

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 29—January, 1897.

I.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON.

FEBRUARY 16, 1897, will be the four-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Philip Melancthon. The Protestant world will remember to celebrate the day as one of gracious influences. For the name of the most serene spirit among the noble group of the great reformers is one that all the churches delight to honor. Lacking the vigor and originality of his great chief, falling short of the constructive force of the resourceful Calvin, and representing in himself no national movement as did Zwingli and Knox, yet as the tried and trusted lieutenant of the mighty leader of the German Reformation, the calm and scholarly theologian, the judicious and temperate advocate, he holds a place of deserved prominence and even more deserved affection. Luther in one of his fine bursts of enthusiasm wrote of him: *Res et verba Philippus; verba sine re Erasmus; res sine verbis Lutherus; nec res nec verba Carolostadius.* Such an estimate was more than kind to Melancthon in so far at least as the comparison with Luther himself was concerned. It was to Luther in no small measure that Melancthon owed his capacity for deeds; without Luther to wield the weapons which he forged in his intellectual armory it is to be feared that the fires in the forge would often have gone out. He shares from their close comradeship a large part of Luther's fame as the herald of intellectual and religious freedom, yet, by the temperate spirit which animated his words and acts, escapes the hostility so often stirred by his rash and rough-spoken leader. If at times he yields too much in the effort to reconcile

Protestantism. All the fundamental doctrines are placed in a favorable light, and the special development of organized Church life in its distinctive polity and worship is used with great ability for his purpose.

The theological world owes the writer a debt of gratitude for his book. The conclusion, however, is, so it seems to me, a little lame. We do not wonder that he makes a plea for Church union. But we do not understand why it is that he seems to delight in the prospect of the—as he expects—approaching dissolution of confessional Churches. If this should be the case, why then study Symbolics? Are union and confessionalism antitheses? I trust not. True union is confessionalism on a higher plane. Unionism and liberalism make a great deal of noise just now, and even good men like Prof. Müller are contaminated with them, but a reaction will certainly set in sooner or later, and this reaction will be in the direction of confessionalism. Let us make a thorough study of Symbolics in order to prevent the coming reaction from degenerating in repristination.

Dubuque, Iowa.

N. M. STEFFENS.

De Algemeene Genade. Rede bij de overdracht van het Rectoraat aan de Theologische School te Kampen, op 6 December, 1894, door Dr. H. Bavinck. 8vo, pp. 56. (Kampen: G. Ph. Zolsman, 1894.) We owe our readers an apology for so long withholding from them knowledge of this eloquent address, the subject discussed in which has of late been much occupying the minds of our Dutch brethren. The treatment accorded it by Dr. Bavinck is broad and suggestive. He opens by contrasting the usual conception held of Calvin's severity with the wide sympathy of that great thinker for the whole sphere of natural life, as shown in the development he gave of the fruitful doctrine of "common grace." He then undertakes to point out how this doctrine (1) is grounded in Holy Scriptures, (2) finds no place in the Romish system, (3) was set forth by the Reformers, especially by Calvin, and (4) is still to-day of the greatest importance to us. Under the first head he develops the Scriptural teaching that since the fall the whole world exists under a dispensation of grace. In the second he shows how the Pelagianizing standpoint of Rome prevents the recognition of the reign of common grace throughout the world. Man having lost in the fall (according to that system) only a *donum superadditum*, he exists as fallen in *puris naturalibus*, i. e., on the plane of pure nature. On this plane no "grace" is needed for the working out of natural perfection: while the gift of grace in the sphere of Christianity can only result in raising the Christian life to an absolutely supernatural plane. The effect is complete dualism in the conception of the relations of the natural and supernatural, by which they are brought into sharp antagonism and cannot be united in a single world-view. Calvin's logical and systematic mind could not rest in this dualism. His deep sense of sin prevented him from attributing to fallen man power to work out natural perfection, and forced him to trace the natural goods which show themselves in natural man to the workings of divine grace. Thus he wrought out the doctrine of common grace, while he avoided confusing it with special grace as Zwingli did. In the third section of the address a sympathetic statement is given of Calvin's teaching on the subject; and it is pointed out that subsequent theologians contented themselves with merely repeating his words. This is followed by a very interesting description of the influence on Reformed thinking of the two one-sided tendencies of Socinianism and Anabaptism, both of which are shown to be children not of the Reformation but of prereformation tendencies—Socinianism having its roots set in the rationalism of the Renaissance, and Anabaptism in the popular movements of the Middle Ages, such as the Franciscan and, he might

have said, the Paulician. By the one of these tendencies the *ordo supernaturalis*, by the other the *ordo naturalis* was discredited: so that wherever this influence penetrated the breadth of Reformed thought was endangered. In the fourth part, the importance of the doctrine is developed in the light of this historical survey. "It is always the same problem," we read, "that lies at the base of all earnest questions. The relation of faith and knowledge, of theology and philosophy, of authority and reason, of head and heart, of Christianity and humanity, of religion and culture, of the heavenly and the earthly vocation, of religion and morality, of the contemplative and the active life, of Sabbath and work days, of Church and State—all these and still other problems are determined by the conception held as to the relation between the divine and the human, between creation and re-creation, between the work of the Father and that of the Son." And then follows an earnest plea that men shall recognize the value of the natural world, and shall realize that there too God is graciously working, though not in the form of special grace. We may meet now and then in these striking pages an expression which may seem a trifle unguarded. Such an one for example is this: "There is no *theologia naturalis*. The sinful man not only does not know from nature the Trinity and the Incarnation, but neither does he know from nature God in His unity, in His nature, in His attributes." Doubtless, what is meant is that sin has blunted all man's faculties, and that, not existing *in puris naturalibus* but as sinful man, he is incapable of rising to any true knowledge of God *without God's gracious aid*; and that herein is grounded the necessity of "common grace." "Common grace" is the universal divine aid given to men to preserve them from festering in corruption. This contention we esteem not only sound but important, and we thank Dr. Bavinck for his clear exposition of the ground and function of "common grace," so pointedly brought out in the contrast which he draws between the Romish and the Reformed teaching. The crying need of conveying to the minds of the general public the real relations of the two theologies is illustrated afresh every day. Thus, for example, the youthful Hort, when he was shaking off the evangelical conceptions in which he was bred, praised Kingsley for dealing "a manly blow at the central lie of Calvinism, viz., that man's natural state is diabolical" (*Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, p. 64). That is his exaggerating way of saying that according to Calvinists man does not, as fallen, exist *in puris naturalibus*, but is corrupt and depraved. It is worth something to understand, however, that the "Calvinistic" exhibition of the fact of human corruption is but the obverse of the vindication of the need and the consequent reality of "common grace," that is of God's abiding presence with the whole race of man, and the refutation of that dualism which would set men under "nature" wholly apart from God's gracious dealings and isolate them as truly "orphans" in the world. The cause of the grace of God in the "natural world" is bound up with the Calvinistic, or better, the Augustinian doctrine of human depravity.—*The Gospel of Experience; or, The Witness of Human Life to the Truth of Revelation*. Being the Boyle Lectures for 1895. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, etc. 12mo, pp. xix, 206. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896.) These lectures have and make no claim to be a scientific presentation of a theology of experience. They offer no careful analysis of either human or Christian consciousness with a view to drawing out its theological implications in a doctrinal interest, or with a view to comparing its implications with the theology of the Scriptures in an apologetical interest. Their dogmatic or apologetic value is of the smallest. They are rather a series of sermons

from the point of view of Anglican teaching, essaying to present, with reference to a number of important topics, first what is deemed to be the teaching of Revelation, and then certain items of support for this from what is supposed to be the experience of the "spiritual man." Viewed in this light, they are interesting discourses, and must have been suggestive and helpful to an audience composed of believers and desiring to have their attention called to the harmony between the teaching they had received and their experience under it.—*Evolution or Creation. A Critical Review of the Scientific and Scriptural Theories of Creation and Certain Related Subjects.* By Prof. Luther Tracey Townsend, D.D., Author of *Credo*, etc. 12mo, pp. 318. (New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1896.) Prof. Townsend, in this volume, seeks to answer for Christian people, perplexed by the trend of much recent discussion, the fundamental question of How came the human race on this earth? Unterrified by any strength of assertion to the contrary, he replies emphatically, Not without God. He does more. Rejecting not merely the naturalistic but also the timidly supernaturalistic answers, he insists that man came into the world just as the Bible says he did. Prof. Townsend has his feet planted here on the rock. When it is a question of Scriptural declaration *versus* human conjecture dignified by any name, whether that of philosophy or that of science, the Christian man will know where his credit is due. Prof. Townsend has his individual opinions, of course, which we may or may not share. He writes also for a popular audience, and we may think with more or less looseness of thought and expression. But in his trust in the affirmations of the Word of God as the end of all strife, he will commend himself to every Christian heart.—*The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity.* Four Lectures delivered in St. Asaph's Cathedral, on June 16, 17, 18, 19. By Arthur James Mason, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury. 12mo, pp. xviii, 142. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896.) Surely the thorny subject of "Ecclesiastical Unity" could not be discussed in more gracious tones or with a more generous recognition of the virtues and graces and essentially Christian intentions and performances of Christians of all names than is done in these delightfully written lectures. Nor would it be easy suavely to express a more lame and impotent conclusion than that to which they would lead us. Canon Mason says, in effect, All these communions, branches of the "Catholic Church" and "schismatic conventicles" alike, are Christian organizations, the adherents of which hold the One Head; but we cannot enter into "ecclesiastical unity" with any of them unless it will consent to become Anglican. It will be safe to say that an entirely similar zeal for "ecclesiastical unity," on the same terms *mutatis mutandis*, burns in the bosom of every most bigoted sect of them all. Of course, Canon Mason glozes the harshness of his demands with smooth phrases. There is an "internal principle of unity," which consists in common possession of the fundamental faith of the gospel. And there is an "external principle of unity," which consists in communion in the one sacrament of the Lord's Body. But this sacrament cannot be rightly administered save by those properly appointed thereunto; and there is no power of appointment thereunto save in that Order which has received this power by unbroken succession from the apostles; so that there can be no unity save through the mutual recognition and fellowship of presiding bishops standing in such succession, and none can be received into this unity who will not place themselves under their jurisdiction. How Canon Mason can make this stringent demand consistent with the fundamental principle (which he recognizes as such) that the one test of necessary doctrine is "Taught or not taught by the apostles," we need not stop to ask:

who can pretend that any apostle has anywhere made it of record that the Lord's Supper can be administered only by one appointed to that function by an accredited "Successor of the Apostles?" Canon Mason himself can only plead the danger of anarchy in relaxing the rule, as if this were equivalent to a Biblical precept, or anarchy could be avoided only through a sacerdotal figment. It is more to the point, however, to consider the consistency of erecting such a barrier to ecclesiastical communion with the strong assertion which he gives to the duty of union. "To break unity is to forsake the holy Name," he tells us: "we cannot acquiesce in a divided Christendom without surrendering the Christian faith itself." Who breaks unity? Who denies communion in the body of Christ to his fellow-Christians? Canon Mason rightly recognizes that it is Rome who, above all other sects in Christendom, "breaks unity," by erecting intolerable and unscriptural conditions to communion. Let us say it with no heat, but with clear and firm conviction, that next to Rome it is Anglicanism, which in the west is most seriously chargeable with the same sin. The conditions which Anglicanism demands for communion are also intolerable and unscriptural, and in insisting anew upon them Canon Mason brings down upon himself his own condemnation. He who refuses communion to his brother of the one faith—and Canon Mason recognizes Protestants as preserving the one faith (p. 9)—he it is who tears the seamless robe of Christ. In our Presbyterian churches the Lord's table is spread for the Lord's children. We do not ask them to see eye to eye with us on all points of doctrine, though we believe our teaching to be the pure Word of God for the saving of the world—it is enough if they cast themselves for all earthly and heavenly good upon the mercy of our common Saviour. We do not ask them to subject themselves to our discipline, or to accept our form of organization and government, though we believe these to be the ordinance of God—it is enough that they acknowledge our common Lawgiver and King. When the Episcopal churches do the like, the ecclesiastical unity of Canon Mason's longings is an accomplished fact for the Protestant world. The chief obstacle to it is the sectarianism of the Anglican position. Let Canon Mason point out one single passage of Scripture which requires recognition of the claims of a sacerdotal episcopate or subjection to its discipline as a condition of Church communion, or let him acknowledge that the sin of a divided Christendom lies at the door of those who would betray one of the greatest Churches in Christendom into demanding such conditions as the price of communion with it in the body of Christ.—*The Early Church and the Roman Claim*. Lectures by J. Lawrence Rentoul, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis, and of Christian Philosophy, Ormond College, Melbourne University. In Reply to Archbishop Carr, on "The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff." Third Edition. 12mo, pp. 220. (Melbourne: Melville, Mullen & Slade, 1896.) Archbishop Carr has roused a redoubtable antagonist in Prof. Rentoul. Possessed of a detailed knowledge of the history of the Christian origins, and endowed with a gift for controversy, and withal keenly alive to the importance of the issue raised, Prof. Rentoul has little difficulty in exhibiting the absurdity of the claims put forth by the Archbishop. The four lectures which constitute this booklet were first delivered in St. Kilda's Presbyterian Church in Melbourne as a much needed rebuttal to six lectures on the "Primacy of the Roman Pontiff" which were delivered by Archbishop Carr during the Lenten period of last year. They are a model of controversial writing, and as a statement of the historical origin of the Roman legend, of the sacerdotal idea, and of the papacy, they constitute a concise treatise of permanent value, written in full knowledge of modern research and with a constructive power of no usual order. It

would be well if a circulation could be found for so excellent a treatise beyond the borders of Australia.—*The Idea of the Church*. By the Rev. Principal Sheraton, D.D., LL.D. An Address to the Alumni of Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, October 8, 1896. 8vo, pp. 28. (Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1896.) The evangelical conception of the Church and its functions has no more earnest or genial advocate among the clergy of the Church of England than the learned principal of Wycliffe College. In this slight address he manages to bring together in the most winning way an exposition of the two opposed theories of the Church which have divided Christendom, and an exhibition of the conformity of that which he rightly calls the Evangelical and Reformed conception with the teachings of the Scriptures and the experience recorded in history. The lecture must have been good to listen to; it will be well if its sound and Biblical teaching shall take root in the hearts of the Episcopal clergy of Canada.—*Baptism Not Immersion*. By the Rev. D. W. Poor, D.D. 18mo, pp. 17. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, etc., 1896.) Dr. Poor has succeeded in packing a remarkable amount of the case against the Baptist claims into these seventeen small pages. He writes freshly and tellingly. Sometimes there is a little overstatement, as, for example, when he lets the word "affusion" slip in as designatory of ordinary baptism in the *Didaché*. Those charged with correcting the proofs of the pamphlet for the press have been guilty of serious carelessness. On a single page (p. 11) we not only have such an oversight as "surperstitious," but an argument is wrecked by printing "literally" for "laterally," and only one leaf earlier (p. 9) the sense is again destroyed by printing "inseparable" instead of "insuperable."—*Prayer and the Healing of Disease*. By Rev. W. S. Plumer Bryan, D.D. 16mo, pp. 56. (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1896.) An eminently sober and sensible review of the whole matter of prayer in its relation to the healing of disease, taking its starting point from the divine record of the healing of Hezekiah (2 Kgs. xx. 1-7). Without harshness of word or judgment, Dr. Bryan points out faithfully the errors of claimants to supernatural powers of healing, exhibits their affiliations, and warns against their tendencies. The booklet supplies a need in furnishing a satisfactory tract for use in "infected" districts.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

V.—PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

INDUCTIVE LOGIC. By JOHN GRIER HIBBEN, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Logic in Princeton University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. 12mo, pp. xiii, 345.

Much as has been written on Induction since Mill's work appeared, little effort has been made to reduce the materials of induction to convenient textbook form. In this regard Fowler's little manual has for years occupied the field without any rivals. Of late, however, several new applicants for honors have appeared, among them the work of Prof. Hibben. This little volume is the fruit of an effort to bring the materials of induction into a form and compass that will meet the requirements of a manual of elementary instruction in the class-room. It is meant to serve as a fit companion to the books of elementary instruction in deductive logic. Prof. Hibben points to the fact that most of the premises of deductive reasoning are obtained by observation and investigation as evidence of the close dependence of deduction on the inductive processes. He insists on the necessity of a thorough