it was officially designated, the *Constitutional*) cause in the General Conference which occasioned the tragic division of American Methodism. In the organizing Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, convened in Louisville, Kentucky (1846), he served as secretary, and was asked to serve as chairman of the committee to compile a new hymnal and to become assistant editor of the *Southern Methodist Christian Advocate*. In 1850 he became Book Editor and in 1858 the Editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review, South*. In 1875 he accepted the call to Vanderbilt, where he remained until 1882, the year of his death.

Summers's writings are numerous. Some mention should be made, however, of his *Commentaries on the New Testament* (1870), which had diffusive influence in Southern Methodism, before turning to his Systematic Theology.

In his *Commentaries* his concern, as adumbrated in the introduction, was two-fold—(1) the adherence to a correct text verified by the most authentic manuscripts, and (2) the simple exposition of the passages, avoiding either long secondary citations, or extended 'practical reflections'.

Summers's lectures at Vanderbilt on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion were edited and published in two volumes by his former student, who was at that time Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt, the Reverend John J. Tigert, six years after Summers's death, with the title, *Systematic Theology: A Complete Body of Wesley Arminian Divinity* (Nashville, Tennessee, Publishing House of M.E. Church, South, 1888). This work, because of the nature of the lectures, lacks logical systematization. There is considerable originality in the text, but a critic, Charles Bledsoe, was no doubt correct in observing that 'Summers measures all things in heaven and earth by Richard Watson's *Institutes*' (vide E. Mims, *History of Vanderbilt University*; Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 1946, p.60).

To illustrate some facets of Summers's theology, we arbitrarily select four sections of his systematics: methodology, soteriology, anthropology, and Methodist ecumenism—since this is the order of discussion Summers follows.

In methodology the basic question always is: 'Where does one go for the data of theologizing?' Summers recognizes both 'natural' and 'revealed' theology as sources in accordance with the nineteenth-century articulation of the divisions. His ultimate affirmation, however, is that the Christian faith 'is *not* a system of natural, but of revealed theology'. Yet he is not willing to abandon natural theology. He recognizes 'certain primordial intuitions' of the existence of God. He says: 'the mind is so constituted that in the exercise of its native powers, under favorable auspices—including the operation of the Holy Spirit . . . it can arrive at the knowledge of God' (T. O. Summers, *Systematic Theology*, I.50). But in the last analysis he binds himself to say that 'though we admit such intuitional principles in order to be capable of recognizing Deity', revelation in the Scriptures remains the conclusive source of man's knowledge of God—as well as the prime source for the awareness of moral obligation. Here Summers returns to Richard Watson, with some relief, and also to Bishop Pearson (a seventeenth-century English theologian), both of whom he quotes to assert mankind's ultimate dependence on external instruction from the Scriptures for any real idea of God (Summers, op. cit. I.48ff.).

Furthermore, Summers is fascinated by the development of the Darwinian theory of evolution and the awakened interest in geology. This interest leads him to a denial of a literal exegesis of the first chapters of Genesis. He writes:

The opening chapters of Genesis are to be discerped from the demiurgic account which follows, and hence the creation of the earth may date back as many millions of ages as geology requires for all the phenomena developed by its researches.

It may also be noted that Summers had the temerity to invite Thomas Huxley to lecture in Vanderbilt, and Vanderbilt is in Tennessee, a state not without some notoriety on matters Darwinian. This led to the dismissal of Alexander

Winchell, Professor of Geology, but Summers seems to have escaped any radical criticism.

With respect to the doctrine of the Atonement, Summers attempts, quite understandably, if wholly unsuccessfully, to assert three theories simultaneously. Though influenced by W. B. Pope of Didsbury, he lacks the exact discriminations made by the latter. He writes: 'Christ's mediation is grounded in the Divine concern for the salvation of mankind, as bearing a three-fold relevancy, i.e. to God's own perfections (propitiatory-Anselmic), to the interests of the universe (the governmental-Grotian), and to the future fealty of the transgressors (moral-Abelardian)' (Summers, op. cit., I.281). The discussion ends, however, with the jettisoning of the views of Grotius and Abelard and the full reassertion of the substitutionary doctrine of Anselm. Why? The apparent answer is a desire to recapitulate the views of Wesley and Watson.

In the field of anthropology there is reassertion of the Wesley-Fletcher analyses, though with some hesitation, and with the disturbing and completely untenable habit of American Methodists of identifying those anthropological analyses with Dutch Arminianism. Summers maintains the 'utter impotence of the natural man apart from Divine grace' and at the same time affirms 'a redemption in Christ co-existent with the loss in Adam' (Summers, op. cit., II.25ff.). Because of the divine forgiveness of the guilt (*reatus*) of original sin by the efficacy of Christ's universal atonement, the guilt of depravity is not charged upon posterity until confirmed by actual transgression. Summers states it thus:

That preventing grace which is given to *every* man (through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus) so far modifies and counteracts the depravity of our nature that various virtues are developed in every stage of man's life—which, however imperfect, give a charm to individuals and society. . . . The unconverted man who prides himself on his natural goodness is under responsibility for that very preventing grace which has occasioned everything that is good about him. Unless he truly acknowledges his dependence upon the atoning Lamb . . . he will be damned forever in spite of his morality (*vide* L. H. Scott, op. cit. p.394).

This simply reiterates Wesley's laconic statement: 'We ascribe all good to the free grace of God' (Wesley, *Works*, X.229).

Summers distinguishes, as did Augustine, preventing and co-operating grace. Preventing grace gives man 'the capacity to will and to do the right, enlightening the intellect', and co-operating grace 'works in us, of course, but it cannot work in us, *after the initial operation*, without working with us'.

Of special note for this Conference is Summers's recognition of the relationship between British and American Methodism and his own great dependence upon the theological work of British Methodists. He was the moving spirit in Southern Methodism to support the first Ecumenical Methodist Conference held in London in 1881, though he did not attend, and the Methodism of the South has continued to this date to take primary leadership in Methodist ecumenism. Summers desired some common agreement from the Conference on theological affirmations, but would be content, he wrote, 'if an Ecumenical catechism and Hymn Book could be adopted'. The *New York Times* criticized, editorially, the first Ecumenical Methodist Conference for avoiding the discussion of doctrine. Summers replied in an article which the *Times* published. A few sentences of that article are illuminating:

We are not confined in John Wesley's straight-jacket . . . we believe no dogma merely because Wesley affirmed it . . . we reject many of his views (quoted in L. H. Scott, *op. cit.* p.400).

Summers recognized the need for theological adaptation. 'Creeds', he wrote, 'are not like water in a cistern which purifies itself by the lapse of time.' The doctrines of Scriptural inspiration, of atonement—all crucial affirmations of Christianity—must be restated in terms 'free from all errors and incrustations of the past'. But these assertions uttered a few months before the end of the career of the Vanderbilt theologian are notably *not* characteristic of his writings.

The *Systematic Theology* by Summers was placed in the Conference Course of Study of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1892. For twenty years this work was a primary influence in the theological formulations of Southern Methodism.

Drew Theological Seminary of Madison, New Jersey, was opened in 1867 under the presidency of John McClintock. Dr Randolph S. Foster was appointed Professor of systematic theology but was elected to the Episcopacy seven years later. He was succeeded by John Miley, whose *Systematic Theology* in two volumes brought to a significant, scholarly pre-eminence the characteristic indigenous development of Methodist theology in the nineteenth century.

An historical survey, however, requires the prior recognition of two unique contributions to Methodist Theology in the United States directly connected with Drew Theological Seminary.

Methodism required organized historical resources. The first publication in the field of biblical and historical theology was the compendious *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* in five volumes, first envisaged by John McClintock (later the first President of Drew). The first volume was published in 1867 and the final one in 1887. It laid tribute upon the ablest scholarship in America. Besides the Methodist contributors from both North and South, articles were written by Leonard Bacon (Yale), J. H. Fairchild (Oberlin), G. P. Fisher (Yale), Charles Hodge (Princeton), E. A. Park (Andover), and Philip Schaff (Union).

John Fletcher Hurst (1834-1903) was uniquely responsible for enlarging the intellectual horizon of Methodism. He had been a student at the Universities of Halle and Heidelberg before becoming Professor in and subsequently the President of Drew, and later Bishop. Viewing the poverty of Methodism's ecclesiastical historiography, he was inspired by his German professor Karl Hagenbach to provide data for advanced studies in theology. Accordingly, along with George Crooks, he set up the *prospectus* (1874) for a *Biblical and Theological Library* of nine volumes to be written by American Methodist scholars. Besides Hurst's monumental two volume *History of the Christian Church* of 1897 (the first in Methodism), mention also may be made of the contribution of Milton W. Terry of Garrett Biblical Institute in his volume *Biblical Hermeneutics* and of that of Charles W. Bennett, also of Garrett, in his book *Christian Archaeology*. John Miley's work was included in this library, and to the study of Miley we now turn.

JOHN MILEY, 1813-95

Born in Ohio, John Miley received the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees from Augusta College in Kentucky. R. S. Foster, his predecessor at Drew, was a fellow-student. Miley served in Ohio pastorates until 1852, then transferred to the New York East Conference, where his repute in preaching and in theological writing for the twenty-year interim before going to Drew brought wide and discerning comment in Methodism of both North and South.

The discussion here must be limited. Attention will be called only to his volumes on *Systematic Theology* and to his discussion therein of theological methodology and anthropology, and the articulation of his theory of the atonement.

What are the sources of theology? Miley answers: 'There are two sources, nature and revelation' (Miley, op. cit. I.8. Cincinnati, Ohio: Methodist Book Concern, 1888). And here he brings to a climactic fulfilment the trend noted first in the writings of Wilbur Fiske—namely, American Methodism's nineteenth-century quest for an adequate and indigenously distinctive natural theology, for Miley continues: 'the first question of all religion, the existence of God, must be taken *first* to nature'. Nature is an indispensable source of theology. Our author continues then to elaborate the four classic arguments for the existence of God—ontological, cosmological, teleological, and (in Miley's terminology) anthropological. Significantly, this last argument is taken directly from Immanuel Kant's *Metaphysics of Ethics* (op. cit. I.108).

Revelation on the other hand is primarily identified with the objective utterances of the Scriptures. But revelation is by no means to be limited to the Scriptures—'revelation has no *necessary* Biblical limitation'.

In all generations sincere and devout souls have been seeking for God and truth . . . Who shall say that no such prayer has been unanswered? . . . Any religious truth divinely given . . . to the recipient from God is revelation (op. cit. I.11).

The determinative words here are 'religious truth divinely given', for Miley is obviously convinced of the objective revelation of valid propositions or meanings amenable to logical articulation. In this same chapter he forcefully rejects the idea that mysticism contributes any sufficient data for theology, and also vehemently sets aside Schleiermacher's elaboration of the data evoked in the religious consciousness.

There are, for Miley, two other '*mistaken sources*' of theological data—creeds or confessions, and tradition. These 'have no authoritative quality' whatsoever (op. cit. I.12). Thus, Miley easily asseverates a position long developing in American Methodism, that the classic creeds and confessions of Christendom are totally irrelevant to the construction of systematic theology. Mistakenly and dishearteningly he identified 'tradition' (*paradosis*) wholly with Roman Catholicism and the Council of Trent.

Miley attempts to construct a doctrine of original sin by admitting the framework of Western Christendom's Augustinian heritage, but at the same time invalidating the definitive constructs which particularize this heritage—thus avoiding what he calls the discriminations which have forced Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, Pope, and Summers into 'confusion and contradiction' (op. cit. II.517ff.). The Augustinian tradition is historically characterized, in this regard,

by the assertion that the justification of man requires salvific forgiveness of two kinds of guilt—that involved in rebellious, freely willed, actual disobedience, and that attached to participation in Adamic original sin. Miley will accept the fact of an inherited, atrophied nature, but denies that this nature is in any way involved in guilt (op. cit. I.521). Hence there is no need for an efficacious, salvific, prevenient grace. In the inherited vitiated nature of man, the will is unimpairedly free to will the good (op. cit. II.272ff.). But the vitiated nature is completely incapable of initiating good motives or choices for the unimpaired will to elect. These may arise only from prevenient grace. Accordingly, Miley seeks to avoid Pelagianism by making prevenient grace morally necessary but soteriologically innocuous (op. cit. II.304ff.).

This moralistic revisionism of the doctrine of salvation and the analysis of the human predicament is far too shallow and psychologically inadequate—if not contradictory—to retain a place as a creative contribution to theology.

The anthropological asseverations of Miley lead, logically, to the necessity of revising the Methodist emphases in the doctrine of the atonement toward a morally rationalistic construct. This he does by accepting, essentially, the moral government theory of Hugo Grotius, though not without some uncriticized, implied contradiction, for the Grotian view presupposes the guilt or demerit involved in human depravity which Miley has set aside. Nevertheless, for Miley, the meaning of the Incarnation and the saving work of Christ has to do primarily with enhancing the good motives amenable to unimpaired human free will, and thus actualizing divine moral government essentially through man's rationalistic choice of the good (op. cit. II.176ff.).

The development of theology in the work of John Miley marks the end of a movement. The creatively new approach and desperately required intellectual reformation of American Methodist theological *motifs* were already under way when Miley wrote his *Systematic Theology*. But there are only three inconsequential references to this reformulation in his two volumes. I refer, of course, to the influential work of Borden Parker Bowne (1847-1910), Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, who brought to America the insights of Renouvier, Lotze, and Euchen. To discerningly critical minds Bowne was without question an intellectual genius without peer in American Methodism to that date (cp. H. W. Schneider, *A History of American Philosophy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1946, p.249). Though he wrote extensively in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, candour requires the recognition that his influence on the *mass* of Methodist theologizing was neither discovered nor appropriated until the twentieth century. Hence the assigned limitations of this paper prevent us from embarking on a discussion of his work.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

First, it will have been noted that the problem of methodology and apologetics is central to each representative Methodist theologian in the period under study. This may be accounted for in the usual ways. The works of Paley and Butler and others continued to interest inquisitive minds in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century issues of natural theology. Furthermore, alert minds such as those of Fiske and Warren were quite aware of contemporary hypotheses in the physical sciences and were equally aware that the work of Paley and Butler

remained wholly irrelevant to the new issues. New constructions were required in a statement of natural theology.

The new constructions were significantly conditioned by the fact that some theologians were studying in Germany and others were reading German theology. Thus the 'Copernican Revolution' in epistemology wrought by Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* laid the groundwork for the reconciliation of science and religion in Methodist theology in America as elsewhere. The work of Schleiermacher also stimulated new approaches, many of them quite false and inadequate, to the understanding of the place of 'feeling' in the cognitions of theology.

But account for the facts as one will, surely a crucial dimension in Methodist apologetics was *not* the communication of the gospel to a pagan or godless culture, or even to a culture dominated by the new science. Rather it was the communication of the gospel to those *within* the Church, who in this struggle with nature kept asking for a theology of nature which would account for the ravages nature worked upon them in their struggle with life on the frontier. Could the God of this ravaging nature be the God of their history as they sought to realize God's will in the history of a new world as learned from their saving faith in Jesus Christ? The significance of the life-work of Borden Parker Bowne is that he combined, transitionally, the philosophical concern about science and the evangelical concern about the problem of evil in Nature (given by God) which required conquering if the Kingdom of Christ were to be actualized in America.

Secondly, the concern for human responsibility in the context of the basic Protestant affirmations respecting 'salvation by faith alone' etc. became in practice confused with the necessary struggle of the 'will to live' amidst the ravages of nature on the frontier. The settlers of the expanding frontier did not conquer the wilderness, the mountains and the deserts by faith alone; yet, in retrospect, as one in imagination follows the Overland Route, the Santa Fé, and the Oregon Trails as traversed by teams of oxen and hand carts, one knows that truly it *was* by faith alone.

But this will to live, enhanced predominantly by saving faith in God as revealed in Jesus Christ (witness the Gospel songs of the frontier) was assuredly perverted into a false sense of human ability which is to be found in the brash Americanisms of the present day. At the heart of the nineteenth century, however, the brashness was more indicative of creativity. Our fathers had stood by the barren banks of arid rivers, had gazed into mountain-crested bowls of sand and sage-brush, had laid their gear across the trampled turf of buffalo trails, and had cried into the teeth of inimical nature: 'We shall build a city here'; and cities arose—sometimes senseless cities, still growing apace, and still seeking a *raison d'être* for their existence beyond the mere fact of their fathers' defiance. How many towns yet abuilding raise their edifices ever higher toward the sky in symbol of the pioneer's 'Yes' to Almighty God's apparent 'No'! Such a people—and of such is the dominant strain of American Methodism—will hardly be cognizant of the relativity of an eighteenth-century solution of the problem of faith and works—and may perhaps be forgiven for living in a realm where faith is known *only* through the works of faith.

On the intellectual level, however, one may discern certain formal causes for

the *temporarily* characteristic American theological mood of self-reliance which appears so patently to be in rebellion against the sovereignty of God, and which, in most cases, unquestionably is. The heritage of Methodism is unequivocally involved in the Puritan ethic of New England (in spite of the fact that American Methodism has been, from the beginning, predominantly a movement of the South and Mid-West). The Puritans wanted to build the 'Kingdom of Christ' in this new world—witness the discerning lectures of Mr H. Richard Niebuhr at the Harvard University Tercentenary published under the title *The Kingdom of God in America*, or the numerous books and essays of Mr Perry Miller, who adroitly suggests that the early Puritan divines really hoped to make out of New England an ecclesio-political 'boot-camp' wherein to receive training for the ultimate task of directing the establishment of the Kingdom of God in England (cp. *Errand into the Wilderness*, Harvard University Press, 1956). This desire to plant the Kingdom of Christ—even through the inevitable vicissitudes of Protestant pluralism—remained part of the Methodist dynamic through most of the nineteenth century, and in many irrelevant ways still asserts itself in American life.

In this context the theological schools of Methodism meet the responsibilities flooding in through the tasks of the twentieth century. Of interest to many may be the fact that no Methodist theological faculty in America today is staffed by Methodists alone. Every faculty is characterized by confessional pluralism. Furthermore, the work of the school is enjoined in the struggle for words, concepts and ideas which express the faith. Every precaution must be taken to make sure that the Gospel is not perverted by the false understandings others may have of our Christian words and concepts. The definitions which we have used in our propaganda now need responsible linguistic analysis; otherwise our apologetic may be misunderstood.

Methodism in the United States has now many new frontiers. May we face them in the spirit of the pioneers.

DAVID C. SHIPLEY
