

THE  
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. IX.—SEPTEMBER, 1879.

ARE WE DRIFTING?

THE answers are manifold. Scientific and sophistic, gnostic and agnostic, sceptical and scriptural—they become confused and confusing. By every motive which concerns public and personal welfare we are challenged to discriminate sharply, to ascertain which of all is authorised and trustworthy. If we are to abandon our moorings and drift, or if the bonds are already snapped, it is high time to know it and prepare for the worst. If, on the other hand, we are advancing, we should take our bearings, and reassure ourselves of the direction and the guidance.

If this question were addressed to the Church, the answer would perhaps be ready. As Presbyterians, we might promptly reply,—Never was our Church more loyal to her standards, more settled in Christian principles and polity and purpose, more intolerant of essential error, more tolerant of essential truth. But the question has a wider range. It is not merely whether our Church is true to her standards, but whether the foundations themselves are destroyed by the swirl of progress or regress, and clinging Church and toppling standards and conservative government and social organisation and public morality are all dislodged and afloat. In the light of revelation, the course is clear—never clearer than now. In common with the Church of the living God, evermore we hold the Christian faith not as old or new, but as vital and veritable, centering in Christ—the personal, historic Christ—as the Messiah predicted, and so Divinely attested; in whose perfect merit, we see the way of salvation; in whose perfect teaching, we have the truth; in whose perfect person and character, we have at once the life and the supreme model of moral excellence; in a word, the Christ of whom the Scriptures testify as the way, the truth, and the life.

Throughout the Revelation there runs the gracious doctrine of redemption, like the keynote in music giving tone to the entire chord, and blending all into harmony. Redemption from sin, originated not

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

loudly called. Let them leave their intestine feuds, and set themselves with all their heart and soul and strength and mind to the great, but, by God's blessing, not insoluble problem of the Christianisation of the people of India, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. So shall the blessing come back upon themselves in a power and freshness and life that no mere doctrinal discussions or abstract debates can ever give.

JAS. S. CANDLISH.

---

### THEOLOGIANS OF THE DAY—JOSEPH COOK.

IN the course of a tour in the United States, in the summer of 1866, when I was a professor in Queen's College, Belfast, I paid a visit to the famous Theological Seminary at Andover. The professors told me that there was a young man in their institution anxious to see me, and politely apologised for troubling me with such request. I answered that I spent a large portion of my life in intercourse with young men, and asked them at once to introduce me to him. I found that he was pondering in an intelligent and earnest manner the deepest problems in philosophy, and the living questions of the day; and I left him with the conviction which I expressed to several persons, that with the exception of their great man Dr. Park, I had not met at that graduation season at Andover, where the ablest of the Congregational body do congregate, a more noteworthy man than this stalwart youth. For years I did not hear more of him. I had forgotten his name, and could not inquire about him. It was not till I had been settled for some time in America, that on the then famous lecturer coming into my house in Princeton, I found that this was the very youth, now grown to manhood, I had conversed with on profound subjects in Andover. What influence I may have had on Mr. Cook I do not know, but I am pleased to notice that on intuition and several other subjects, he is promulgating to thousands the same views I had been thinking out in my study, and propounding to my students, in Belfast and in Princeton.

From scattered notices, I gather that he was born (in 1838), and reared and still lives, in his leisure days, in that region in which the loveliest of American lakes, Lake Champlain and Lake George, lie embosomed among magnificent mountains. He was trained for college at Phillips' Academy, Andover, under the great classical teacher Dr. Taylor; was two years at Yale College, and two years at Harvard, graduating at the latter in 1865, first in philosophy and rhetoric of his class. He then joined Andover Theological Seminary, went through the regular three years' course there, and lingered a year longer at that place, pondering deeply the relations of science and religion, which continued to be the theme of his thoughts and his study for the next ten

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

years. At this stage he received much impulse from Professor Park, who requires every student to reason out, and to defend his opinions; and many sound philosophic principles from Sir William Hamilton and other less eminent men of the Scottish school. He spoke from time to time at religious meetings, and was for one year the pastor of a Congregational Church, but never sought a settlement. In September, 1871, he went abroad, and studied for two years, under special directions from Tholuck, at Halle, Berlin, and Heidelberg; and received a mighty influence from Julius Müller of Halle, Dorner of Berlin, Kum Fischer of Heidelberg, and Hermann Lotze of Göttingen. He then travelled for a time in Italy, Egypt, Syria, Greece, Turkey, Switzerland, France, England, and Scotland. Returning to the United States in 1873, he took up his residence in Boston, and became a lecturer in New England on the subject to which his studies had been so long directed, the relations of religion and science. For a time he lectured at Amherst College, and while doing so, he was invited to conduct noon meetings in Boston. I mention these incidents to show that Mr. Cook did not take up the work which he has accomplished as a trade, or by accident, or from impulse; but that for years he had been preparing for it, and prepared for it, by an overruling guidance.

I regard Joseph Cook as a heaven-ordained man. He comes at the fit time—that is, at the time he is needed. He starts in the appropriate place—that is, in New England, where both truth and error are more keenly discussed than in any other part of the United States, or perhaps in any other country in the world. All the people read newspapers, in the cities a daily newspaper; the more intelligent have a favourite magazine, and they are ready to discuss all popular questions, political and theological. Every town, almost every village, has its course of lectures in the winter; these are often mere vapid rhetoric, but still they start topics for talk if not for thought.\* More important still, he comes forth in Boston, which is undoubtedly the most literary city in America, and one of the great literary cities of the world. I am not sure that even Edinburgh can match it, now that London is drawing towards it and gathering up the intellectual youth of Scotland. It has a character of its own in several respects. I have here to speak only of its religious character. Half-a-century ago its orthodoxy had sunk into Unitarianism—a reaction against a formal Puritanism—led by Channing, who adorned his bald system by his high personal character and the

\* I had occasion, not long ago, to address a body of State teachers at a convention in New England. I had seated myself on the platform ready to speak, when a teacher came up to me, and said, "Let us settle the question of free-will and predestination." I told him that we would have to settle this question at a future time; and, in case we should never meet again on earth, I took him engaged to meet me in heaven, where we would see things in a clearer light. Immediately on this gentleman leaving, another teacher came up, and desired to know what I thought of annihilation being the punishment of the wicked. At this instant the chairman called on me to begin my address, and we lost the opportunity of discussing and deciding the questions.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

eloquence of his style. People could not long be satisfied by a negation, and Parkerism followed; and a convulsive life was thrown into the skeleton of natural religion by an *a priori* speculation, derived from the pretentious philosophies of Germany, in which the Absolute took the place of God, and untested intuition the place of the Bible. The movement culminated in Ralph Waldo Emerson, a feeble, but a more lovable Thomas Carlyle—the one coming out of a decaying Puritanism, the other out of a decaying Covenantalism. But those who would mount to heaven in a balloon have sooner or later to come down to earth. The young men of Harvard College, led by their able president, have more taste for the new physical science, with its developments, than for a visionary metaphysics. As I remarked some time ago in a literary organ, Unitarianism has died, and is laid out for decent burial. Meanwhile there is a marked revival of Evangelism, and the Congregational and Episcopal churches have as much thoughtfulness and culture as the Unitarians. Harvard now cares as little for Unitarianism as it does for Evangelism—simply taking care that orthodoxy does not rule over its teaching. But the question arises, What are our young men to believe in these days when Darwinism, and Spencerism, and evolutionism are taught in our journals, in our schools, and in our colleges? To my knowledge this question is as anxiously put by Unitarian parents of the old school, who cling firmly to the great truths of natural religion, and to the Bible as a teacher of morality, as it is by the orthodox.

Such was the state of thought and feeling, of belief and unbelief, of apprehension and of desire, when Joseph Cook came to Boston without any flourish of trumpets preceding him. Numbers were prepared to welcome him as soon as they knew what the man was, and what he was aiming at. Orthodox ministers, not very well able themselves to wrestle with the new forms of infidelity, rejoiced in the appearance of one who had as much power of eloquence as Parker, and vastly more acquaintance with philosophy than the mystic Emerson, and who seemed to know what truth and what error there are in these doctrines of development and heredity. The best of the Unitarians, not knowing whither their sons were drifting, were pleased to find one who could keep them from open infidelity. Young men, tired of old rationalism, which they saw to be very irrational, delighted to listen to one who evidently spoke boldly and sincerely, and could talk to them of these theories about evolution and the origin of species and the nature of man. The consequence was, his audiences increased from year to year. He first lectured in the Meinaon in 1875. The attendance at noon on Mondays was so large that his meetings had to be transferred to Park Street Church on October, 1876; and finally, in 1876-7, in 1877-8 and 1879, to the enormous Tremont Temple, which is often crowded to excess. In the audience there were at times 200 ministers, many teachers, and other educated persons. His lectures, in whole or in abstract, appeared in leading newspapers, and his fame spread over all America; and, continuing his

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Monday addresses in Boston, he was invited, on the other days of the week, to lecture all over the country. He now lectures in the principal cities, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, receiving from \$150 to \$200 a lecture, and always drawing a large and approving audience. In a number of American cities, especially in the Middle States and in the west, there are little knots of infidels, some of them very noisy, and Joseph Cook is found to be the man to meet them and counteract their influence. Several of the secular, and a few even of the religious newspapers, have ridiculed him, and tried to put him down; but this has only made him more known, and increased his audience, who find him to be a true and genuine man. Some scientific sciolists have thrown out doubts as to the accuracy of his knowledge, but have not been able to detect him in any misstatement of fact; and as to his theories, they are at least as good as theirs, and for defence he is able to fall back on Lotze, who holds so high a place in Germany. None of his detractors will be able to put him down, and he has too much good sense and principle to allow himself to be tempted into sensationalism, the rock on which so many American speakers have struck.

Whatever people may say to the contrary, Joseph Cook is an original man. He may have got some of his impulse from Dr. Park, but he follows, certainly he copies, no one. I have to add that no sensible man will make a fool of himself by trying to copy one who has a way of his own. He is a unity throughout—body, soul, and mind all act together to produce the effect. He has none of the small rhetorical mannerism so cultivated in American colleges, and which has kept so much of American eloquence from being natural; a mannerism which consists of a few formal attitudes supposed to be suited to the subject—as the pointing upward when a mountain is named, and downward when a vale is referred to; of an intonation derived from the teacher, and the same for the whole class or college; and a select set of exclamations which impress the hearers with the irresistible conviction that there is no earnestness in the speaker. Professor Cook throws himself entirely into his subject. His bodily frame evidently takes a part, and moves in accordance with his theme. One of his lectures which I have had the pleasure of hearing consists in a dialogue between man and his conscience. We see that the speaker is absorbed in the discussion; we are constrained to listen, and we become intensely interested as we do so. In others he lightens and thunders, throwing a vivid light on the topic by an expression or comparison, or striking a presumptuous error as by a bolt from heaven. He is not afraid to discuss the most abstract, scientific, or philosophic themes before a popular audience; he arrests his hearers first by his earnestness, then by the clearness of his exposition, and fixes the whole in the mind by the earnestness of his moral purpose.

The prelude with which Professor Cook introduces his lectures is a happy device, as it relieves a hard subject, and gives him an opportunity

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

of rebuking evils as they spring up, and of guiding public sentiment, much as journalists do. His lectures, however, will be his permanent means of usefulness. I have before me five goodly volumes of these. It is needless to give a summary of works that are so clearly written, and so accessible to all. I close this imperfect article by offering a very few critical remarks on the positions he takes up. I notice the volumes, not in their historical, but rather in their logical order.

I. The volume on TRANSCENDENTALISM. Professor Cook, like Socrates, insists much on definitions and tests of truth, and would thus correct much of the error of the day which arises greatly from ambiguity of language and confusion of thought. He uses Intuition, Instinct, Experiment, and Syllogism as tests of truth. He gives an admirable account of Intuition. I have long been insisting that the tests of intuition are not primarily, as Kant and most metaphysicians maintain, necessity and universality. The primary mark of intuition is self-evidence, and this is followed by necessity and universality. We know that two straight lines cannot enclose a space, not because we are compelled to do so, or because all men do so, or because of forms in the mind; but because we at once perceive it to be so from the nature of straight lines. We are glad to find Mr. Cook following this order. I venture to suggest that he would add to the cogency of his statement if he would announce clearly that a truth is perceived intuitively *by looking at the nature of the things*. He would thus separate himself thoroughly from those *a priori* forms which Kant imposes on phenomena, and which carry us away from realities.

II. The volume on ORTHODOXY. In this volume, as in the preceding, he founds morality on intuition, shows that intuition convicts men of guilt, and demonstrates very satisfactorily the need of an atonement. He proves from the intimations of our nature that God must condemn and punish sin, and corrects the common misapprehensions of the nature of the atonement, showing that it does not imply that Jesus Christ is reckoned as guilty, but merely that he suffers in our room and stead. In the volume before us he thoroughly exposes the theology of Theodore Parker. Before the attack of Mr. Cook, Mr. Parker's influence was waning, now it is thoroughly gone. I believe we shall soon be able to say the same of Mr. Emerson, who, however, is always treated lovingly by our lecturer, and whose poetry in prose will live long after his mystic opinions—if they can in their undefined form be called opinions—have ceased to sway the thoughts of men, young or old.

III. The volume on BIOLOGY. Here he has the wisdom to oppose, not evolution—which is a truth both of nature and revelation—but materialistic evolution. He takes advantage of the concessions of evolutionists, and exposes their inconsistencies with considerable dexterity; and shows conclusively that they are not warranted in deriving life from inanimate matter, or the soul from body. I am not sure, however, whether he has not imposed too rigid a limit upon the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

potency of matter. It is true that all matter has inertia, that it cannot move of itself, while the oldest definition of the mind is, that it is self-moving. But surely matter has some powers or properties. I have been labouring in my published works to show that while matter is so far passive, that it does not act of itself; it is also so far active that matter acts on matter, molecule on molecule, and mass on mass. All that is required of the spiritualists is to show that the properties of mind, such as thought and volition, are entirely different from those of matter, such as extension and resistance.

As to life, I think it wiser in the present state of science not to dogmatise as to its nature. No definition has yet been given of it fitted to stand a sifting examination. It is certain that all attempts to produce a living being from inanimate matter have failed. But it has not been scientifically settled whether life is a separate principle or the product of a wondrous adjustment of chemical and mechanical forces. I do not believe that religion has much interest in the settlement of this question one way or other. I am inclined to say much the same of spontaneous generation; even if it were established, religion would not thereby be undermined; for there might be numerous adaptations implying design in the concurrence of causes producing life.

I feel constrained to state that, while Lotze is a great name both in philosophy and in physiology, I am not inclined to set so great value on his special theories as our lecturer does. Some of them have been reviewed by competent critics, and have not been verified by the latest science. I have to add, that I set no value on the theory which Mr. Cook states—though I am not sure that he adopts it—about there being some non-atomic enswathment of the soul. I rather think that he has not benefited his argument by introducing it and attaching such importance to it.

IV. The volume on HEREDITY. Our lecturer has given a very good summary of what has been ascertained on this subject. He has an acute criticism of the theory of pangenesis, which Darwin introduces to bolster up his system where he felt it to be weak. What is the new pangenesis but the old life? The mystery of heredity has not yet been cleared up. All that we know is that there are certain empirical laws, which, in the end, will have to be resolved into higher laws. Meanwhile, we are greatly indebted to Professor Cook for restraining sciolists from turning the little that is known to an improper use. In his lectures, both on biology and heredity, he shows his good sense in falling back on the accurate researches and judicious statements of Professor Beale.

V. His lecture on CONSCIENCE is a very valuable one. It contains much sound argument, but it by no means exhausts the subject or meets all the objections started in the present day. Our higher moralists, following Butler, have for the last century and a-half been appealing to conscience as a simple and unresolvable power with unquestionable authority from which there can be no appeal. In opposition, attempts

have been made since the days of Hume to account for the genesis of conscience by the association of ideas. These have now been abandoned. I have taken my share in the discussions which have led to this result. The attempt now is to account for our moral ideas by heredity. This is the grand speculative question in ethics—indeed, in philosophy generally—at this present moment. Herbert Spencer has taken it up, and is constructing a theory which those who defend the old morality must proceed to take up. I trust that Professor Cook will be spared to take part in this conflict, involving, as it does, most momentous consequences, both speculative and practical.

JAMES M'COSH.

---

## THE LATE LORD LAWRENCE, VICEROY OF INDIA.

WHEN suddenly, and to the sorrow of the whole Empire, the chilly damp of the past summer struck down the British Peer who was best known as John Lawrence of the Punjab, two men gave voice to the opinion of his country on his career. The Anglican dignitary who had invited the family to lay the honoured remains in Westminster Abbey, declared, as he stood near the grave's mouth, that the Joshua of his country had fallen—"the great Proconsul of our English Christian Empire," who had saved "the India of Clive, of Hastings, and the illustrious statesman Bentinck, the civilisation which is sanctified by the missionary zeal of Martyn, of Duff, and Wilson, by the enlightened wisdom of prelates like Heber and Cotton." And the Nonconformist statesman, Mr. Forster, told the people of the manufacturing and labouring districts, that one of England's greatest men, throughout her history, had passed away. "When our children's children, and the men of our race all the world over, in future times, shall read the wonderful story of our rule in India, there is no man to whose career they will look back with more justifiable pride than to that of Lord Lawrence. . . . You only know of him by repute; it has been my privilege to have had his personal friendship for the last few years."

It has been mine to have watched every step of his progress, since he made the Punjab what it became when he used it to save the whole of India from anarchy and barbarism. It was mine to publicly chronicle and criticise every act of John Lawrence from the day that he took Delhi to the time when we Anglo-Indians welcomed him back as Viceroy and Governor-General, and again speeded him home after five years in the highest office a British subject can fill, next to the Premier's. And since he exchanged the cares of empire for the duties of the philanthropist and the peer in London—coming occasionally to Edinburgh, where, indeed, he discharged almost his last official act—I had learned to know