

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 8—October, 1891.

I.

ETERNAL RETRIBUTION.

THE question of the future and eternal destiny of man will not rest from discussion. One does not wonder at this. The thought that a single man, still more that multitudes of men, because of their deeds in this short life, should be lost eternally, is one which is so awful to contemplate, that it is not strange that not merely rationalistic expositors of Scripture, but also not a few truly devout and spiritual men, have ever protested that it is impossible that this should be the real teaching of Scripture. Accordingly, such have eagerly laid hold of every word here and there which might of itself seem to warrant a larger hope, and have earnestly sought to show that the passages which, to the ordinary reader, seem to declare the doctrine of the eternal doom of many are susceptible of a different interpretation.

By those who contend for the belief in the final universal restoration of all rational beings to holiness and happiness, it is assumed that this is a necessary logical corollary from our affirmation of the infinite perfection of God. For it is insisted that if we believe in a God who is infinite in knowledge and wisdom, power, love and righteousness, then we must logically admit that it is impossible that He should have allowed any creature to come into being, by whom He foreknew that the gift of life would be so abused as to issue in endless sin and misery. Whatever force there may be in this presumption considered in itself, it will be observed, in the first place, that it wholly overlooks the powerful counter-presumption which is furnished by the fact of the uniformly hardening power of habit. For character, to all appearance, tends to fixedness

indispensable to the effectual exhibition of them to others" (p. 205). He nobly strove to correct this one-sidedness in later life. But his defective early training handicapped him as a theologian throughout. The strongest theological influences he received came from N. W. Taylor and the younger Edwards (p. 25). As a jurist he naturally worked out for himself the governmental theory of the Atonement, which is not so surprising as Dr. Wright thinks (p. 21), considering the domination over the legal mind of the Grotian theory of punishment. In accord with this theory of the Atonement, he consistently denied forensic justification, reducing it to executive pardon, and representing the work of Christ as not its ground but only its condition (p. 235). On the doctrines of Regeneration and Sanctification (pp. 231 and 260; cf. p. 242) his philosophy of moral agency led him to adopt pelagianizing opinions: indeed Dr. Wright tells us (p. 210) that the Oberlin men, amid other differences in their construction of the doctrine of holiness, were in accord in adopting the fundamental postulate of Pelagianism: "What they were all agreed in, however, was the natural ability of the human will to keep the law of God, or, in other words, the equation between the extent of obligation and that of natural ability." It would be instructive to compare many passages in this account, indeed, with say the Introduction to Vol. v, of Dr. Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.—*A Biographical Sketch of John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D., Doctor Praestantissimus*. By Rev. A. R. Kremer, A.M. 12mo, pp. 235. (Reading, Pa.: Daniel Miller, 1890.) The object of this most appreciative biography is not to supersede Dr. Appel's larger book, but to make the character and work of Dr. Nevin better known in circles where the larger work is not likely to penetrate. The book is written too loosely to be widely useful. And Mr. Kremer's appreciation of his hero—great man as he was—is too unbounded. Dr. Nevin to him "outstrips all praise;" perhaps a rereading of the Autocrat-of-the-Breakfast-Table's essay on big trees would be a useful discipline to the author. It gives an odd effect to read in conjunction Dr. Wright's account of Dr. Nevin's tract on the Anxious Bench (*Finney*, p. 67) and the glowing account of the same controversy given by Mr. Kremer. But to Mr. Kremer, Dr. Nevin was always right and always successful.—*The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. By R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo, pp. xiii, 358. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1891.)—*Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman, during his Life in the English Church*. With a Brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by Anne Mozley, editor of *Letters of the Rev. J. B. Mozley, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford*. In two volumes. 8vo, pp. 436 and 461. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890.)—*Philomythus. An Antidote against Credulity*. A discussion of Cardinal Newman's essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles. By Edwin A. Abbott. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, pp. lxxv, 259. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1891.) These three works are probably the most important of the very large Newmanian literature which has been called forth by Cardinal Newman's death. To those who were already somewhat minutely acquainted with the history and personnel of the "Oxford Movement," the two volumes containing Newman's correspondence must be very illuminating. Others will miss in them a sufficient historical setting for the letters to enable them to follow and rightly to appreciate the lines of development, or to test and unravel the psychological problems which they raise. The needed historical sketch is admirably supplied by Dean Church's delightful volume, which almost seems to have been written to give the necessary thread of fact which Miss Mozley, if not unaccountably, yet certainly most unadvisedly omitted. Dean Church