

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 28.—APRIL, 1894.

---

I. THE ATTRACTIONS OF POPERY.

DR. JOHN H. RICE, with the intuition of a great mind, warned Presbyterians against a renewed prevalence of popery in our Protestant land. This was when it was so insignificant among us as to be almost unnoticed. Many were surprised at his prophecy, and not a few mocked; but time has fulfilled it. Our leaders from 1830 to 1860 understood well the causes of this danger. They were diligent to inform and prepare the minds of their people against it. Hence General Assemblies and Synods appointed annual sermons upon popery, and our teachers did their best to arouse the minds of the people. Now, all this has mainly passed away, and we are relaxing our resistance against the dreaded foe just in proportion as he grows more formidable. It has become the fashion to condemn controversy and to affect the widest charity for this and all other foes of Christ and of souls. High Presbyterian authority even is quoted as saying, that henceforth our concern with Romanism should be chiefly irenic! The figures presented by the census of 1890 are construed in opposite ways. This gives the papists more than fourteen millions of adherents in the United States, where ninety years ago there were but a few thousands. Such Protestant journals as think it their interest to play sycophants to public opinion try to persuade us that these figures are very consoling; because, if Rome had kept all the natural increase of her immigrations the numbers would have been larger. But Rome points to them with insolent triumph as prognostics of an assured victory over Protestantism on this continent. Which will prove correct?

## DABNEY'S DISCUSSIONS.

DISCUSSIONS. *By Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas, and for many years Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.* Edited by C. R. Vaughan, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of New Providence, Virginia. Vol. III. Philosophical; 8vo, pp. 611. \$4.00. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1893.

Dr. Dabney has for several decades been well known to the philosophical and theological world. His reputation is far more than national, and hence his works not only deserve, but receive, the most careful study. This being the case, we supposed that another review of his last volume would not be out of place in this periodical. It is a labor of love and a delight to re-read discussions which we had the privilege to hear from his own lips in Union Seminary and also at the University of Texas. Several times in this review we may refer to Professor Wright's able review of this same volume, in a recent number of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, but in no spirit of controversy, and with no desire for debate. An old student of Dr. Dabney's, who was under his training for many years, may have apprehended some points in our able divine's philosophy better than one who sees it for the first time in the printed page.

"Positivism in England" is an article in Dr. Dabney's best tone. He gives us a logical history of Comteism. His trenchant pen analyzes the system into its constituent elements and formative principles. Comte unconsciously had a psychology, that of sensualism. Its formative principle is, Nothing is true save *sense* perceptions and consequent reflexive processes. Second cause is the only cause. Search for final cause is absurd. *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu* is held by Comte and his followers; he never once saw the Ithuriel spear that goes to the core of the whole debate, and reveals the truth, *Nisi intellectus ipse!*

Comte's classification of human knowledge shows the vice of his system. It runs: mathematics, physics, astronomy, mechanics, statics, chemistry, organisms, sociology. There is no metaphysics, no theology.

Dr. Dabney unveils positivism, and shows its ghostly form. It is materialistic; it is the science of "material forces and their regular laws." There is no spirit. The supernatural is impossible. Hence, when it comes to criticism, we have the inane theories of Strauss and Renan. It is fatalistic: "phenomena are governed by constant laws from which prayer and adoration can demand nothing." There are only blind physical second causes. Naturalism is another name for the whole. M. Auguste Comte has as English followers Buckle and John Stuart Mill. With great ability Dr. Dabney refutes this philosophy, and exposes its baseless character. The rudimental instincts of conscience, free-agency, and the *a priori* norms of thought, all cut up by the very roots this baleful philosophy. All these the author presses with great vigor and acuteness.

Dr. Dabney manifested his greatness as a polemic in debate with that giant intellect, Dr. A. T. Bledsoe. Intellects of the finest powers were engaged in discussion of the deepest, most difficult problems of human philosophy. It was a spectacle to command one's admiration. Both were trained logicians and profound scholars

The elements of Dr. Dabney's theory of the will are these: The soul is self-

determined; there is no equilibrium of will; *motives*, the subjective, active spontaneity of the appetencies of the soul, are causative of volition; *the inducement*, the external objective in view of which the volition takes place, is merely its *occasion*, not its cause; motives rise according to a permanent subjective law, *the disposition*, which is the ultimate and most original expression of selfhood.

Professor Wright, in his able review of Dr. Dabney's theory of volition, evidently misconceives the fundamental distinction of this theory of volition. He writes: "Dr. Dabney grounds the divine foreknowledge in the certain prevision of a chain of human volitions. The volition, then, must be certain. But this can only result from the efficiency of motive. Motive must then be connected with a certain tendency, and this, in turn, with environment. In other words, the defence in this form is committed to a fruitless regress." The ultimate in this analysis is disposition, and environment does not produce disposition. It is only that in view of which, as a mere occasion, the fundamental law of selfhood expresses itself. Hence there is no regress beyond that regulative law of the human soul, its disposition.

We also beg leave to remark on another criticism. Professor Wright states that in replying to Dr. Bledsoe, "Dr. Dabney answers by defending, not the Calvinist's position, but the doctrine of Placæus. It apparently is a case of *ignoratio elenchi*." 1. To speak of Dr. Dabney's being guilty of *ignoratio elenchi*, without giving specific proof, strikes one as extraordinary. 2. Dr. Dabney here and in other places distinctly denounces and rejects the scheme of Placæus. Especially in his *Theology* does our author state and refute the doctrine of Placæus. This acute heretic laid a snare for his opponents, into which they fell, namely, the distinction between "antecedent and immediate imputation" and "mediate and subsequent imputation"

The chapter on "The Emotions" is one of conspicuous ability. It is a subject strangely overlooked in systems of philosophy, or very poorly treated when taken in hand. Little does Locke, Hamilton, or Porter teach us. Kant is not exhaustive. Brown is illogical in his classification. McCosh is weak. Dr. Dabney presents a classification new and worth its weight in gems.

He says, "Feeling is the temperature of thought," but gives this not as a definition; it is a suggestive analogy merely. He says expressly that no definition is needed, or can be given, except that which every man has in his own consciousness.

The cardinal point in Dr. Dabney's classification is the distinction between the *passive sensibilities* and the *active appetencies*. The sensibilities are affected from without; the appetencies arise from within. *Inducements* can touch sensibility; *motives* arise out of appetency. Here is the safeguard of free-agency.

Feelings, then, go in *pairs*. There is the passive side and the active side. This suggestion threads the labyrinth. If space permitted, we would give the classification in full. All should study it; we sincerely believe that it is the best thought on the subject in the world's philosophy to this date.

Is motive causal of volition? If you mean by motive feeling as a sensibility produced by an objective cause, we answer, No, for then free agency is gone. If you mean by motive the active, subjective appetencies, arising solely from within, we answer, Yes. We have escaped the semi-Pelagian doctrine, and do it by a rational psychology. Edwards did not see this clearly as Dr. Dabney does, and

hence flounders at times. This distinction is the golden key of all the difficulties of the theory of volition.

Dr. Dabney wisely too escapes the theory which makes feeling a primary act by which the self attains to cognition in the process of consciousness. If so, there is no distinction between cognition and feeling, *i. e.*, there is no rudimental distinction. Shall we say cognition is the mere feeling of an idea? If so, we are betrayed into the sensationalism and skepticism of Condillac and Hume.

We would have been glad had Prof. Wright brought out the merits of Dr. Dabney's classification of the feelings; it is the centre of this chapter.

There are three papers on Inductive Demonstration. Dr. Dabney holds that induction is syllogistic. In this he agrees with most of the authorities. Whately, Fleming and Stuart Mill stand with our able author on this point; so do the older authorities, from Aristotle down. Extensive quotations from these writers prove Dr. Dabney's position.

We had never seen, until we took up Dr. Dabney's discussion of this subject, any account of induction which was satisfactory. They all, while maintaining induction to be syllogistic, had this logical vice, it was argument from *some* to *all*. Hence the syllogism was always invalid.

The physical sciences are founded on induction, and if induction is a false syllogism, an argument from *some* to *all*, then the splendid structure of modern science is founded upon sinking sand. How absurd! How humiliating! What a revelation to positivism; its proud boast is vain. All is uncertainty. Logic is false if every ratiocinative process is not virtually syllogistic; science is false, for its so-called truths are mere probabilities. Shall we say that real induction is an inference from some observed cases to all possible cases? It is syllogistic; but where is the universal basis or major premise? It is in the *universal intuition and law of causation*. There you have the major premise. John Stuart Mill holds the same but vitiates it. This is the cardinal and central feature of Dr. Dabney's theory of induction.

Our able author goes through all the "methods," proving the application of his doctrine as he goes. As to the method of agreement: 1. No effect can arise without a cause. 2. But X arose preceded by A + B + C. Therefore A or B or C or some combination of them must be the cause of X. So, too, we prove A + D + E and of A + F + G. Another syllogism: 1. A cause must be present at the rise of the effect. 2. B and C were absent in second and third cases; D and E in the first and third; F and G in second and third, while yet X was always present. Therefore none of these, but only A, was cause of X. Another syllogism: 1. Like causes produce like effects. 2. None but A could be possible cause of all the Xs. Therefore A was only cause of each X. In the same way we proceed in the method of difference, of residues, and of corresponding variations. The thorough understanding and application of Dr. Dabney's theory of induction would sweep away as the mists of the morning much of the unstable science, falsely so-called, which now prevails.

Prof. Wright expresses the opinion that "induction is not syllogism"; we are sorry that he takes a view which to us, at least, seems to bring uncertainty in all science.

"Spurious Religious Excitements" should have followed in order the paper on "The Emotions." Deep in the principles of volition and emotion does Dr.

Dabney lay the ground work of this able discussion. Every pastor should read and carefully master this exposition of the acting of the human heart under spurious excitement. Because of his knowledge of the human soul, Dr Dabney, almost with inspired clearness, points out the evils of false evangelism.

"Monism" is a lecture delivered before the American Association of Christian Philosophy. Sir William Hamilton classifies monists as follows: 1. Those holding absolute identity of subjective and objective. Such were Schelling, Hegel and Cousin. 2. Materialism which assumes object as original and genetic, and evolves the subject. 3. Idealism which assumes the subject as original and genetic, and evolves the object. Prof. Wright states in other terms the same classification, but thinks that Dr. Dabney has not recognized the different phases. We think it clear, however, that Dr. Dabney has divided monism into materialistic, idealistic, and Spinozist. In the introductory paragraphs this is plainly done. Absolute identity of course is pantheistic. Spinoza's theory is also pantheistic. The German idealists are absolute idealists, and hold that the rational ego from whose acts of self-consciousness everything is derived, intellectual and material, subjective and objective, is the "absolute ego." This is an absolute one, and hence is clearly pantheistic. German idealism in all its phases, from Fichte down, including Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Schopenhauer, and Hartman, is clearly monistic, and hence, essential pantheistic.

Monism is many in its various shades, and yet monistic in all its forms, and, therefore, all its forms carry monistic vices.

For the beautiful speculations of Lotze we have the highest opinion, and are loathe ever to condemn. Yet there is great uncertainty in his views, now seeming monistic, now near to the assertion of an infinite personal Spirit, from whose will all else springs, and in whom they consist.

But no matter how beautiful and alluring monistic theories, they must be rejected; not as a mental discipline, for they should be studied; but as being the true solution of the central problem of philosophy.

The philosophy of the absolutists is very exalted at times in its tone, and uses many splendid terms. All this we grant. Ueberweg, Fischer, and Pfeleiderer do indicate as much. But whenever any philosophy exhibits God as the ground of all existence in such a sense that he has not personal existence independent of, and distinct from, all other existence, it has the vice of pantheism, and will soon develop itself.

Immanence and transcendence must ever stand apart; neither can overshadow the other without baleful results.

We trust that we may yet see another volume from Dr. Dabney's pen, covering the whole of man's ethical and emotional nature. His lectures on these subjects would be invaluable to the students of philosophy. A. R. COCKE.

*Waynesboro, Virginia.*

#### SHEDD'S ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY.

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY: A MISCELLANY. *By William G. T. Shedd, D. D.*  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893. Pp. 297. Price, \$2.00.

This book is not a connected treatise on the important questions in debate between orthodox and heterodox theologians. It is a collection of articles written, "some for special occasions, and some for religious journals," and now gathered

together in a single volume. The most of them bear, directly or indirectly, upon matters of recent controversy in the fields of science, philosophy, criticism, and theology; but in them all we have the clear thinking, fine writing, and sturdy orthodoxy for which Dr. Shedd is so well known.

The collection is made up of forty-three articles and one sermon, which latter stands at the end of the volume. In the nature of the case it is impossible to make any suitable review of the discussions which the volume contains, for to do so would almost require the writing of another series of brief articles.

The first nine articles deal with various topics bearing on the pulpit and the preacher. Here the articles on *Theological Independence*, on *Courage in the Ministry*, on *Doctrinal Preaching*, and on *Wit and Humor in Preaching*, arrest the reader's attention.

Then follow eight very fine articles on various phases of modern infidelity, especially those arising from anti-Christian science. We mention those on *The Credulity of Infidelity*, on *The Hasty Inferences of Infidelity*, on *The Meanness of Infidelity*, and on *Infidel Physics*, as worthy of special notice.

After these come six or seven articles dealing with radical criticism in a most effective way. Here the articles on *The Two Views of the Old Testament*, on *Conjectural Criticism*, and on *Pseudo-Higher Criticism*, enlisted our special interest.

The remaining articles are of a varied nature, dealing with topics of doctrine, of polity, of social economics, and of politics; but we cannot, in the space at our command, even give the titles of these.

Our readers are familiar with the various writings of Dr. Shedd, and in the volume before us we have his well-known qualities of thought and literary style. We incline to the opinion that any author runs some risk in republishing in book form articles which have already appeared as fugitive writings in various newspapers and magazines. To say that Dr. Shedd has done this in a manner which puts in our hands a book which we can read through with real interest, is perhaps to pay him about as high a compliment as we can. Most of the articles deserve a place in some permanent book form, and Dr. Shedd has done wisely in collecting them together. We hope that he may be spared to give us more such articles.

The great range covered by these articles shows how wide and accurate is the reading of Dr. Shedd. He is a master in the field of doctrinal theology, alike in its dogmatic and historical aspects. From these articles we also find him intelligently informed regarding the wide field of natural science, and quite at home in the burning realm of biblical criticism. Then, too, he is not unfamiliar with the living social and political questions which agitate men's minds at the present day. To our minds this breadth of culture and wide range of knowledge, coupled with a cautious, well-balanced judgment, is one of the most striking features of this volume.

At the close of the collection there is given a sermon, preached on November 27, 1862, a Thanksgiving day, in the Brick church, New York. In this discourse we see clearly what were the author's convictions in reference to the great civil struggle in progress at that time. We have no desire to criticise the general views expressed in this sermon, still we cannot but think that it would have been better not to have included the sermon in this collection of articles. It bears some marks of the high pitch of feeling unavoidably prevalent at that time, it does scant justice to the conscientious convictions of the men who felt compelled to

form what is now popularly known as the Southern Presbyterian Church, and some of the implications of the sermon have not been verified by the facts of history. The remarkable growth and present prosperity of our church during the thirty years of its existence is especially significant in this connection.

But the volume commands our high admiration, and it deserves a place in every minister's library. It is stimulating to the intellect, and it cannot fail to fortify the faith of the reader in regard to the burning questions of religious controversy at the present day.

We may be mistaken, but it strikes us that the general style of the book-making of this volume is not quite up to the usual high standard of its publishers.

*Louisville.*

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

#### RICE'S OUR SIXTY-SIX SACRED BOOKS.

OUR SIXTY-SIX SACRED BOOKS: How they came to us and what they are. A popular hand-book for colleges, Sunday-schools, normal classes, and students, on the origin, authorship, preservation, character and divine authority of the Christian Scriptures. Fourth edition. With analysis and questions. Sixth thousand. By Edwin W. Rice, D. D., author of *People's Commentaries on Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, etc.* Philadelphia: The American Sunday-school Union, 1122 Chestnut street. New York: 8 and 10 Bible House. 1893

To those who value books, as many appear to value newspapers, by their size and their pretension, this slender duodecimo, which has lately been issued by the American Sunday-school Union, will seem of small importance. It will be altogether otherwise in the case of those who do not object to having the edible portion of their artichoke served up to them without the rough integument and indigestible appurtenances.

If anything was needed in the way of presumptive recommendation beyond the imprimatur of the house that has published this in common with so many other works of sound merit, it is furnished by the circumstance of its authorship. Dr. Rice has prepared us, by his previous contributions to Biblical literature and exegesis, to expect at his hands only what meets the requirements of genuine piety, evangelical orthodoxy, advanced scholarship, and special adaptation to the wants of intelligent students who are themselves destitute of the point-of view this writer gives them, and of a kind of knowledge with which he is competent and glad to supply them. The expositions of the Gospels in the *People's Commentaries* have given our worthy author a very desirable, and, we think, a stable reputation. What we have intimated to be true of this *vademecum*, is naturally enough applicable also to the other books which Dr. Rice has brought out under the same or kindred auspices. We think, however, that he has a strong hankering himself after the kernel without the husk; for the *multum* that is consistent with the *parvum*; for the quintessence of a thing as contra-distinguished from its non-essentials. But let us understand one another. The abridged and often jejune syllabus cannot be substituted for the complete lecture, or the compact *résumé* for the adequate discussion. This would be as though one should attempt to get along with rattling skeletons or anatomies clothed only with veined sinews, and to do without flesh and blood and living *men*. Still, even such skeletons