

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 12. — APRIL, 1890.

I. BAPTISM UNDER THE TWO DISPENSATIONS.¹

OF the three definitions of baptism given in our Westminster Standards, the most complete is that found in the Larger Catechism. It constitutes the answer to Question 165, and is in these words: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit; of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's."

This definition has primary reference, of course, to ritual baptism, but it distinctly indicates that "the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," derives its significance from the fact that it has been appointed by Jesus Christ to symbolize the benefits that come through *real* baptism, which alone introduces to membership in the invisible church.

This real baptism is effected through that operation of the Holy Spirit by which the soul is united to Christ, and thus has secured to it remission of sins and adoption into the family of God; by which it is regenerated and its resurrection unto everlasting life realized. It is to this baptism that the apostle refers in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are

¹ *The Great Baptizer.* A Bible History of Baptism. By Samuel J. Baird, D. D. 12mo, pp. 489. Philadelphia: James H. Baird. 1882.

straight on, until he either comes out on the other side of the wood, or finds that there is no other side—at least none attainable by him.” Surely if there be a God, and that God “our Father in heaven,” it is most reasonable to suppose that he will help us by a revelation from on high, and not leave us to perish by exhaustion, or by the “leopards and lions” which Professor Huxley saw in the depths of that tangled forest.

II. In combating the positive philosophy, as set forth by Mr. Harrison, who would have us “worship humanity, that is to say, to adore the generalized conception of men as they ever have been and probably ever will be,” Professor Huxley writes:

“I know of no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric ages, man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than the other brutes; a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead him to destruction; a victim to endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with barren toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then for thousands and thousands of years struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on; and when he has moved on a step, foolishly confers *post-mortem* deification on his victims. He exactly repeats the process with all who want to move a step farther. And the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

“That one should rejoice in the good man; forgive the bad man, and pity and help all men to the best of one’s ability, is surely indisputable. It is the glory of Judaism and of Christianity to have proclaimed this truth through all their aberrations. But the worship of a God who needs forgiveness and help, and deserves pity every hour of his existence, is no better than that of any other voluntarily selected fetich. . . . I could just as soon bow down and worship the generalized conception of a wilderness of apes.” (Pp. 51, 52.)

This representation of “the evolution of humanity as set forth in the annals of history,” given us, not by enemy, but by one *facile princeps* among the advocates of that doctrine, I would commend to the careful consideration of any among the readers of THE QUARTERLY who may be disposed to adopt the doctrine for themselves.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.

BIXBY’S “RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES.”

RELIGION AND SCIENCE AS ALLIES; OR, Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge. *By James Thompson Bixby.* Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 175 Dearborn street. 1889. Pp. 226.

This unpretending volume contains much more solid thinking and strong writing than at first appears. It is well compacted, and needs careful reading to do it justice. Though there is much on the religious side with which we cannot agree, yet Mr. Bixby evidently has a well digested knowledge of the various sciences, and a specially clear and correct conception of the proper logical methods to be pursued in scientific research. He is particularly happy in showing that, on the religious side, substantially the same logical methods hold good as on the side of science. This constitutes the really strong point in the treatise.

There are eight chapters in the book, with the following titles: Introduction; I., No Necessary Antagonism between Science and Religion; II., Causes of the Actual Antagonism; III., The Claim of Religion; IV., The Claim of Science; V., The Faiths of Science; VI., Scientific Results; VII., Positive Scientific Proofs of Religion; VIII., Conclusion.

No attempt will be made in this short notice to allude to the contents of each of these chapters. Only a few salient points may be noticed.

1. In the first chapter the position that there can be no *necessary* antagonism between science and religion is very well wrought out. In the nature of the case there must be inherent harmony between true scientific results in any department and sound views regarding religious truth. Perhaps Christian apologists have sometimes been a little too suspicious of scientific research. The true position to take is to assume that there is no *necessary* antagonism between scientific and religious truth; and if there be *actual* antagonism, either our scientific conclusions are in error or our understanding of religious truth is incorrect. The relation assumed to exist between them, therefore, should be irenic, not polemical.

2. The conceptions of religion as set forth by our author are exceedingly defective. In regard to revelation, inspiration, the miracle, the authority of the Scriptures, and the idea of Jesus, we are compelled to take issue with Mr. Bixby. The conceptions are purely naturalistic, and hence a higher conception must be maintained, even in the debate with science. The following statement regarding Christ, made on page 58, will serve as a sample: "I gladly recognize him as the loftiest spiritual seer and teacher the world has seen; the best historic embodiment of spiritual perfection that we have. But we must own, if we are clear-sighted and frank, that in Christ himself we do not yet obtain an oracle exempt from the limitations of humanity and the conditions of earthly knowledge." Such an idea of Christ is entirely inadequate to determine the conception of religion.

3. The large place given to "faith" by our author, on the scientific side, is a very important point, and in many respects the part that faith plays in scientific research is very fairly stated. This is a fact often overlooked in discussions concerning science and religion. The scientist sometimes claims that he reaches his conclusions by the pathway of knowledge alone, and has no need of faith at all; and in like manner he insinuates that religion must rely almost entirely on faith—even credulity. Mr. Bixby very properly points out that science has her faiths as well as religion, and many pertinent illustrations drawn from several sciences fortify his position. Knowledge and faith both have their functions, alike in the field of science and in the sphere of religion. Hence religion and science are in substantially the same position, so far as reaching certainty is concerned.

4. That in many ways science and religion pursue the same logical methods of reaching their conclusions, is a position well taken and well defended by Mr. Bixby. Of course, there are limitations of a certain kind connected with those transcendent supernatural truths which our author ignores to a great extent in setting forth his conception of religion. These limitations are to a large extent overlooked by our author; still, the general soundness of his position is not impaired thereby, though the conclusions reached require to be somewhat modified.

5. In this treatise we observe that there is an illustration of what we often find in writers who have paid special attention to scientific research and become proficient therein, but have not studied with equal care the facts and claims

of religion. In such cases, we often find that scientific experts may stand exposed as mere novices in matters of religious knowledge and biblical interpretation. If such men propose to enter the religious sphere, they should qualify themselves for doing so by as careful a study of the truths of religion as of the facts of science.

In like manner the Christian writer should be equally careful in entering the scientific department. He, too, should qualify himself for doing so by a diligent study of the sciences, else he may make great blunders which will only reveal his ignorance. The only man who is truly and fully qualified to discuss the relations between science and religion is the man who is fairly well acquainted with the facts in both departments. Notwithstanding all that may be said in approval of this book, it is evident that the author does not meet on the religious side these conditions on the religious side.

F. R. BEATTIE.

Columbia, S. C.

COBBE'S "SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE," ETC.

THE SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF THE AGE, AND OTHER PLEAS AND DISCUSSIONS. *By Frances Power Cobbe, Author of "An Essay on Intuitive Morals," "Religious Duty," etc.* Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 141 Franklin street. 1888. Pp. 243.

This little treatise consists of six well-written essays; and, like some volumes of sermons, takes its title from the first of these—"The Scientific Spirit of the Age." The branch of scientific research whose "spirit" is discussed is physical science, and biology is made prominent by the scholarly author. The opinion of Sir James Paget, to the effect that nothing could be better fitted to advance human prosperity than science, is effectively criticised. The point is well taken that scientific research does not largely call into exercise the higher range of human faculties, but merely calls forth the highest exercise of the lower range of these faculties. Miss Cobbe also argues effectively to show that the spirit of modern science is injurious to art, and especially to poetry as the art of arts. The effect of the scientific spirit on ethics and religion is shown to be hurtful, if not wisely guided. Some strong womanly things are said in this connection. She concludes that "while science has given us many precious things, it is, in its present exorbitant development, depriving us of things more precious still."

The second essay is a vigorous critique of our modern system of education, inasmuch as it almost totally ignores the education of the emotions. A strong plea is made for reform in this matter. It may be doubted, however, whether as much can be done for the education of the emotions in the school-room as in the home. A true home is the best nursery for the emotions.

The third discussion is an exceedingly interesting sketch of what is termed, "Progressive Judaism." The history and destiny of the Jews, now "scattered and peeled," are absorbing themes, and Miss Cobbe has warm sympathy with them. The three parties found at present among the Jews are sketched, and their respective opinions stated—the Orthodox, the Older Reformed, and the Newer Reformed Jews. Though this discussion is fraught with profound interest, and breathes the warmest sympathy with God's ancient people, there often appears a lack of appreciation for evangelical Christianity, as is evident from passages like these: "Now Christian theists have hitherto wanted a rallying point, and have been taunted with the lack