

Newman Smyth was endowed on specific conditions. These required subscription to a creed based virtually upon the old Westminster and Savoy Confessions, which we need scarcely characterize as extremely orthodox. An opposition, headed by the Boston *Congregationalist*, vigorously assailed the appointment, not, as it appears, from any decided objection to Dr. Smyth's tendencies or views, but upon the ground that they were not in accord with the confessedly antiquated document of the deed of trust. The result has been that the "visitors," with whom rests a veto power, have annulled the appointment by a vote of two to one. The reason given is simply that Dr. Smyth's habit is "to use language more as expressive of his feelings than his thoughts, and to conceive of truth sentimentally and poetically, rather than speculatively and philosophically." His theological views the visitors declare themselves satisfied with. They admire his "natural frankness, his moral earnestness, and his Christian sincerity," and the brilliancy of his style; but do not find that precision and definiteness of thought which is desirable in a professor of dogmatic theology.

THE position assumed by our contemporary in Boston seems only capable of one explanation. It certainly is no maintainer of the principle of creed subscriptions. Is it pressing this case, therefore, as a *reductio ad absurdum*? It may thus render good service; for we frankly question not only the wisdom but the right of one generation seeking to bind, *nolens volens*, all succeeding generations to its ways and will. It, however, is open to grave doubt whether the cause of Andover is served by the course the *Congregationalist* has taken.

THE Constitution and Creed of Andover Seminary were the result of a compromise. New England Congregationalism contained two parties, equally evangelical, equally loyal to the Scriptures and earnest in defence each of its own particular philosophical mode of interpreting the nature of man and the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. But, whatever differences between them, often vehement and sometimes bitter, they were altogether agreed as against Unitarianism, Universalism, Arminianism, Socinianism, etc. At this point the

history and the creed of Andover have been a unit. Nor did the founders object to "improvements in theology" along *their* line of thought; hence their creed, which, if it must be taken in its exact and complete literalism, is "a complicated and iron-bound endeavour to anchor the orthodoxy of the future as by a chain-cable to one of its particular phases in the past, and affording more provocation to mental reservation and promise of dishonesty than of doctrinal advantage." The trustees, however, would treat the Constitution and Creed in a spirit that will not forbid, but the rather promote, a large and tolerant orthodoxy, and the development of larger views, and of a more free but none the less reverent and Christian spirit in theology. We allow them to speak for themselves: "This Creed is to be interpreted in accordance with the general law of Creeds, as well as with its explicit language. It is not put forth as a complete statement of Christian doctrine, nor of any single doctrine. It asserts the great Protestant principle, that 'the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.' It requires of every Professor this pledge: 'And furthermore I do solemnly promise that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness; that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the Creed by me now repeated, together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion, so far as may appertain to my office, according to the best light God shall give me, and in opposition, not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists; and to all other errors, ancient and modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men.' It thus limits its own obligations by the supremacy of the Scriptures, and by the solemn promise exacted of each Professor to teach the truths of the Creed according to the best light God shall give him—a light which, in the preface to the Creed, it is clearly recognized God is constantly shedding forth in His works of creation, providence, and redemption. Moreover, these truths are to be maintained in opposition to certain specified heresies. This portion of the Creed, in its public read-