

S. M. Casey
1871
Berkeley

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.

225038

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD, *By Henry Drummond, F. R. S. E., F. G. S.* New York: James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, 1886.

Also, a popular, low-priced edition, New York: John B. Alden, Publisher, 1887.

The present idolatry is the worship of *Natural Law*. Its priests cold-bloodedly expound its inexorableness in glittering sentences, and enforce the reception of its religion by gilded sophisms. All beings, acts, events and relations are bound upon its altar and sacrificed to its un pitying nature. There is no escape from its relentless pursuit, no rescue from its iron hand. No prayers are ever heard, no relief is ever afforded. Its wheels crush unmercifully, and they whirl everywhere. When troubles come—when sorrows sweep over the soul like drowning seas, and helpless hands are seen above the angry waters, and strangling cries are heard across the plunging waves—these ministers of Natural Law stand serenely on the shore, and preach across the roaring surge the gospel of the inevitable, the religion of the inexorable. And when these same sorrow-waves dash over their hearts and darken all their vision, a part of the Carmel-scene is re-enacted as these Baal priests call frantically upon their God for some pitying recognition, the extension of some helping hand. The Gospel of Natural Law is a miserable failure, a mere religion of bleak despair. In its system there is no place for the miracle, for a supernatural interference in order to salvation. Whatever happens, happens according to unfeeling, unbending Natural Law. It is as cheerless as despair, as black as night. It is the Gospel of unkindness, thoroughly unfriendly to a guilty and suffering race. It lets in the facts of sin and misery, but excludes grace and its scheme of redemption.

Prof. Drummond, whose book we are to review, although a professor in the Free Church College at Glasgow, a sworn Presbyterian and Calvinist, is a disciple of this school, an expounder and friend of this icy system. His admirers and sympathisers will repel the charge; but if they will follow us patiently to the end of this critique, they will at least admit that this is no *unfounded* slander. Prof. Drummond doubtless would himself deny that he falls under this accusation. But we have nothing to do with his consciousness. We have no means of knowing his heart. We are dealing with his book. If his book, fairly interpreted, puts him in this category, then he must accept the companionship, or repudiate his publication.

Upon the first appearance of this volume it received unstinted praise from many sources. Some notices placed it by the side of the Analogy of Bishop Butler, and declared it the equal of that masterly and immortal apologetic. A more reckless comparison was never made, a more erroneous conclusion was never reached. Prof. Drummond, as we shall presently see, expressly discarded the idea of *analogy* and contended

for the veritable *identity* of natural and spiritual laws. We believe the book is rapidly and justly depreciating in public opinion. We write to help it in its downward course.

The central doctrine of an author is the critical position of his book. It would be exceedingly unfair to judge his work by incidental utterances, though these may be important enough to receive special attention. It would also be unfair to make the argument by which he seeks to maintain his view the principal ground for reaching a judgment as to the merits of his performance, though the method of his reasoning might be striking. No volume is every syllable erroneous, and only One is every syllable true. In all human compositions something can be found to be approved, and also something to be disapproved. To reach a judgment, therefore, upon the question whether a book shall be praised or condemned, it is obviously a just method to try the doctrine which threads the volume, the doctrine for which it was written, the doctrine which all illustrations are designed to make clear, which all reasonings are designed to make firm. If this central and all-pervading doctrine can be successfully assailed, there is no occasion for examining the work in detail. If, on the other hand, that central idea, around which all illustrations, facts and arguments are grouped, can be successfully defended, the citadel of the author will at least stand, though very out-post fall into the hands of his assailants. This is a canon of criticism which is grounded in simple fairness.

We propose to pursue this method with the volume under review. Consequently the first task which this rule imposes, is to discover the author's key-position, state it, and then try its strength and soundness. This method relieves us of the necessity of articulating those subordinate statements which we may regard as true, and also of detailing those which may impress us as false. Many utterances of Prof. Drummond in this volume we heartily accord with, and regard as charmingly expressed. But that which mainly concerns us in this notice is that radical principle which undermines our theology, and in the interest of which he has written.

The book is avowedly iconoclastic. The conscious and declared aim of its author is to obliterate the old and valuable distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural. The attempt is bold, dashing and brilliant, nevertheless a failure. The author is a devout worshipper at the shrine of Natural Law. He endeavors to widen its sphere until every thing in heaven and earth, in philosophy and theology, in nature and grace is brought under its relentless sway. He knows nothing that is not its subject—no place where it does not reign. His book is a grand retreat from before the enemy—a brilliant surrender to the materialism of the day.

To support this charge we put in evidence, first of all, the title of the book—“*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*” If the constitutional principles and legal forms of the United States were enforced

upon Great Britain, could any sane man deny that the British government would cease to be a monarchy after receiving these republican forms and rules? If the carpenter apply the laws of the circle in cutting a piece of plank, must it not of necessity be circular in shape, and not square? In like manner, after Prof. Drummond has discovered that the laws of the Natural world are the laws of the Spiritual world also, can any doubt that, to his mind at least, the two spheres are the same in kind? If Natural law reigns in the Spiritual world, then the Spiritual must be Natural.

Prof. Drummond does not shrink from this conclusion. In his Introduction, on the 6th page, he states his question so plainly that no one can misunderstand him, or imagine that he does not understand himself.

"The Natural laws then are great lines running not only through the world, but, as we now know, through the universe, reducing it like parallels of latitude to intelligent order. * * * * * Now the inquiry we propose to ourselves resolves itself into the simple question, Do these lines stop with what we call the natural sphere? Is it not possible that they may lead further? Is it probable that the Hand which ruled them gave up the work where most of all they were required? Did that Hand divide the world into two, a cosmos and a chaos, the higher being the chaos? With Nature as the symbol of all harmony and beauty that is known to man, must we still talk of the super-natural, not as a convenient word, but as a different order of world, where the Reign of Mystery supersedes the Reign of Law?"

Thus does Prof. Drummond state his question. He affirms that, unless Natural laws are run up into the Spiritual world, then the Spiritual world is a chaos, while the Natural world is a cosmos. He strangely ignores the fact that Spiritual laws in the Spiritual world would reduce it to order and beauty. The reader will notice that he expresses a desire to see the word *Supernatural* banished from the English vocabulary, except as a convenient term by which one phase of the Natural may be referred to. He wants its old theological and philosophical signification withdrawn from it. But he is apprehensive that he might be misunderstood; somebody may think he does not know, or has lost sight of, the distinction between *analogy* and *identity*, between *likeness* and *sameness*. So on the 11th page he writes:

"The position we have been led to take up is not that the Spiritual Laws are analogous to the Natural Laws, but that *they are the same laws*. It is not a question of analogy, but of *identity*. The Natural Laws are not the shadows or images of the Spiritual in the same sense as autumn is emblematical of decay, or the falling leaf of death. * * * * * The Laws of the invisible are the same Laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural."

The passage is quoted as it stands. Nothing in the context modifies it. He means what he says, that there is no distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural. On the 14th page he frets with im-

patience that current theological literature should still blindly cling to the old exploded distinction :

"In the recent literature of this whole region there nowhere seems any advance upon the position of 'Nature *and* the Supernatural.' All are agreed in speaking of Nature *and* the Supernatural. Nature *in* the Supernatural, so far as Laws are concerned, is still an unknown truth."

The proof is abundant. We are not mistaken. He does mean to reduce the Supernatural to the Natural. On the 6th page of his Preface he says:

"Is there not reason to believe that many of the laws of the Spiritual world, hitherto regarded as occupying an entirely separate province, are simply the Laws of the Natural world? Can we identify the Natural Laws or any one of them in the Spiritual sphere? That vague lines everywhere run through the Spiritual world is already beginning to be recognized. Is it possible to link them with those great lines running through the visible universe which we call Natural Laws, or are they fundamentally distinct? In a word, is the Supernatural natural or unnatural?"

"Is the Supernatural natural or unnatural?" Of course our author does not believe it to be "unnatural." It is the oratorical affirmative of the proposition that the Supernatural is natural. On page 17, he tells us how it filled him with delight when this truth first burst upon him. He "ran up the Natural Law as far it would go," and "at the top," "the appropriate doctrine burst into view in a single moment."

On page 22 of his Preface, he lets his readers into a secret—he tells them how Science and Religion can form a compact. Just let Religion surrender everything to Science, and there can be peace between the two. "What is required, therefore, to draw Science and Religion together again—for they began the centuries hand in hand—is the disclosure of the naturalness of the Supernatural."

Science itself has never had the impudence to propose a union upon such a basis. It was left for a professor of the Church to propose the ignominious surrender! It is he who would hand over our Theology to Science! It reminds one of Benedict Arnold of unenviable Revolutionary notoriety.

"For the sake of the general reader who may desire at once to pass to the practical application," Prof. Drummond analyses his Introduction, that he may give such a reader a condensed view of the principles which permeate his book. There he reveals his motive. His avowed aim is to erase the old line between the Natural and the Supernatural. In listing the points under the "Law of Continuity," he says:

"5. The existence of Laws in the Spiritual world other than Natural Laws (1) improbable, (2) unnecessary, (3) unknown.

6. The Spiritual not the projection upward of the Natural; but the Natural the projection downwards of the Spiritual."

In defending these propositions, Prof. Drummond employs the in-

ductive method of reasoning, and from *eleven* individual laws, which, in his opinion, are the same in both the Spiritual and Natural worlds, reaches, by a grand generalization, the conclusion that the existence of laws in the Spiritual world different from the Natural laws is "(1) improbable, (2) unnecessary, (3) unknown." The inductive method of argumentation is certainly legitimate, but our author employs it with a degree of recklessness that cannot be commended. He must be a man of great self-assurance and dogmatism thus to announce, without the slightest twinge of modesty, without the faintest emotion of diffidence, the sweeping conclusion that the reign of Natural law is universal from so few instances as the basis of his judgment. A grand world-wide and heaven-embracing generalization, dogmatically announced, from eleven cases! This induction would have been startlingly large in its conclusion if every instance had been unimpeachably to the point; but when it is remembered that it is by no means certain that a single one of these specified Natural laws exists in the Spiritual world, it amounts to reprehensible rashness thus to deduce so radical a conclusion from so few instances, and they themselves doubtful cases. The top of the argument is too big for the bottom.

1. Prof. Drummond first examines the subject of "*Biogenesis*," and announces that the laws of physical and spiritual life are identical. Upon this investigation he finds the Scriptural words—"He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life"—equal to the Latin maxim, *Omne vivum ex vivo*. If we should grant this equivalence, then no information concerning the nature of life in general, nor of spiritual life in particular, is gained. The silly theory of spontaneous generation would be exploded, and all that would be proved is that all life, whether natural or spiritual, must have a living origin. This is all that the establishment of what is attempted in the first chapter would yield. The identity of nothing is proved.

2. Prof. Drummond next searches into the subject of *Degeneration* for an instance in which the Natural and Spiritual are one and the same as to their laws. The Spiritual law expressed in the words—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation"—is said to be identical with the modern scientific doctrine of *Reversion to Type*. If the cultivated and refined rose be neglected by the horticulturist long enough, it will revert to the wild brier, from which, by human attention, it was developed. But if a sinner neglect the Gospel provision for his salvation, he does not return to a state of *guilt* and condemnation, but remains where he is. That state which preceded his present was the holy life in Paradise: surely by the *neglect of salvation* no sinner will revert *thither*. If the Christian neglect the means of grace, of course his piety will decline, but will he degenerate to the sinner he was before conversion? No Calvinist can teach such degeneration, such spiritual reversion, without breaking with his creed. But what is the type of the Christian, but the immaculate Son of God? He is the pattern to

which grace will eventually conform the saint. By neglect of the Gospel will the child of God revert to this type? If not, then the law of degeneration as it reigns in the Natural world is not identical with the law of Spiritual declension in the realm of grace, but only in some aspects analogous to that principle.

3. The third instance is discovered in the laws of *Growth*. "*Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow,*" for when you have discovered *how they grow*, you have also discovered *how the soul grows* in spirituality. But the lilies "toil not, neither do they spin;" without anxiety and care their seed awakes to life, without effort their flower blooms into loveliness, without weaving their leaves are woven, without toiling their tissues are spun—passively in the loom of nature they are woven into more than a Solomon-like glory. It is not so, however, with the sinner as he rises from the state of death and expands in Spiritual life. Heavy conviction burdens the soul before its conversion; effort, painful, continued, and conscious, must be made in order to rise in the Spiritual scale. No soul ever grew into beauty and usefulness by sitting quietly upon the moist, rich banks of this world. Men are not plants. There are only some points of likeness between the way they grow in spirituality and the way flowers grow into beauty and fragrance.

4. Prof. Drummond heads his fourth chapter *Death*, and reasons to show that the Spiritual truth set forth in the words of Paul—"To be carnally minded is death"—is but one special determination of that scientific law written in the words—*A falling out of correspondence with environment*. The great mistake here, as also in his fifth and sixth chapters on *Mortification* and *Eternal Life*, is an utterly false definition of life and death. Life, he calls "correspondence with environment," and death "a failure of correspondence with environment." According to this definition life and death are nothing more than relative terms. Is life nothing but a *relation*? Is death nothing but another *relation*? Is there in the sprouting and growth of the acorn nothing but the influence of circumstances, nothing but the surroundings of environment? The idea is ridiculous. Life is a *real energy*, a something which has entity and continuity. The seed has a germ, and the environment is the occasion upon which it develops or dies, and to identify the life and the environment, is to identify the cause and the occasion. Much more is this true of animal life, and it is truer still of mental and spiritual life. Life is a real power at work within and through the environment. It is perfectly conceivable that the life may be extinguished while the environment remains the same. It may be perfectly true that God's ordinary method of bringing about death is by destroying the correspondence with the environment, but this by no means proves that life and death are mere *relations*. Prof. Drummond's idea is, that Spiritual life is nothing but Natural life with an altered environment, with which, however, it is still in correspondence, and that Spiritual death is nothing but Natural

death with a changed environment, but out of correspondence with it all the same. The idea is nonsensical. Spiritual life is one kind of life different from Natural life, and working within and through its own environment. There may be some beautiful analogies between the two, but to say that they are both *mere relations* to different environments is the sheerest stuff.

But our limits will not allow us to go any further into these details. We have accomplished our purpose. We have been making the point that so radical a generalization as Prof. Drummond makes when he declares that the Supernatural is Natural, ought to be an induction from a multitude of the clearest instances, before it can be announced with positiveness and inculcated with dogmatism. He has relied upon *eleven* instances. We have examined six of them, and find them *doubtful*, if not certainly erroneous. We repeat our charge of rashness. Instead of publishing such a book in his youth, he ought to have kept it in *soak* to the close of life, when, perhaps, it would never have been printed at all.

Now let us close this critique by listing those distinctions which Prof. Drummond seeks to batter down. Some of them he avows; all of them are legitimate and necessary deductions.

I. He assails the old distinction between *Theology* and *Natural Science*. He quietly assumes the truth of evolution. It runs all through the volume. You feel it in every page. You read it in the very phraseology. You see it in his quotations. His companionship is with that school. It is the scarlet thread on which he strings all his shining beads. He no more stops to prove evolution than he stops to discuss the divinity of the Bible. As the Bible is the unquestioned source of the Spiritual laws, so Natural Science is the unquestioned source of the Natural laws; and if the laws and principles of one are identical with those of the other, why should not Natural Science and Theology—the systematic arrangements of identical laws—themselves be identical? Hence it was easy for him to propose that union of the two on the basis that Theology surrender to Natural Science. If the constitutions of Great Britain and the United States furnish the same principles and laws, why could not the two, without any straining, be called the *same* constitution? If Natural Science and Theology are conversant about the same laws, why should the two not be identified, so that the Science of Nature would become the Science of Religion?

II. Prof. Drummond moves his heavy batteries against that ancient and useful distinction, without which neither philosophy nor theology can get on, the *Natural* and the *Supernatural*. Seeing how strongly this distinction is entrenched in the mind and literature of the church, he impatiently wishes the word *Supernatural* could be banished from the language; and yet he fails to see how he could get on without it, and so resiles a little, and desires it to remain, not as expressing some substantial idea, but merely as a "convenient term." But if the Natu-

ral and Supernatural are identical, why this partiality for the Natural? Why not wish that the word *Natural* could be stricken from the dictionary? Why run up the Natural laws into the Spiritual world? Why not run down the Supernatural laws into the Natural world? Instead of making all Natural, why not make all Supernatural? There must be some reason for this partiality.

III. He seeks to obliterate the distinction between the *Natural* and the *Miraculous*. Does he not teach us that Natural law reigns everywhere—in earth, in heaven, in nature, in grace? But the Miracle is an infraction of Natural law—a something which happens not in accordance with the course of Nature, but contrary to it. The very essence of the Miracle is contranatural, and its evidential value in the system of grace cannot be too highly estimated. All evidences, whether external, internal or experimental, may be grouped into unity upon the Miracle. But if, under this unbending and universal Reign of Law of which Prof. Drummond and his school write, there is no place for the Miracle, then there is no place for revelation, which is a Miracle, no place for the Scheme of Grace which is essentially Miraculous. Destroy this distinction, and not only is it impossible to prove a Supernatural Revelation and a Supernatural Religion, but these things cannot exist. A Miracle in accordance with Natural law is no Miracle at all. We want such an interference with the course of Nature as will prove to us that there is a God above Nature, able and willing to pardon through the Atonement.

IV. Prof. Drummond wrote his book to destroy the distinction between the *Natural* and the *Spiritual*. If this were not his design, then he did not understand himself; hence the title of his volume. And when he has accomplished his end, what becomes of us? If under this kingdom there is no hope of pardon for guilty sinners, how can there be any hope under the kingdom of Grace, seeing the two are identical in their laws? If there is hope under the laws of Nature, where is there any necessity for a Spiritual kingdom? Is there any difference between our state by Nature and our state by Grace? If not, what becomes of the Bible doctrine of Regeneration? If there is, what becomes of the theory that Grace and Nature deal alike with sinners? If there is in the kingdom of Grace a provision for pardoning the guilty, then that provision is also in the kingdom of Nature, or it is not. If it is not in the realm of Nature, then the two kingdoms are not identical. If it is, then why may not the natural man discover it, and by it work out his own salvation independently of grace? "If by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." Paul recognizes a distinction between "the law of the spirit of life" and "the law of sin and death." In his inspired judgment they are not identical.

We do not like the companions of Prof. Drummond. The promi-

nence of a whole page and italics are given to excerpts from the writings of Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, Frederick Harrison, Emerson, Carlyle, Rousseau, and such like. He speaks "half in the speech of Ashdod," and with difficulty "in the Jews' language." We remember he has lately sided with Huxley against Gladstone.

R. A. WEBB.

BRIGG'S MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY. The prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption through the Messiah; a critical study of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in the order of their development. *By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

This book is a vindication of American Scholarship. It is our first great contribution to the science of Biblical Theology. No longer can it be said that the scholars of our country have done no original work in this department. The fugitive articles in newspapers and the sporadic studies in reviews are at last succeeded by a volume of permanent value. It is the only book in the English language that discusses Messianic Prophecy from the true point of view, and is moreover the most thorough and adequate treatment of the subject in any language. The author needs no introduction to the theological public. His stimulating book on *Biblical Study* and his scarcely less fresh and forceful work on *American Presbyterianism*, to say nothing of his fearless—or, as some are pleased to call it, his presumptuous and savage—attack upon the Revised Version, have made his name a familiar one of late, not to say formidable. His ability and scholarship, his courage and enthusiasm, are conceded by all. The uneasiness he has caused is not due to distrust of any of these qualities but rather of his temper and prudence, together with his anomalous critical attitude. The devout tone of the volume before us is re-assuring, as is also the candor and courtesy with which he considers competing views before discarding them. The style is always brisk and clear, at times hard and metallic, fitting his thought more like a coat-of-mail than a soft and flowing garment, and, though his conviction that "the truth will take care of itself," and that "it cannot be resisted by the blind inertia of conservatism or overcome by the mad rush of radicalism," seems to have had a grateful effect upon his style, it still lacks somewhat of grace, mellowness, and repose. Especially in the treatment of this transcendent theme there is need of glow rather than glitter, and sweetness as well as light.

We believe Dr. Briggs to be an earnest, conscientious and reverent student of God's Word, and we have no sympathy with the attempt to deprive him of a fair hearing, by classifying him with the destructive critics of Germany and Holland, but at the same time we differ with