

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 35—July, 1898.

I.

THE PLACE OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY IN MODERN HISTORY.*

THE work done by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, in one aspect of it, is "the ablest and ripest product" of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But, in another view, it is the starting point of that splendid religious and political development of the English-speaking peoples, which, on its religious side, is marked by the evangelical revival and the modern Christian propaganda at home and abroad; and, on its political side, is marked by the enfranchisement of the peoples of the United Kingdom, the building up of autonomous colonies within the British empire, and the planting of the continental republic of the United States. Of course, every work done by man, just because it has place in the organic historical movement, has roots in the past and bears fruit in the future. Of the most of these works, we are entitled to say that each of them is one of a vast number of equally important steps which men are always taking in the march of humanity to its predestined goal.

But we shall fall into a grave historical error if we assign to the finished work of the Westminster Assembly a function in the history of the English-speaking peoples of any other than the highest and most critical import. The waters of the great Lakes move continuously through the St. Lawrence basin to the Atlantic Ocean. At no point is the movement uninteresting or without

* An address delivered at the celebration, by Princeton Theological Seminary, of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Westminster Standards.

the Nemesis has somehow left me scathless, propitiated by my piety. I said, long ago, 'The train of ideas which leads man to believe in and to treasure fetishes is *one among the earliest springs* of religious belief.' But from even this rather guarded statement I withdraw. 'No man can watch the idea of God in the making or in the beginning'" (p. 120).

McCormick Theological Seminary.

BENJAMIN LEWIS HOBSON.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF GOD AND THE WORLD, as Centring in the Incarnation. By JAMES ORR, D.D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh. Third Edition. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliott, 1897.

We have great pleasure in calling the special attention of our readers to the third and revised edition of Dr. Orr's volume. It is presented in an attractive form and offered at a price which should secure for it a wide circulation. It is not necessary to repeat what was said in our columns by Dr. Darling in his favorable and extended review (Vol. vi, p. 359) of the work when it first appeared. We need only say that a reëxamination of it has confirmed the opinion we formed of it soon after its publication, namely, that it is an exceptionally able, suggestive and useful treatise in philosophical apologetics.

Princeton.

JOHN DEWITT.

A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom. By Andrew Dickson White, LL.D., L.H.D., Ph.D., Late President and Professor of History at Cornell University. In two volumes. 8vo, pp. xxiii, 415 + xiii, 474. (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896.) Few books have come to us recently which do more credit to the bookmaker's art than these two handsome volumes: it is a pleasure to handle them and the eye delights in their well-printed pages and large, clear type. The work which they embody is an evolution and approaches its readers with all the comfortable assurance of an old friend. In its babyhood it was introduced to the public as a lecture on "The Battlefields of Science," published in the columns of *The New York Tribune*. Soon it had grown into "a little book called *The Warfare of Science*" (12mo, pp. 151, 1876). That waxed into "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science," a long series of articles in *The Popular Science Monthly*. Finally, the full-grown work appears, swelled to nearly a thousand octavo pages, in the volumes now before us. At its first appearance in book form Dr. James McCosh felt constrained thus to comment upon it: "President White has in his *Warfare of Science* brought forward an agglomeration (very indiscriminate and uncritical) of facts to show that religious men have opposed science, and been defeated. As no doubt he wishes to be impartial, I suggest that he gather a like body of facts to show that savants have used their science to put down religion, which stands as firm as ever" (*The Development Hypothesis, Is it Sufficient?* 1876, p. 75). After all its growth in size, the same judgment must be passed upon the completed work: it is still an "indiscriminate and uncritical agglomeration of facts," brought together for the support of a thoroughly one-sided and fatally misleading proposition. Dr. McCosh indeed did more than justice to the work when he said that its intention is "to show that religious men have opposed science." That is its effect; and we may readily infer from the exposure made in these erudite and well-packed pages that not all religious men of all ages have been perfectly informed, or entirely wise or invariably right. But Dr. White does not so read his thesis. He is eager to put into conflict not some religious men and the advancing conceptions of sci-

entific thought, but distinctively what he calls "Dogmatic Theology" and "Science;" and he defines Dogmatic Theology as the theology "based on Biblical texts"—to which he adds, no doubt, "and ancient modes of thought," but only as an unimportant indication of what he thinks Dogmatic Theology really is. The thesis which he is actually striving to make good accordingly is that the doctrinal teachings of the Bible, so far as they concern matters with which science has to do, are simply a mass of mythological conceptions, the attempt to hold to which as truth has been to throw up a dam across the advance of the stream of knowledge—which, therefore, this irresistible stream has repeatedly been at necessity to break through and bear away. He considers himself a Christian man and reverences "the blessed Founder of Christianity," and labors—even in the publication of this volume—for the spread of "pure and undefiled religion;" but the sphere of religion is to be sharply limited and the whole sphere of science left undisturbed by its influence. The sphere of science moreover is made as broad as possible. In the twenty chapters gathered in this book announcing so many instances of the rout of Theology before advancing Science, the latter term is made to cover with its ægis every department of human research from pure Metaphysics to the Higher Criticism. It is amazing what a wealth of detail Dr. White has brought together in support of his thesis. Of course, it has not been possible for him to collect all these details and record them without falling into errors of fact. A considerable list of such errors might easily be drawn up, a good number of which would impinge upon the thesis they are adduced to support. But the trouble with the book does not lie in these inevitable and insignificant errors of detail. It lies in its fundamental conception and in the whole disposition of its material. Here there is such fatal one-sidedness, that the entire treatise—valuable as it is and will remain as a magazine of facts—is hopelessly vitiated. As Dr. McCosh pointed out twenty years ago, all that it proves is that some religious men have been slow to follow the advance of science; and the same could easily be shown of some scientific men: nay, it was largely not because they were men of religion, but because they held too tenaciously to the current ideas of men of science, that these men lagged behind the vanguard of advance. Least of all does Dr. White's argumentation, in any case, prove that there is warfare between Science and Theology, and he has done grave injustice to his own cause and his own book by writing this thesis down on its title-page and making the validation of it the object of his labors. What after all, in strictness of thought, can be meant by affirming a warfare between "Science" and "Theology?" There is no such thing as "Science," with a big S: sciences there are, but the *scientia scientiarum*, which alone can be meant by "Science," is a philosophy, and can only be interpreted as a general world-view supposed to be involved in the results of the various sciences. But how can Science, with a big S, in this sense come into conflict with Theology? Theology is itself a science, one of the *scientiæ*, of the results of which Science is the abstract expression: and to speak of a conflict between the two is to say that the whole we have erected in our minds will not comport with one of its component parts. The absurdity of it all will be at once perceived when we shift the assumed conflict to another department of science. How would it do to speak of the warfare between Science and Botany, say; or between Science and Geology? The self-contradiction can be voided only by a preliminary arbitrary exclusion of Theology from the domain of Science, and it is just this narrow point of view which characterizes Dr. White's attitude and vitiates his conclusions *ab initio*. If this assumption is not made to start with, it is very clear what happens to "Science" if it is in conflict with

Theology. When "Science" gets into conflict with one of the sciences which it assumes to represent, it is, of course, "Science" that goes to the wall. Our complaint against Dr. White's book then is, that in its fundamental view-point it is the outgrowth of pure prejudice, and that in its elaboration it is one-sided and thoroughly misleading. A "history" is just what it is not: it is a polemic treatise and a polemic treatise which in its whole spirit and effort is painfully like a partisan attorney's plea. A history of the adjustments, through the ages, of theological thought and general culture was well worth writing. A piece of special pleading like this was not worth writing: and the undeniable ability of the performance and the richness of material assembled will not save it from this condemnation. All that the book as a whole really proves is thus the narrowness of Dr. White's *Weltanschauung*.—*The Sacred Books of the East*. Translated by Various Oriental Scholars and Edited by the Rt. Hon. F. Max Müller. American Edition. Vol. I. *The Upanishads*. Translated by the Rt. Hon. F. Max Müller. 8vo, pp. g, ci, 307 + lli, 350. (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897.) Vol. II. *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, as Taught in the Schools of Âpastamba, Gautama, Vâsishtha, and Baudhâgana. Translated by Georg Bühler. 8vo, pp. lxii, 314, xlv, 360. (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1898.) The "Christian Literature Co." proposes the reissue in an American edition, at a greatly reduced price, of the twenty-four volumes of the well-known series of *The Sacred Books of the East*. The present installments are the first of this enterprise. The first volume contains the whole of the twelve Upanishads, translated by Prof. Max Müller, which appeared as Vols. i and xv of the original series. The second similarly contains the whole of the *Laws of the Âryas*, translated by Georg Bühler, which appeared originally as Vols. ii and xiv of the English series: thus the *dissecta membra* are brought together and the work made more coherent and usable. Evidently the matter has not been reset: so that except for the fact that each volume will contain two volumes of the English edition, and the arrangement of the volumes is made more convenient, the purchasers of the American edition can be sure that they have the English edition unchanged. The opening volume includes a portrait of Prof. Max Müller and a new Preface to the American edition. As everybody knows, this series of books worthily puts for the first time within the reach of the English reader the documents on which the great religions of the world base themselves. They are not enticing reading. Nor will the study of them lead men of insight to think and speak of the religions which they represent as Christianity's "peers," as Prof. Max Müller strangely seems to think. But they are indispensable to all who would know what religion on the plane of nature is really like and what it is able to produce: and who would thus learn to appreciate more truly and more fairly the gulf that divides the religion which God has given from those that man has made. The Christian Literature Co. deserves the thanks of students of comparative religion for placing the series within the reach of all, in such excellent shape.—*Lao-Tze's Tao-Teh-King*. Chinese-English. With Introduction, Transliteration and Notes. By Dr. Paul Carus. 8vo, pp. 345. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1898.) In this volume, Dr. Carus has performed a very notable service to the science of Comparative Religion. It is simply a scientifically complete edition of the Tao-Teh-King for Western use, containing within one cover all that is necessary to make the work accessible to the student. His purpose, as he states it, "is first to bring the Tao-Teh-King within easy reach of everybody, and secondly to offer the student of comparative religion a version which would be a faithful reproduction not only of the sense but of all the characteristic qualities,