

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 3.—JANUARY, 1888.

I. REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

The word Revival implies the previous existence of life ; more properly, it means resuscitation or resurrection from the dead. But according to usage, and with reference to the secondary meanings of the word *life*, it means calling into active exercise a life which has become torpid or has been slumbering. Hence, it has special application to the church, not to the world outside. In Acts 2: 41 ff. we have an account of a revival in the proper sense of the word ; for all the statements there concern the members of the visible church of God. What is commonly called a revival—a general religious movement among the unregenerate—was called by our fathers an “awakening.” There is a sense in which such an awakening may be called a revival, to-wit : a revival of God’s work, (Hab. 3 : 2)—that work of salvation, of calling in His elect—which He has been doing from the beginning. This work seems at times, and in some places, almost to cease ; the Lord seems to abandon His church and give it up to the power of Satan, as in the days of Elijah, at the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the “Dark Ages.” Then comes a time of reviving, a great movement among the dry bones, and a great multitude stand up for the Lord. (Josh. 24—1 Sam. 12.—Judg. 2.—1 Chron. 29.—Hezekiah, Josiah, the Maccabees, Pentecost, the Wilderness, the Brethren of the Common Lot, the Reformation, the Kirk of Shotts, Northampton,

evident that the enemies of the Sabbath are the enemies of the Christian religion. Sabbath violation is a fundamental evil. Some of the severest judgments of God are visited upon men and nations for the disregard of the fourth commandment; and this, for the best of reasons, as we can see, namely, that this sin is often the beginning and root of many others; whilst strict morality in this particular is a mighty defence against temptations in all circumstances. The Sabbath should be guarded with zealous care both by State and Church. And every effort on the part of foreign-born citizens to antagonize this fundamental civil and religious institute, and introduce the "Continental Sunday" into our country, should be opposed by prompt and efficient action. The "Personal Liberty" agitators demand "open saloons on Sunday," "free whiskey on Sunday," and they think it an unjust restraint of their "personal liberty" not to be allowed thus to ruin themselves and demoralize the community at pleasure, without let or hindrance. They should be brought, willing or unwilling, under the sway of law. It is well understood by them that to close up the places where intoxicating drinks are sold on the Sabbath would ruin most of them, at least in the cities, and a sense of such impending ruin of their infamous traffic is driving them to desperation, and this last movement is a life and death struggle.

It remains to be seen what will be done, whether the Sabbath or the saloon will be supported by the efforts and suffrages of the people. This is the living issue now, and it calls for thought, prayer and heroic action. God help them to make the right decision, and to act promptly in the use of all legitimate means for the furtherance of His will, and the glory of His name.

Philadelphia, Pa.

MASON W. PRESSLY.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DR. MORRIS VS. FUTURE PROBATION.

IS THERE SALVATION AFTER DEATH? A TREATISE ON THE GOSPEL IN THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, *by E. D. Morris, D. D., LL. D., Lane Theological Seminary.* Second edition. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, New York: Crown 8vo., pp. 252. 1887.

This work is an able and scholarly, a temperate but, in our judg-

ment, convincing discussion of the question which it handles. The fact that it has passed to a second edition shows the favorable estimate which has been formed of its ability, and also the interest which is taken in the topic of which it treats. Systematic theology has been by many assigned to a back seat, and bidden to give way to biblical criticism and discussions of scientific hypotheses in connection with revelation. This question of a future probation, however, summons it to the front, and under the arraignment of the New Theology, which its supporters are pleased to honor with the title of Progressive Orthodoxy, is called upon to vindicate the conservative position of the Church universal. The fact is that theology is never permitted to rest quietly in the region of dogma. It is forced into the field of polemics by heterodox theories springing up in every generation. It must ever be in the front rank as a defender of the truth of God.

The doctrine of a future probation does not profess to be co-incident with universalism. It does not assert the fact of a universal restoration of the race, in consequence of a universal atonement. This is its claim, whatever its logical tendencies may be conceived to involve. It maintains, that for the dead heathen, that is, those who died unevangelized, a first opportunity will be afforded of attaining salvation by the presentation of the gospel to them after death, and that for those who had the gospel and rejected it in this life a second opportunity of securing salvation will be furnished upon condition of their believing the gospel in the future state, those only being excepted who on earth committed the unpardonable sin, or sinned the sin unto death. With these exceptions, there is the *hope* of salvation for the dead. Death does not close their evangelical probation. The pith of the doctrine, then, is the *salvability* in another state of all those who died without accepting the gospel, with the limitations mentioned. Prof. Morris enumerates four theories in regard to the possible salvation of men after death :

“The spontaneous or evolutionary theory, affirming that these salvatory changes will occur chiefly through the action of forces inherent in the soul itself ;

“The educational and disciplinary theory, which attributes the result rather to combined processes of training and chastisement providentially brought to bear upon the soul for its moral restoration :

“The papal or purgatorial theory, which relates to imperfect believers only, and refers their ultimate perfection to the influences of direct punishment divinely inflicted upon them in order to their complete purgation and preparation for heaven ;

“The probationary theory, asserting the salvation of a large proportion of the inhabitants of the intermediate state, not through such discipline or purgation, but through the presentation and application to them of the gospel, as it is in Christ.”

It is the last of these theories which the author proposed to refute.

It will be observed that he limits the question to salvability in the state intervening between death and the last judgment—why, he does not inform the reader. His method is, first, to consider the testimony of particular passages of Scripture bearing on the subject; secondly, to examine the argument from the general testimony of Scripture; thirdly, to adduce the witness of Christian symbolism; fourthly, to allege the witness of Christian theology; and fifthly, to cite the witness of Christian experience. He is justified in giving the discussion this wide scope by the fact that the advocates of the hypothesis do not confine themselves to the Scriptures, but endeavor to enlist in its support the suffrages of Fathers and theologians. He meets them with their own weapons.

The particular Scriptures, adduced in favor of the hypothesis, he groups under seven heads. The first four of these classes, which we have not space to note, the author criticises as furnishing only "inferential testimony or suggestion," but at the same time he subjects them to examination. The first of the classes affording, as is claimed, direct testimony is: Passages implying or directly revealing the fact of probation after death. Among these, which are confessedly few, the most prominent by far is 1 Pet. 3: 18-20, concerning preaching to the spirits in prison. Prof. Morris takes the same view of this passage as was expressed in a notice of Dean Plumtre's work in the last number of this QUARTERLY—namely, that it is too obscure to be used as a proof-text. He gives, however, his opinion—modestly suggested—as to the meaning of the passage; and we agree with him, so far as his construction goes. It is, that the apostle's aim was to encourage believers in carrying forward, through difficulty and trial, the work of proclaiming the gospel. The reference to Noah's ministry "is explained by the peculiar relations of the first judgment by water to that second and conclusive judgment by fire, on which the apostle so strongly endeavors in both of his epistles to fix the thought of the church in his day. *

* * * Those who had rejected the earlier invitations of divine grace [made by Christ through Noah], and died in disobedience, the apostle describes as now in Hades as in a prison." Add to this—we venture to suggest—that Peter designed to strengthen the faith of Christians by the consideration that, although the persecutors of Noah were vastly in the majority, they were suddenly overwhelmed by the judgment of God and are now in the prison of hell, and that, in like manner, their own cruel persecutors would not ultimately triumph, but would perish in a similar catastrophe, and the illustration appears complete. There was no reason why Christians should despond, but, in view of such a history, every reason why they should maintain their faith and hope in the face of persecution, and patiently and joyfully prosecute their work of proclaiming the gospel of Christ. We concur with Dr. Morris when he says: "The parallelism thus brought to light, is a thousand fold more likely to be the true interpretation of the text, than the alternative

explanation demanded by the dogma under consideration—an explanation for which we find distinct corroboration nowhere else within the revealed and revealing Word." It seems to us that the whole drift of the context requires this interpretation. There is nothing in that context to warrant the constructions of the Papist and the Future Probationist. They have read between the lines and interpolated the doctrine which they wish to be true. We have dwelt at disproportionate length upon this passage on account of the part which it has been forced to bear in this controversy.

The second class of passages mentioned by the author consists of those which illustrate future probation. The fable of this class is the Parable of Dives and Lazarus. It has been discovered in its light that the rich man's soul in torments became penitent, and that Abraham encouraged that disposition in him by a tender, fatherly address. Is it not wonderful, that hope for a soul in torments is extracted from a parable of our Lord in which he represents Abraham as distinctly informing it that there was no hope of its escape? What else means the *impassable* gulf? We cannot notice the other testimonies. But what need? *Ab uno disce omnes.*

The third class of passages examined is that which presents unbelief in Christ as the only ground of condemnation. This view the author properly meets by a denial of its truth. There is another ground of condemnation expressly asserted in the Scriptures—namely, the transgression of the moral law contained in the conscience. Paul affirms that those who transgress that law shall perish, although they had not the written law imparted to the Jew.

The author then presents in opposition to "these sporadic quotations the direct and continuous testimony of our Lord himself, and the corroborating witness of his apostles and of his Church, respecting this gospel as belonging exclusively to earth and time." We take occasion to append two passages which appear to us decisive. The first is Mark 9: 42-49. Christ, in this passage, first enforces the duty to refrain from giving offence to others; secondly, the duty to refrain from stumbling ourselves in seeking salvation. Hence the law of self-denial or self-sacrifice: whatsoever is an impediment in the way of our own salvation must be sacrificed. This leads our Lord to enounce the great principle that sacrifice must take place in every case: "Every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." Salt preserves; fire consumes. A sacrifice salted with fire is a sacrifice ceaselessly consuming. He who resolves to serve God voluntarily offers himself a perpetually consuming sacrifice on the altar of that service (see Rom. 12: 1, "a living sacrifice"), but he shall escape the necessity of being made a penal sacrifice. He who refuses, in this world, thus to sacrifice himself will be hereafter offered a ceaselessly consuming sacrifice on the altar of penal justice. The alternative is: Sacrifice yourselves now, and you shall be eternally saved; spare your-

selves now, and you shall be eternally sacrificed—you shall be “cast into hell-fire, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Awful negation of hope to the lost, thrice repeated by lips which were wont to bless! Men never got the doctrine of a future probation from the Author of these words.

The second passage is Heb. 9: 27, 28: “As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment,” etc. The point insisted upon by the writer is, we conceive, not that it is appointed unto men to die, but that it is appointed unto men *once* to die. It is not the certainty, but—if the word may be tolerated—the *oneness* of death which is emphasized. This is proved by the preceding context, in which the writer asserts that it was necessary for Christ to die only once: “Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others: for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” It is also established by the succeeding context: “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time,” [not to die the second time, but] “without sin, unto salvation.” The case is clear. It is appointed unto men to die *once*. This excludes the possibility of another living to be concluded by another dying. If that were possible a chance would be afforded to men to seek a remedy for the mistakes of the first life. No, they die once, and “after this the judgment.” Death concludes the work of life, and judgment sets an irrevocable seal upon that conclusion. The case of Christ is similar, argues the writer. His once dying concluded the only mediatorial, atoning work he will ever do, and God’s judgment settled forever the results of that work. Neither will he renew the work, nor give it a new application. If then Christ’s case is, as the writer affirms, in this respect analogous to that of men, they, having once died, will have no second opportunity to work out their salvation. The very core of the hypothesis of future probation is that death will not terminate the opportunities of grace and salvation. This passage refutes the hypothesis, as though it was written for that end. We have tarried upon this section of the author’s proofs, because of a conviction that it is the most important and conclusive.

In the argument from the general testimony of Scripture, he refutes the claim that it supports the hypothesis under consideration. This is ably done, with the exception that he urges a theory of probation which we think inconsistent with the Scriptures. But of this more anon. The argument from the creeds and confessions of the Church universal is complete and overwhelming. Nothing of churchly authority is left to the maintainers of this doctrine, which contemplated from this point of view is seen to be the merest heresy. He brings out the fact that Dr. Farrar’s “only important witness drafted from the whole circle of patristic authorities is Origen;” and

he cites Dr. Plumptre's admissions, that "the Fifth General Council classes Origen with Arius, Nestorius, Apollinaris and Eutyches as an errorist worthy of reprobation, though without specifying the error which called forth its anathema;" and "that the Trullan Council, held at Constantinople, A. D. 691, formally condemned Origen among others as belonging to that class of teachers who invent changes for our souls and bodies, and impiously utter drunken ravings as to the future life of the dead."

The argument from the witness of Christian theology does not consist in an appeal to the judgment of theologians—that would have involved an endless task—but to the principles of theology as they lie in the author's own conception, particularly in their bearing upon the relevant question of probation. So far we have gone along with Prof. Morris in the main cordially and admiringly; but we regret to say that at this point we are under the necessity of filing our dissent from his views; and we have room to do little more. His whole theory of probation is out of harmony with the Calvinistic theology. That theology affirms that Adam was, after his creation, by a free determination of the divine will, appointed the Federal Head and Legal Representative of all men, and that they had their legal probation in him. When he, as a probationer, failed, they, as probationers, failed in him. It also affirms that Christ, the Second Adam, was appointed the Federal Head and Legal Representative of his elect people. When he, as a probationer, succeeded, they, as probationers, succeeded in him. In either case, the legal probation of men is finished. But the author takes the ground that men, as men, are now universally in a state of probation which is closed at death. Now either that probation is legal or evangelical. If legal, how can sinners already under condemnation fulfil it? Can they be justified by the works of the law? If evangelical, how can the heathen be in such a state of probation, since their very definition is that they are men destitute of the gospel? The only question which can be raised consistently with Calvinism is, whether the evangelical probation of those who live under the gospel will be continued in a future state; and that amounts to this, Will some of the elect be regenerated and justified after death? The principles of the Calvinistic theology make short work with the question of a probation in another state than the present. We suggest, whether upon the author's view, it might not be ingeniously maintained that, as the probation of men continues until death, the awful experience which men undergo in passing through that shocking transition, may not be designed to lead those who have died unbelieving to accept the offer of salvation which they refused on earth. No, the legal probation of men, of all men, has been finished before death, and the evangelical probation of those who have the gospel, according to the Calvinistic conception, tests the question whether they are among God's elect or not, whether or not they will accept the

righteousness of a glorious Substitute who finished the probation of his people before the New Testament dispensation was inaugurated.

We have also to demur to the author's endorsement of Pres. Edward's speculation touching the constituted identity of the race with Adam—a speculation based upon his philosophical crotchet of a continuous creation, and incapable of adjustment to his own better view of the federal headship and representative character of the first man. Nor can we see how the author's views as to the universal fatherhood of God, unless more qualified than they are in this work, and his doctrine that "in some deep sense" Christ died for all men individually, can be harmonised with the Calvinistic doctrines of regeneration, adoption and particular atonement.

But notwithstanding these theological statements to which we have been constrained to except, and apart from them, we cheerfully yield to the author the palm for a triumphant refutation of the heresy of future probation. The final argument from the witness of christian experience we have not room to notice. We hope that this work, so timely and so able, may be blessed of God to check the spread of an hypothesis which threatens to subvert the foundations of the orthodox faith, to chill the fervor of evangelical preaching, and to arrest the progress of the foreign missionary enterprise.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

BOWNE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM.

PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM. *By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, author of "Metaphysics," "Introduction to Psychological Theory," etc.* Pp. x. 270. 8vo. Cloth, \$1.75. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1887.

The wide reputation of Professor Bowne insures a large and appreciative audience ready to listen attentively to this his latest word on a topic of such commanding dignity and importance; a topic, too, which long experience in his chosen field of study has furnished him rare qualification to discuss not only intelligently but with authority.

The form of the work is prepossessing; it is a portly volume, substantially bound, and printed in large restful type on clear white *extra-heavy* paper.

It opens the discussion proper with an *Introduction* of forty pages, following which we have seven formal chapters, *viz.* :

- I. Unity of the World-Ground.
- II. The World-Ground as Intelligent.
- III. The World-Ground as Personal.
- IV. The Metaphysical Attributes of the World-Ground.
- V. God and the World.
- VI. The World-Ground as Ethical.
- VII. Theism and Life.