

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 1.—JULY, 1887.

I. BERKELEY'S IDEALISM.

A splendid edition of Bishop Berkeley's works was issued, in 1871, by Professor Alexander Campbell Fraser, the incumbent of the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh—the chair once illuminated by the genius of the illustrious Sir William Hamilton. The elaborate dissertations in which the accomplished Editor expounds the Bishop's idealistic system, and the fact that they have emanated from one who has succeeded the great exponent and defender of Natural Realism, have had the effect of calling attention afresh to the principles of Berkeley's philosophy. In proceeding to discuss them we deem it important to furnish a brief preliminary statement of the main features of Berkeley's system :

1. The Denial of Abstract Ideas.
2. The Denial of the Existence of Matter as Substance. There is no such thing as material substance.
3. The Denial of even the Phenomenal Existence of Matter, separate from and independent of spirit: denial of Natural Realism. Material things have no reality in themselves. Whatever reality or *casuality* material things possess, is dependent and relative.
4. *Esse est percipi*: the so-called material world depends for existence upon the perception of spirit. A thing exists only as it is sensibly perceived.

Spirit, and in their prayer ask God to enable them in casting their votes to do His holy will, and if he should then allow a sufficient interval before the election, for this importunate secret prayer, warning the people not to "confer with flesh and blood" in the meantime, but to consult God only; and if when they come together for the purpose of voting, he should lead them again in prayer as a congregation, that God would guide them by His Holy Spirit to choose men whom He is calling, and then without any nominations whatever, the people should prayerfully cast a silent ballot, then the result might be fairly interpreted as an indication of God's will in the premises. Then, if those elected were allowed time to examine their own hearts, and also to ask God by earnest prayer to enable them to do His will, and should then find in their hearts a corresponding call, it might be fairly inferred that these men were *called of God's Holy Spirit* to bear rule or do service in His House. There being no human methods or agencies introduced, it would be plain to all that the result was the will of God.

If this simple committing of the Church to the sole guidance of God's Holy Spirit in the choosing of officers were the general method in our Church, we would have a far different and more encouraging record to make, and our Church would acquire a vigor, a spirituality and a progressive and aggressive power which she has not known for many years.

ROGER MARTIN.

IV. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BASIS OF CHURCH UNITY.

The readers of this Review are familiar with the basis of Church Unity, set forth by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at the meeting of the General Convention in Chicago, in October last. It is not my purpose to discuss at any length the feasibility of such Church Unity as is proposed, or the adaptation of the Creed propounded by the Bishops to the end they have in view. I have it in mind rather to place this proposition in its relations to the general tendencies of the times, and the teachings of the Holy Scriptures in the matter of Church Unity. Observant Christian men will agree with me in the affirmation that the idea of Church Union is among the conspicuous and influential forces that control the Christian world of to-day. All signs

indicate that its power and prominence are increasing, and it promises to become for some years the dominant principle in shaping the history of the Kingdom of Christ. In this respect as in many others, the development of the Church is kindred to that of Society and the State. However distinct from the State the Church may be, and of right ought to be, yet inasmuch as the elements constituting the two are so largely identical, and the controlling conditions so nearly the same, it is found that the prevailing tendencies in the one at any given period exert great influence upon the character of the other. Social, political, and governmental ideas intertwine with ecclesiastical, and all combine to give tone and color to the history of an Epoch. A notable proof of this statement is passing under our eyes in ecclesiastical government. The characteristic democracy of our era in social and political life is modifying the Prelatic system and methods of the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal Churches, and a degree of power and control asserted by the laity that threaten to nullify the whole theory of Prelacy. The general statement I have made is justified, also, in the disposition that obtains so widely toward some outward, if not organic, union of Christendom. In the political world, this century is eminently characterized by a movement towards consolidation and centralization. Illustrations occur to my readers as I write. Your memory recalls the dream of centuries fulfilled by the genius of Bismarck in the achievement of the German Empire. Then comes the recollection of the Union of Austria and Hungary, and the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy. Then strikes upon the ear the tramp of the Slavonic hordes, as with Russia at their head, they march to the attainment of the mightiest of modern Empires. And the American of this generation has witnessed a gigantic struggle of States to rend the bonds that united them to their sister States, and has seen the seceding States forced back into an indissoluble Union. This principle, so potent in building up and binding together Kingdoms and Empires and Republics, asserts for itself a wider dominion, and by means of International Codes of law and Courts of Arbitration is endeavoring on this broader field to bring into union and co-operation independent States. When we pass into the ecclesiastical sphere, we find the air charged with very much the same influence, we discover the operation of the same force. My readers readily recur to the union of the Old School and New

School Presbyterians, North and South; the union of all Presbyterians in Canada; on a larger scale, the formation of the Pan-Presbyterian Council and similar organizations among Methodists and Episcopalians; and more inclusive than any of these, the Evangelical Alliance. None can fail to see that the same tendency is at work in the efforts now making to unite Northern and Southern Presbyterians, and United Presbyterians and Associate Reformed, as well as other movements among different bodies of Christians, both in this country and abroad.

As the Missionary work in foreign lands grows in extent and success, the necessity for closer union among native Christians becomes imperative, and in Brazil, Japan and other countries, much is already accomplished, and more is contemplated, toward obliterating lines of division that exist in Christendom, and uniting all Evangelical Christians in one organization. Without multiplying illustrations, or stopping to discuss facts apparently antagonistic to my assertion, I venture to think that no one will dispute the statement that the idea of Church Union is a potent factor in current thought and life. The brief review of familiar events I have made makes it clear that, though there may be eddies in the current, the stream sets strongly in the direction of consolidation and union, throughout Evangelical Christendom. This obvious fact springs upon the Christian and the Church questions that are worthy of profound and prayerful consideration. Is this tendency to be held good or evil? Is its origin divine or human? Is its in sympathy with the spirit of our Lord and in harmony with His instructions and the principles of His Kingdom? Shall we foster and guide, or shall we discourage and repress? Regarding the tendency in the general, I believe it to be the fruit of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christian people. No devout student can doubt that the desire for the real unity of His disciples pervades the life and teachings of our Saviour, and penetrates His most ardent longings for them and for His own glory in them. To think lightly or to speak flippantly of any honest effort to carry into effect this supreme wish of our Lord, is to run grave risk of wounding the Master in the house of His friends.

While, therefore, I believe the temper of our times, has to a large extent, absorbed the spirit of Christ, and while I honor and welcome any sincere effort to further the union of God's people, it

must not be supposed that I am committed to the position that the tendency is wholly good, and that the methods of Church union that are proposed meet my approval. It is greatly to be feared that many have a false conception of Christian Unity, and that many Protestants have gone over, it may be unwittingly, to the Romish theory on this subject. It is of the utmost importance that it be seen that true unity, the unity for which our Lord prayed, is a spiritual unity. It is grounded in a participation of the life of Christ. It is visible, but it is visible most of all in the graces that are the product of this life. Unity of this kind, based on community of life, rendered visible to the world by a common character, resembling that of Christ, has power to convince man that a new principle, transforming and assimilating, resident in Jesus Christ, has entered into human history. Apart from this spiritual unity, identity of creed, ritual, and government has nothing in common with Christ's idea of the unity of His followers.

It does not concern me to deny that the ideal of the Church is found in this spiritual unity, underlying and penetrating outward and mechanical unity in creed and worship and order. My contention is that the spiritual unity is primary, the ecclesiastical secondary. The Romish doctrine makes that first which is last, and has thereby destroyed, as far as in her lies, the real unity of Christians. It is of vital moment to ascertain how far this tendency towards the union of Christ's disciples is vitiated by this false doctrine of Rome. I cannot enter upon this question, but record my apprehension that there is grave reason to believe that the Romish doctrine has attached itself to the movement. In support of this opinion, I content myself with remarking that it is principally the exclusive and High-Churchly element in the Protestant Episcopal Church that is active and prominent in efforts to achieve "Church Unity." It is well-known that their doctrine of the Church is, to all intents and purposes, that of the Church of Rome.

In the light of these general remarks on the prevailing disposition towards Church Union and the good and evil there may be in his tendency, I submit the proposition of the House of Bishops:

"As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and, therefore, as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to-wit:

I. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.

II. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

III. The two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

Upon this proposition I offer but few comments, feeling confident that if what I have already said be true and just, the attentive reader can easily form his own judgment. The kindly spirit that prompts this proffer to the Christians of America should not fail of recognition. The present writer does not sympathize with the disposition some have shown to treat the Bishops and their efforts with ridicule or indifference. Every movement that has in it any promise of bringing Christians more closely together, and leading them to discover and to exalt their points of agreement above their points of difference, should meet with encouragement. It is to be hoped, therefore, that all the Churches will appoint Committees of Conference. While I have no idea that much can be done at present to advance the kind of union in contemplation, yet such a conference may lead to other important results.

I venture to add that the fourth proposition of the Bishops seems fatal to the whole scheme. If I understand it correctly, it sets up the claim that the Diocesan Episcopacy, with Apostolic Succession, is an essential element of the Church, and a necessary plank in the platform on which we are all invited to stand. The insertion of this plank appears not only to render impossible the desired Church Union, but to indicate the influence the High Church party had in the manufacture of the Basis of Union.

At any rate, the logical result of this fourth article is to require all such Churches as the Presbyterian and Congregational to deny the validity of their ordination, and all ministers in these churches to receive ordination, at the hands of Diocesan Bishops. All this makes on the mind of the present writer the impression that the Bishops are strongly tainted with the Romish doctrine of the Church and Church Unity, and, however kindly intended, the effect of agreement on this basis would simply be the absorption of all other Churches in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Conference may lead to a withdrawal of this article.

Meanwhile, let all recognize the true spiritual unity that already exists: let every Christian exalt its importance, emphasize its reality, and increase its power. In this way we shall best answer our Lord's petition and haste the consummation of the ages. In this way we shall most truly advance any outward union that may be either possible or desirable.

C. R. HEMPHILL.

V. THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE PROHIBITION MOVEMENT.

Intemperance in drink is a great evil. To be convinced of this fact, we have only to look at the many families misery-stricken, homes desolated, hearts broken, individuals ruined in body and soul, crimes committed, poverty entailed, and the millions of money wasted, all through intemperance in the use of intoxicating drinks. It is also a prevalent evil; indeed, it has been on the increase for several decades, and still is, with a few local exceptions. It is reliably stated that not less than one hundred thousand persons die yearly in the United States from the effects of strong drink alone. This is appalling. It is not strange that all humane persons should rise in determined opposition to this evil. They are impelled thereto by sentiments of patriotism, humanity and religion. The methods of opposition have been various; scores of Temperance Societies have arisen; Local Option, High License, Scientific Temperance Instruction, and various other means have been tried, with a degree of success not altogether encouraging to the friends of temperance.