

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 33—January, 1898.

I.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION.

LESLIE STEPHEN somewhere cites a suggestion of Bishop Butler that nations as well as individuals may go mad. However this may be as to other professions, the imputation of aberrancy has for long time lain upon the investigators of nature, and the opinion is widespread that since the appearance of Darwin's famous book the disease has reached an acute stage. To outsiders it is difficult to comprehend why naturalists have abandoned the old scheme of instantaneous creations and catastrophic exterminations of species, which processes were supposed to have been enacted over and over again through long ages; and have rejected the types and archetypes of the comparative anatomists, with their beautiful evidences of design, in favor of a theory which seems to relegate all animated nature to the chapter of accidents.

Some intelligent people find it impossible even to understand what *Evolution* signifies, and start with erroneous definitions, deriving extraordinary conclusions from their own errors. The theory of Evolution does not, for example, teach that a dog, or that a dog's descendant, may be transformed into a cat; or that a dandelion, itself or its posterity, can in any length of time become a rose. Yet how great is the difficulty experienced by some in understanding that it does not break down any of the barriers of actually existing species? Its real effort is to account for the cross-resemblances now found between dog and cat, by the supposition that both have come from some common ancestor, which was neither one nor other. It also declares that "laws of nature" (whatever is understood by this term) and the whole environment

legung). But the reader receives no notification that he has passed from the first into a second book, either in the Table of Contents or in the body of the work: in both he simply begins afresh with a "Chapter I," and is left to his own conjecture to discover what the new commencement of chapter-numbers may mean. This is confusing. It is happily a confusion which can readily be remedied by the simple insertion, at the opening of the volume, of a leaf bearing the Book-title, as is done in the German edition with completeness, to wit: "Part I. The Genesis of Ecclesiastical Dogma or the Genesis of the Apostolico-Catholic Theology and of the First Scientific, Ecclesiastical System of Doctrine. Second Book: The Foundation." The section of the treatise contained in this volume yields in interest to no other part of the whole work: it constitutes, indeed, as already hinted, the hinge of the whole construction. Here Dr. Harnack essays to trace the origin of the old Catholic Church in the gradual secularization of the Church and the invention by it of the fiction of apostolic authority and the setting up of apostolic standards for the government and teaching of the Christian body. Here we have, therefore, his account of the origin of the Episcopate, of the Rule of Faith, and, above all, of the "New Testament." For, according to Dr. Harnack, it was the Church of the second century which invented the "New Testament"—not indeed in the sense of the composition of the books of which it is constituted, but in the sense of the erection of it into "an external authority" for the direction of the Church. American Presbyterians should be particularly interested in this original presentation of a theory which is destructive of the whole foundation on which their Church is built, but which is none the less being now pressed upon them from their own midst by Dr. Harnack's able and faithful pupil, Dr. A. C. McGiffert. So far as it concerns the origin of the New Testament canon—to us the most important and revolutionary element—the reader should consult the strictures made upon it by Dr. William Sanday in his Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration*, Ed. 3, pp. 13 and 61; where also he will learn something of the methods of probably the most brilliant and most learned but certainly not the most trustworthy historian of the Church which our generation has seen.

—*Two Studies in the History of Doctrine*. Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy: The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation. By Benj. B. Warfield. 8vo, pp. viii, 239. (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897.) The former of the two studies here reprinted was originally prepared as Prolegomena to Augustine's anti-Pelagian treatises: it consists of an account of Pelagianism; an introduction to each of Augustine's anti-Pelagian treatises, with abstracts of their contents and illustrations from the Sermons and Letters; and a summary of the doctrine of grace developed in them. The latter of the two studies is a greatly enlarged edition of an essay published some years ago in the *Magazine of Christian Literature*. It seeks to trace the general drifts of doctrine on the intensely interesting subject with which it deals, and essays to show that on no other than the basis of the Reformed theology can a consistent doctrine of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy be framed. The truth of this conclusion may fairly be considered to be illustrated by a courteously written criticism upon this essay which has appeared in *The Reformed Church Review* (October, 1897, 4th series, Vol. i, pp. 520–530), apparently from the pen of the editor, the Rev. Prof. William Rupp, D.D. After passing the several opinions under review, Dr. Rupp, rejecting the historical Reformed view, can find no tenable position save in the extension of "the possibility of salvation, or of probation and moral discipline, into the spirit world beyond death." He adds: "The objection to this theory will be that it does not *guarantee* the actual salvation of *all* infants.

It assures us, indeed, that no infant is damned at death. But if the fate of a departing infant will depend ultimately upon the decision of its own will in relation to divine grace, we cannot be certain, here and now, that every infant will be eternally saved. This must, of course, be admitted. The salvation of the dying infant must be supposed to be liable to as much contingency as the salvation of the living one, but to no more." Here Dr. Rupp places his seal on the entire contention of the essay—which is merely that on the Reformed doctrine alone can there be framed a consistent doctrine of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy; so that, if that doctrine prove to be Scriptural and true, it will become the test of systems and, in its light, the historical Reformed (*i. e.*, the Calvinistic) doctrine only can live. The best that Dr. Rupp, on a basis other than this doctrine, can offer to bereaved parents is that their infants "beyond the veil" are as well off as if they had not died: and even this seems, from his own showing, more than he is entitled to offer to them. For he is forced to add: "There is only this difference between living children and those who are no longer living, that for the salvation of the latter parents can do nothing more except pray, although there is a difference of opinion as to the propriety of that. . . . The Christian training which they can give to their living children, they can no longer give to the dead." Are not the dead, then, in worse case than the living? And what ground can be suggested for really believing that a greater proportion of children dying in infancy will be saved, than of those living here under their pious parents' care and made the objects of a prayer about the propriety of which there can be no difference of opinion? Dr. Rupp, indeed, tentatively suggests that parents may "trust that the place of their own care and training will be supplied by the loving service of beings holier and wiser than they, who will not even make the mistakes which they themselves would have been likely to make:" and feels authorized on this suggestion to conclude that "the salvation of dying infants, if not more sure, is at least not less sure, than is that of the living." It were a pious hope: but it forms scarcely firm enough a basis for this great conclusion. While we are hoping, we may just as well hope that the loving Father will gather all whom He takes out of this world in infancy at once to His bosom. Only, then it would be all up with the "mediating theology" which Dr. Rupp has embraced, with its "ethical" postulates. Only the believer in the Reformed theology which Dr. Rupp rejects is entitled to hope *that*. On the whole and as far as it goes this would seem a commendation of the Reformed theology: and in this feature of it at least there are not very apparent "those elements of hardness and arbitrariness" which, he assures us, cling to the idea of God in that theology.—*An Introduction to the History of the Church of England, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* By Henry Offley Wakeman, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Tutor of Keble College, Oxford, Author of *The Church and the Puritans*, etc. 12mo, pp. xx, 508. Price, \$2. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.) This little volume is a seriously studied and well-written general account of the history of the Church of England, which aims not at a detailed chronicle of events but at an explanation of historical development, and accordingly seeks "to fix the attention of the reader upon that which has proved to be permanent in the history of the Church and to avoid burdening his memory with facts and details which, though often very important and interesting in themselves, have not had a lasting influence upon her fortunes." It is high praise which must be given to a book when it is said, as may fairly be said of this one (on one proviso), that it succeeds in such a purpose. But no other mode of writing history is more liable to fall into one-sidedness. One's own party standpoint inevitably supplies the *criteria* for determining the permanently useful factors in history.