

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 2.—OCTOBER, 1887.

---

I. SPURIOUS RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENTS.

It is believed all thoughtful Christians are alive to the fact that religious excitements, which consist of temporary movements of the emotions devoid of any saving operation of the Truth on the reason and conscience, are equally frequent and mischievous in America. This judgment not seldom expresses itself in very queer and inaccurate forms. Thus: good brethren write to the religious journals grateful accounts of a work of grace in their charges, and tell the Editor that "they are happy to say, the work has been purely rational and quiet, and attended by not the slightest excitement." They forget that the efficacious (not possibly, tempestuous) movement of the feelings is just as essential a part of a true religious experience, as the illumination of the intellect by divine truth; for indeed, there is no such thing as the implantation of practical principle, or the right decisions of the will, without feeling. In estimating a work of divine grace as genuine, we should rather ask ourselves whether the right feelings are excited; and excited by divine cause. If so, we need not fear the most intense excitement. This misconception is parallel to the one uttered by public speakers, when they assure hearers that, desiring to show them the respect due to rational beings, and to use the honesty suitable to true patriots, "they shall make no appeal to their feelings, but address themselves only to their understandings." This is virtually impossi-

the whole of the additions are probably due,) belongs to the opening of the fourth century.

In stating and controverting the views of others, Dr. Funk combines a fine courtesy with a crispness of utterance which delights while it refutes. There are several points in which he records his disagreement with the published opinions of the present reviewer,—as, for example, in the matters of the genuineness of I. 3—II. 1, the relation of the Latin Version of the *Teaching* to Barnabas, the use of the *Teaching* by the Pseudo-Phocylides, and the relations of the several documents which have used the *Teaching*, to one another. I am not convinced by his arguments, but I cannot complain of his treatment of mine, and only in a single instance are my views erroneously stated, (p. lxvi., note 3.) I have never contended that the Latin text was the source from which Barnabas drew, but only that the Latin represents a Greek text which was the source of both its translation and Barnabas' excerpting. This still seems to me true; while the denial of it appears to me a sad sin against the law of parsimony. I have nothing, however, to urge in its favor, beyond what I have briefly stated in the *Andover Review*, vi. 81-97; and Dr. Funk thinks this insufficient.

Dr. Funk's sobriety leads him into a little overdrawn conservatism at times; but it is a guaranty against wire-drawn theorizing. He could never fall into the trap of a "Jewish Original," for instance; and what he urges against those who have so fallen seems to me judicious and satisfying. On the whole, he has given us one of our most satisfactory editions of the *Teaching*, and his work is one which can be cordially recommended to students.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

#### ATONEMENT AND LAW.

ATONEMENT AND LAW; OR REDEMPTION IN HARMONY WITH LAW AS RECALLED IN NATURE, by *John M. Armour*. Second Edition. Philadelphia: H. B. Garner.

Mr. Armour wrote this book to show "that the Great Redemption was wrought out in perfect accordance with Law as revealed in Nature and Providence." "Redemption," he says, "has been almost universally regarded as the Great Exception." His object is to negative this venerable faith of the Church. He belongs, therefore, to that modern class of writers who cannot see anything in heaven or earth but *natural law*. If by law, he and his school meant that general plan of God upon which he has projected and conformed the universe, then, of course, he would be asserting a mere truism. But by law he means the principle of continuity in Nature—the rules which eternally perpetuate its inviolable order. Now, he affirms that the scheme of Redemption falls under these laws, and is in harmony with this order.

Our author's first confusion arises from a failure to keep clearly before his mind the distinction between Natural and Moral law. He

notes the distinction, but he does not perceive, apparently, its full force. Hence, he can write the explanatory clause on his title-page, "Redemption in harmony with law as revealed in nature." Then again he writes as if he intended to identify the two kinds of law: "This is true of Natural, as well as of Moral law; for they are not separated, they are not separable; they do not merely co-operate, nor is it the whole truth to say that they *become* one—they *are* one in awful onward movement in the universe."

Now natural laws, or the laws of nature, do not, *per se*, impose the slightest moral obligation upon rational creatures. We, as moral agents, are bound to respect them as far as they are known, not because they inherently bind the conscience, but by reason of that moral law which commands the exercise of prudence. It is, for example, the sixth commandment which grounds the sinfulness of violating the laws of health. Hence all Mr. Armour says about conforming the plan of salvation to *natural* law is off the point.

But besides this the two laws—natural and moral—are not one. They are and must be separable. It is ruin to amalgamate them. It is perfectly right to violate one natural law by the use of another for beneficial ends. It is perfectly right to countervail the influence of gravity by sailing in an iron ship, but it would be infamous to violate the law of honesty for charitable ends; and yet, if the two laws are the same in kind, they may, with equal impunity, be treated in the same way.

Again, if the suffering consequent upon a violation of natural law is of the nature of *punishment*, then it is wrong to seek to alleviate such suffering, on the broad principle that it is wrong to attempt the defeat of justice. The absurdities involved, all along the line, in this attempt to identify the rules of morality with mere cosmical arrangements are everywhere palpable.

Mr. Armour joins in the furious tirade of modern progressives against the Miracle. He says: "If the Christian world must at length abandon the long cherished belief that miracles involve the suspension of law, it will be because they will accept the higher faith that, law coming from infinite wisdom, there could be no need for its suspension." "The miracle of Redemption itself, was one which, in its very nature, honored law, in that it, in no respect, interfered with its onward movement." Our author was right when he called Redemption a *miracle*, but he spoilt it all when he described it as a miracle in harmony with law, for, to our view, the very essence of the miracle is that it is *contra-natural*. It is this, or nothing. It is ridiculous to assume that the miracle, while intersecting known natural laws, yet accords with some unknown and supersensible law, for the simple but sufficient reason that of the *unknown* nothing can be affirmed. Trench put an ugly weapon in the hand of the enemy when he signaled this idea.

A genuine miracle "no interference with the onward movement" of "absolute and inviolable law"! An innocent child is playing on the

pavement beneath the walls of the building in the process of erection. Thirty feet above the child, a huge block of granite breaks the gearing by which it is being elevated, and falls back in a line perpendicular to the unconscious child. It is falling by the law of gravitation. Suddenly it stops, suspended by some supernatural power in mid air. Now what has become of the law of gravitation during the moment the stone is balanced by the voice of God? Surely its "onward movement" has been interfered with. It has been checked. Now in accordance with what higher and supersensible law is the plenipotent command of God? Echo answers.

The law of death is, (whatever else may be said,) the law of *immobility*—no corpse can move itself. Now Lazarus is under this law—he has been under it for four days. Without the use of any second agents, by the mighty word of his power, Christ commands the immobile body to come forth from its grave, and it obeys. Now what has become of the law of death? No one can be under the law of death and the law of physical life at one and the same moment: no man can be dead and alive, in a corporeal sense, at one and the same time. Before Christ spake, Lazarus was under the law of death—he was dead. After he spake, he was under the law of life—he was alive. Has there been no interference with the "onward movement" of the law of death? Does it still continue to operate? Is it still in force in some higher and supersensible way? The idea is nonsensical.

The law which thunders terror in the sinner's ear is: "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" The "onward movement" of this law is towards the burning gates of despair, and if nothing interferes with its onward movement it will surely press the guilty soul through the fiery portals. But Mr. Armour says the Atonement of Christ lies across the track of doom, and halts this relentless law. The only intelligent meaning of which is, that the law was suspended, held in abeyance, by the Mediatorial Hand of Christ. Then why, in the name of reason, does he, does any man, object to saying that the law in the case was suspended?

Of course God did not arbitrarily and causelessly suspend the law which denounced death against the guilty. He does not absolutely pardon—that is, he does not forgive without reference to the rules and interests of his moral government. He had an adequate reason for suspending the law of spiritual death. That reason was the full and adequate atonement of Christ, which was a genuine satisfaction to his law in the case. Nevertheless the law, as it was in force against the believer, was suspended, or he could not be saved. To say that it was properly suspended, that it was suspended by being truly and completely satisfied, does not alter the fact.

*The grace of God which bringeth salvation* in the Scriptures stands over in contrast to *the law of God which bringeth condemnation*. Grace is not law, and law is not grace. Redemption, as a scheme, was originated in grace, but was wrought out, not by overslaughing and outraging

the principles of the moral law, but by meeting those principles and satisfying them in the strict rigour and severe exactitude of divine justice. Grace built the Temple of Redemption: Law stood off and admired its grand proportions and proportionate grandeur. Grace called Christ to the office of Mediator: Law became the rule of his obedience. Grace introduces the sinner, contrary to the laws of his spiritual nature, into the covenant of Redemption: Law at once becomes the rule of his life. Grace introduces the principle of substitution into the system: the principle is itself legal in its nature. *To Christ* the salvation of the elect is a matter of justice—of justice springing from those covenant-rules under which he interfered with the “onward movement” of the law of sin and death. *To the believer*, on the other hand, his salvation is a matter of free and unmerited grace. Redemption is not a law-product. The Atonement arrested the law which was bearing down upon the sinner with the burning curse. The curse was deposited on Christ, who graciously interposed himself, but the law was stopped “in its onward movement.” That law can never reach the believer from whom it was turned away by the work of Christ. Its power, in this direction, was forever broken. “We are saved by grace.”

R. A. WEBB.

#### BAPTISM MODE STUDIES.

BAPTISM MODE STUDIES, *by the Rev. Herbert H. Hawes, D. D., Staunton, Va.* Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 1887.

The lovers of sound doctrine and the friends of Dr. Hawes are equally indebted to the author for this little volume. It is a thorough-going and masterly treatise on the mode of Baptism, in good print, and yet it is comprised in a hundred small pages. It was just what was needed, and was called forth by a personal request from the Rev. Moses D. Hoge, of Richmond. There are three especially striking things about this book. One is, that nearly everything that is practically worth much in the larger volumes is to be found here boiled down. Another is its marked individuality—I might go so far as to say, its original presentation of the argument. The third thing is its brevity and popularity. True, there are points in the usual discussion that are not adverted to in these few pages. This was hardly possible in the limited compass the author has allowed himself, without injury to those parts of the argument where the well known Staunton pastor has put out his strength. Besides, it will be seen on mature reflexion that (in most cases at least) an exaggerated importance has been attached by the other writers to such points. Then, too, it will commonly appear that the given point in question, while not taken up professedly, has been to all intents and purposes disposed of in one or more of Dr. Hawes's keen, incisive sentences. The author of this book, if challenged would, himself be one of the first to acknowledge, that scarcely anything really