

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 31.—JANUARY, 1895

I. IDEALISTIC MONISM.

I do not care to prefix a rubric of titles of idealistic authors to this criticism, as could be very easily done after the pretentious and pedantic fashion of some review writers. I could cite quite a list, beginning with Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, down to Herbert Spencer, Kuno Fischer, of Heidelberg, and Paul Deussen, of Kiel, and could profess to give outlines of their several phases of Monism from histories of philosophy. But my object is to instruct students who are guided by common sense and their Bibles in the central doctrines of this pretended philosophy which are common to all its phases, and to expose their common errors. No two idealists are consistent with each other, nor even with themselves; hence the attempt to particularize their different schemes would be tedious and hopeless, and would disappoint my practical aim.

Idealism is, in plain terms, that doctrine which tells us that the whole universe, including ourselves, consists of ideas only, and contains no other perdurable substantive beings, material or spiritual, distinguishable from mere trains of ideas or actions. Monism is the doctrine which insists that there is no distinction of mind and matter, that both are one and that there is no true philosophy until all things are traced to one single principle of being. The monism of idealists is, that the universe exists for me only as my representation in thought. Thought and real being are identical. To think a thing is to give it existence, the only kind of existence which anything has. There is not, and cannot be, any creation *ex nihilo*, even if there were an almighty

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

WATTS' NORTHRUP'S "SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD."

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD: *A Discussion by President G. W. Northrup, D. D., LL. D., Chicago, and Professor Robert Watts, D. D., LL. D., Belfast.* Baptist Book Concern, Louisville, Ky. 1894. Pp. 360.

Early in the year 1892 a series of articles on the Sovereignty of God appeared in *The Standard*, an able Baptist paper published in Chicago. These articles were from the pen of Dr. Northrup, President of the Baptist Theological Seminary, then at Morgan Park, but now in Chicago. The aim of the writer seems to have been to criticise consistent Calvinism, and to offer certain modifications of the divine sovereignty which might render that doctrine more acceptable to men.

These articles attracted some attention, and, in Baptist circles especially, called forth a good deal of criticism. Prominent among these critics was *The Western Recorder*, a strong Baptist paper published in Louisville, and edited by Dr. Eaton. In defence of consistent Calvinistic doctrine *The Recorder* secured a series of articles from Dr. Watts, of Belfast, a well-known Presbyterian champion of orthodoxy.

To the articles of Dr. Watts, Dr. Northrup made reply again in *The Standard*, and Dr. Watts rejoined in *The Recorder* to the strictures of Dr. Northrup. Then, finally, Dr. Northrup made a second and rather extended reply, and the discussion thus ended. There were thus five series of articles in all. The editor of *The Recorder* has gathered these together and issued them in the volume before us. They form a volume of three hundred and sixty pages, and the ability of the discussion, as well as the importance of the subject of which they treat, justifies their publication in permanent form.

The discussion, as here published, is divided into three parts. In the first part we have Dr. Northrup's first series of articles; in the second part we have the first series of Dr. Watts, the rejoinder of Dr. Northrup, and the reply of Dr. Watts; and in the third part Dr. Northrup's second rejoinder stands alone. This arrangement seems somewhat defective, but, as is explained by Dr. Eaton in a brief preface, this was due to the circumstances under which the publication was made by *The Western Recorder*.

It will be noticed also that Dr. Northrup has three series, while Dr. Watts has only two. This, of course, was in accordance with the usual conditions of debate. Dr. Northrup having opened the debate, it was proper that he should close it, although in his closing series he has not confined himself entirely to answering what had already been adduced in the debate. Moreover, Dr. Northrup has written at much greater length than his critic, for while he has written two hundred and thirty-eight pages, Dr. Watts has occupied only one hundred and twenty-two.

From the nature of the case it is not easy to do justice to a book like this in an ordinary review notice. To go fully into all the points raised in the discussion would be almost like fighting the battle over again. This we cannot now attempt, and so must content ourselves with a brief presentation of the main outlines of the debate, and with offering a few remarks of a general nature upon it.

Dr. Northrup's first series of five rather long articles lies before us. In the first article he enumerates five views which have been held regarding the sovereignty of God. He sets two of these aside entirely, and says that the others are unsatisfactory. Among those described as unsatisfactory is the following: "The sovereignty of God is his absolute right to govern and dispose of all his creatures according to his own good pleasure, or according to his absolute perfection." He quotes Shedd, Hill and Edwards to illustrate the consistent Calvinistic view which he deems unsatisfactory, and enumerates five particulars involved in this view: "1, God decreed to elect a part of mankind and to reprobate the rest, and remains God, infinitely blessed and glorious. 2, Had he reversed these decrees as regards the individuals included in them, electing those whom he reprobated, and reprobating those whom he elected, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious. 3, Had he decreed to include in either of these purposes any number of individuals less than the whole human race, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious. 4, Had he decreed the damnation of all, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious. 5, Had he decreed the salvation of all, he would have remained God, infinitely blessed and glorious." We have been careful to give in these five particulars Dr. Northrup's own language. How far it is a correct summary of consistent Calvinism remains to be seen later on.

Then, after seeking to show that these particulars involve certain serious consequences in regard to God's nature and his procedure with men, and after examining, in a hurried way, some of the reasonings in support of consistent Calvinism in order to point out their fallacies, Dr. Northrup states what he takes to be the true view of the sovereignty of God as follows, p. 23: "The sovereignty of God is his right and power to constitute and govern the universe according to his absolute ethical perfection; it implies supremacy, independence, and infinite moral excellency, but not optional power in the sense that he is entirely free to will the exact opposite of that which he does will. He exercised his sovereignty in adopting the plan of the existing universe because of its supreme excellency as including those methods of action most worthy of himself." "God is a sovereign and the highest of all, not because he possesses a prerogative, in the exercise of which he is free to choose any one of an infinity of systems of creation, whether equal or unequal in point of excellence; but because he possesses the power and right to govern and dispose of all his creatures according to the dictates of his infinite intelligence, making himself his own highest law, and highest good, and highest end. We deny that the Bible justifies the ascription to God of a prerogative in virtue of which he was entirely free to ordain to eternal life those whom he will consign to the congenial companionship of the devil and his angels." These two statements will give the reader a fairly complete view of the sovereignty of God which Dr. Northrup would present as more satisfactory than that which is set forth by consistent Calvinistic writers.

In the second article of this series Dr. Northrup deals with the statement of

consistent Calvinism, that nothing in men grounds or conditions their election. Here his doctrine comes clearly into view. He holds that there must be some moral differences in those men who are chosen to salvation. His own language, printed in italics, on p. 47, is: "*That there is some difference or differences between men to which God has respect, which are, if not moving causes, yet conditions of his decisions.*" Otherwise he says that the divine procedure "cannot be vindicated from the charge of arbitrariness." This is the very core of the view which Dr. Northrup adopts and seeks to establish. The difficulty to be met is, to provide an ethical ground for the discrimination between individual men which election implies.

Dr. Northrup briefly alludes to various solutions. The Arminian finds this ethical ground in the foreseen faith and obedience of the believer. Most Calvinists hold that this ground is to be found in the glory of God, in which is revealed the perfection of the divine attributes. Some Calvinists prefer to discover this ground in the ethical perfection of God, which leads him to secure the highest good of his creatures, and to find something in those who are chosen to life and salvation which conditions that choice. Dr. Northrup takes his place in the last class, and states his conclusion at length on pp. 58, 59.

In the third article Dr. Northrup seeks to show that consistent Calvinism necessitates the inevitable perdition of the lost, and that his proposed modification of view relieves Calvinism of this serious difficulty. He points out the three types of Calvinism which here emerge, as supra-lapsarian, infra-lapsarian, and moderate. The second is that usually held, but the third is the one Dr. Northrup prefers. Of this there are, he adds, two forms, the one affirming and the other denying that men are under condemnation prior to the age of moral responsibility. The view of Dr. Northrup, though not very clearly stated, seems to be that men are under condemnation prior to the period of conscious moral responsibility.

Dr. Northrup then quotes from many Calvinistic authors to show that the perdition of the non-elect is inevitable, and he also gives some reasons which he thinks prove the same thing. Pages 90-91. Some of these have the ring of quotations from Arminian writers.

The fourth article seeks to show that God cannot be moved with compassion for the non-elect, and that he cannot deal with them in good faith in offering to them the gospel. Dr. Northrup discusses various phases of view here as to the relation and effect of the truth of the gospel and of the Holy Spirit in the case of the non-elect. The general conclusion reached is, that consistent Calvinism cannot make a *bona fide* offer of the gospel to all men, and that his (Dr. Northrup's) proposed modification of Calvinism, which denies the fact of special grace, and holds that all men have given to them common grace prior to regeneration, which, if they use aright, will render the gift of regenerating grace at least possible, if not probable, is free from this objection. Page 116.

The fifth article deals with the perplexing subject of infant salvation. Dr. Northrup here seeks to show that consistent Calvinism implies belief in infant damnation, and that his view gives relief from this dreadful conclusion. It is not necessary to follow him here, for the discussion is full of confusion, and it ignores entirely the idea of the covenant relation which alone provides the basis for the true doctrine of infant salvation, and makes it evident that consistent Calvinism is beset with fewer difficulties than any other form of doctrine upon this subject.

We have dwelt at some length on Dr. Northrup's first series of articles, for the reason that most of the main points raised in the discussion are brought forward in this series.

We now pass to the second series of articles, and enter on our notice of Dr. Watts's first series. These articles are shorter than those of Dr. Northrup, but they are clear, concise, and of no uncertain sound. At the outset, Dr. Watts points out that Dr. Northrup's proposed modification of the consistent Calvinistic doctrine of the sovereignty of God amounts to neither more nor less than an attack upon Calvinism such as an Arminian would make. With good reason the position is taken by Dr. Watts, that nearly every criticism which Dr. Northrup makes involves the principles of Arminianism. In regard to unconditional election, in regard to the perdition of the non-elect, and universal offer of the gospel, and in regard to infant salvation, we are satisfied that the general charge made by Dr. Watts can easily be sustained. There is, in fact, no middle ground to take.

In the second article Dr. Watts turns the tables on his antagonist, and shows that the proposed toning down of Calvinism involves us in much more serious difficulties than consistent Calvinism. Dr. Watts shows from Scripture, and from Christian experience, that this is the case. In a most effective manner he also shows that the modifications proposed by Dr. Northrup logically lead to a denial of the divine omniscience. Moreover, it is made evident at this point also that he has willingly or unwillingly passed over to the ranks of the Arminians.

The third article of this series argues that the denial of the divine sovereignty in the strict sense leads to fatalism. If God does not foreordain whatsoever comes to pass, events may be determined by blind mechanical fate. Even those experiences pertaining to the experience of salvation may become a matter of fate. The guarantee eventually of man's true free-agency is the sovereignty of God. The closing pages of this article are very fine.

In the fourth article Dr. Watts vindicates the federal relationship of Adam, and with this weapon in his hand he lays bare the radical defects of Dr. Northrup's views. He shows that Dr. Northrup has no solution that is better than that of the Arminian of the problem. Why it is that men are children of wrath prior to the stage when personal moral responsibility is reached. If the federal relation be denied, only the personal relation remains, and men are born in depravity without any basis of guilt to ground it. Each man's probation is then under such disabilities as render it certain that when personal responsibility is reached he will inevitably fall under actual transgression. Dr. Watts further points out that experience is against Dr. Northrup's views, for there is no consciousness of personal guilt prior to the fact of depravity, so that once more Dr. Northrup is shown not only to be on Arminian ground, but to take a position which involves the Pelagian principle that responsibility is limited by ability. The criticism of Dr. Watts is exceedingly acute and effective at this point.

The fifth article deals with the federal headship of Christ, and shows the bearing of Dr. Northrup's views upon this important doctrine. Dr. Watts undertakes to show that Dr. Northrup takes entirely too narrow a view of the one act of righteousness which supplies the ground of the believer's justification.

The sixth article discusses plenary ability. Dr. Watts here points out that the theory he criticises is not according to the facts. Dr. Northrup had stated

that every man by the gracious touch of the Word and Spirit has plenary ability to repent and believe. In various respects Dr. Watts shows that this view is not justified by the facts in the case. If, as in the case of the heathen, there is no knowledge of the gospel, what about their plenary ability? And as regenerating grace comes only to those who strive to use this plenary ability, how about those who never possess the conditions which provide this plenary ability? This article is strong and unanswerable, in our judgment.

The seventh article is the last of Dr. Watts's first series. In it Dr. Watts charges Dr. Northrup with unscientific procedure, inasmuch as he simply lodges objections against consistent Calvinism, but does not examine the basis on which it rests, and the proof by which it is supported. On pages 60-61 Dr. Watts gives an outline of the main points involved in the scheme he defends, which is very complete and entirely scriptural. There is much force in what Dr. Watts here adduces.

With the eighth article in this series the rejoinder of Dr. Northrup begins. He first rehearses the main positions of his previous articles, and next accuses Dr. Watts of making "half a dozen palpable and inexcusable misrepresentations." He especially repels the charge that his doctrine is Arminian in its principles and tendencies. But in addition he instances quite a list of additional details of misrepresentations, such as the following: the relation between faith and regeneration, the divine decree and fatalism, the sovereignty of God in redemption, the view of the divine nature as to benevolence and holiness, the atonement, and the gratuitous nature of salvation. This is rather a formidable category, and in our judgment many of the accusations are far-fetched. Moreover, Dr. Northrup does not treat of the positive aspects of the debate as fully as he should have done to make anything like a sufficient reply to the articles of Dr. Watts. This article concludes with an exposition of the ninth of Romans, which greatly confirms the charge of Arminianism against Dr. Northrup's views. To us the exegesis of this difficult chapter is far from adequate.

In the ninth article of this series Dr. Watts begins his reply. With a keen thrust at the difficulty which writers of a certain type have in making themselves clearly understood, he deals with the charges of palpable misrepresentation. At almost every turn he wards off the charge, and exhibits some additional features of Arminian complexion in the views of Dr. Northrup. He defends Dr. Cunningham from the use made of his writings by Dr. Northrup, and shows that Dr. Cunningham taught the opposite of what Dr. Northrup states.

In a most effective way Dr. Watts shows that no middle theory can be successfully constructed and defended. He concludes by pointing out that if God be a being of infinite ethical perfection, in other words, a God of holiness and love, the difficulty is to see how it comes to pass that, if provision has actually been made for all in the same sense and with the same intention, in Christ, all are not actually saved.

In four additional articles of great ability Dr. Watts pursues his critique of Dr. Northrup's views, and presents the defences of strict Calvinism in a manner that really leaves nothing to be desired in the way of discussion. The views of universal grace, of plenary ability, of the federal headship of Adam, of the divine foreknowledge, of the moral possibility of the salvation of the non-elect, presented by

Dr. Northrup, are dealt with in a most thorough manner. At every turn we find Dr. Watts defending strictly Calvinistic doctrine, and warding off the objections raised by Dr. Northrup. Nothing more need here be said than that Dr. Watts without hesitation undertakes the vindication of consistent Calvinism in every case, and shows no sympathy with the attempt to render the doctrines more acceptable by toning them down in various ways.

The third part of the treatise contains Dr. Northrup's second rejoinder, which consists of a single article of over sixty pages. In this much of the same ground is covered as in the articles already noticed, so that no further extended notice is necessary. The main feature of this part of the discussion is an attack upon the federal status of Adam, in which Dr. Northrup, in our judgment, exposes his doctrine is open to more severe criticism than anywhere else.

What has already been said may supply our readers with some general idea of the scope and nature of the debate under review. At the same time the whole discussion should be carefully read to obtain a clear grasp of all the details of the vigorous debate. We conclude with a few inferences which occur to us :

First, It is worth while noting the fact that this is a discussion between two professed adherents of the Calvinistic system of doctrine. Dr. Watts represents the strict, and Dr. Northrup the moderate, Calvinists. In the latter we have a representative of that type of so-called Calvinism that is anxious to modify the doctrine in several respects, and revise those doctrinal standards in which strict Calvinism is stated. In many respects the attempt of Dr. Northrup is marked by ability and an earnest purpose. Still, after reading the critique of Dr. Watts, the failure of the attempt is evident to our mind.

Secondly, The perusal of this discussion has more than ever convinced us of the utter futility of any attempt to state a middle view between the basal principles of Calvinism and Arminianism. God either is absolute sovereign or he is not. He either grounds election in his good pleasure or he does not. He either provides for the assured salvation in Christ of the elect or he does not. Calvinism takes one alternative, and any views which imply the other alternative are essentially Arminian. The practical force of this in relation to the attempt recently made to revise the Confession of Faith is evident. It is far easier to defend strict Calvinism than it is to even state, much less defend, those proposed modifications of it which are not true to Scripture, nor in harmony with religious experience.

Thirdly, We are fully convinced that Dr. Watts has good reason for asserting that Dr. Northrup's fundamental position is really Arminian. When Dr. Northrup takes the position that the ethical perfections of God require us to hold that there must be *something*, he does not say what, in the elect which is the condition foreseen upon which their choice rests, then the condition is transferred from the sphere of the divine to that of the human. It is no longer the good pleasure of God, but something in man, which, after all, conditions the choice. This may be refined Arminianism, but it is Arminianism. So, again, if all men receive common grace which endows them with plenary ability, and if men by the struggle to use this grace procure their regeneration, then, again, the ground of regenerating grace is found on man's side. This, again, is at least half-way to Arminianism. So with the other points at issue in this debate. And even if Dr. Northrup should admit that the *something* in the elect which grounds their election has been put

there by God, the question would then be, What grounds the divine purpose to place this in some and not in other men? This places us at once on an infinite regress, in which there is no resting-place till we rest in the good pleasure of God. This, however, is simply the view taken by strict Calvinism.

Fourthly, We are glad that Dr. Watts has presented the federal idea or principle so fully in his critique. Though beset with difficulties, we are convinced that the federal principle is the key which best solves the mysterious problem of human guilt and depravity, and the problem of the redemption which the elect secure in Christ Jesus. Scripture, reason, and Christian experience, we believe, confirm this position.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville.

VAUGHAN'S "GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT."

THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT TO BELIEVERS AND UNBELIEVERS. *By C. R. Vaughan, D. D.*, of the Synod of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1894. Pp. 415.

This excellent treatise is from the pen of the present teacher of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary, Virginia, and it is dedicated to Rev. Dr. Dabney, for many years teacher of Theology in the same institution. In a well-written *Preface* the origin and purpose of the book is explained. The object is practical rather than speculative. The purpose it is intended to serve is the development of Christian experience rather than a formal statement of Christian doctrine. And yet all through the treatise there are found clear and important statements of the great doctrines which stand related to Christian experience. The statement and application of these doctrines is made by our author in order to the increase of Christian comfort among the servants of Christ by means of the glad tidings of great joy.

As the title indicates, the theme of the treatise is *The Gifts of the Holy Spirit*. The scope of the discussion, however, is really wider than this title may at first suggest to the reader. It is really a treatise on the whole inward or subjective side of religion, as will appear more fully later on in this notice. Very naturally the treatment of the subject falls under two main heads: First, The Gifts of the Holy Spirit to *unbelievers*; and secondly, The Gifts of the Holy Spirit to *believers*. The whole discussion thus falls into two almost equal parts. In both, the vital doctrines which relate to Christian experience in its various stages are handled in a manner which reveals alike a clear grasp of the doctrines and a deep insight into Christian experience. Perhaps we can do our readers no better service, and accord our author no fairer treatment, than to present a brief outline of the discussion, only adding a few comments as we proceed in company with him along the path he has so well marked out.

THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT TO UNBELIEVERS.

In this part of the book there are nine chapters. These may now to be passed briefly under review. They deal with various phases of the Spirit's work in the human soul until regeneration is effected.

Chapter I. treats of the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit on human depravity, and of his moulding effect on the moral nature of man. After explaining in general the nature of this restraining influence, our author mentions some