

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

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.

Public attention is now being directed to a more radical method, viz: Prohibition, by which is meant the interdiction by Constitutional law of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage. The State of Maine was the first to add a prohibitory article to her Constitution; her example has been followed by four or five sister States, and several others have the matter under consideration. Wherever faithfully tried, the experiment has proved satisfactory to its friends, and Prohibition is growing in popular favor; indeed, it has become a factor of ever increasing strength in the politics of our country.

At this juncture, the eyes of many are turned toward the Church. They rightly judge that she is not indifferent to the great evil of intemperance, which is destroying so many souls. Will she not then, unite in a movement which aims to pluck up this evil by the roots? This she is asked to do, and there are those who deem her unfaithful to her mission on earth when she refuses. Under this pressure we notice that the Synod of Pennsylvania has entered into league with this movement, by officially praying the Legislature of their State to pass a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution; and when this action was appealed from, the General Assembly at Omaha dismissed the appeal, thus sustaining and endorsing the action of Synod. In view of this state of things, a brief restatement of the principles governing the relation of the Church to this, and all similar movements, may not be out of place.

The Church, as such, may not espouse the Prohibition cause, or any similar enterprise, or league herself to it in any way whatever. The soundness of this position will appear if we consider the following simple truths:

1. The functions of the Church are *judicative* and *administrative*, not *legislative*. The Church is a Kingdom whose laws are all made for her by her King. The code is placed in her hands finished and complete in every respect. No power is given her to alter this code; on the other hand, all such power is carefully withheld from her. She cannot take from it, nor can she add to it without incurring the King's curse. (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) In other words, she cannot make new laws, but simply expound and declare those given her by her King; her power is not legislative but simply declarative. This is her commission, received from the King's own lips: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all na-

tions, * * * * teaching them to observe all things, *whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

Now is Prohibition one of Christ's laws? On examination of the code we find it is not there. If it were there, we may be sure He would not have water into wine for a beverage at the marriage-feast of Cana. It is hard, too, to conceive how Timothy could "use a little wine" even, as the inspired Paul directs (1 Tim. v. 23), unless somebody had manufactured it. But if Christ has not prohibited its manufacture and sale, the Church cannot do so. There is no such thing as her adding a prohibitory amendment to her Constitution, as given her by her King: we have seen this to be entirely beyond her province. If Christian men are convinced that Prohibition is good "for the present distress," and if Christ has not forbidden it, then may they as citizens, patriots, philanthropists, espouse and work for it. But they cannot do it sitting as a court of the Church: for here they can only speak by "commandment of the Lord." To do otherwise is disloyal to the King, and, in the end, hurtful to the Church.

2. The Church is a *Spiritual Kingdom*. "My Kingdom is not of this world," says the Church's King and Head. This settles the question. Three things are implied in this statement.

(a.) The Church's *ends* are Spiritual. The great end of the Church is to "preach Christ and Him crucified" to a perishing world, that through Him men may be reconciled to God, and saved from sin and hell. Says the King: "Go ye into all the world and *preach the Gospel* to every creature." The Church cannot depart from this to preach Prohibition or aught else. And so the Presbyterian Church has embodied in her Confession of Faith this principle: "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical." But is Prohibition a Spiritual and ecclesiastical question? Is it not confessedly a political, a civil question? Is not the State asked to create the prohibitory law, and expected to enforce it? Is it not a State matter from beginning to end? Then the Church cannot "handle" it; she is precluded therefrom by her own Constitution, and by the very end of her being as explained in the Word of God. Nor is it sufficient to urge the wholesome moral effects of Prohibition, as a reason why the Church should espouse it. Every question in political economy has a bearing, directly or indirectly, on the morals of the country. On this ground, the Church might

“handle or conclude” such matters as the Demonetization of Silver, the Fifteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, the Burlingame Treaty, the Canadian Fisheries question, and, in short, any and every civil question. This doctrine, carried to its logical consequences, leads inevitably to the Supremacy of Church over State. It is precisely the doctrine of Rome. It is on this ground that she claims the right to meddle with political matters, because of their bearing upon the morals of men, and the Church’s interests.

(b) The Church’s methods are Spiritual. It is not enough for the end to be Spiritual; this end must be accomplished by Spiritual means. This is the law of the King: “Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.” (2 Cor. x: 3, 4.) But Prohibition is pre-eminently a “carnal weapon;” it is a direct appeal to the civil arm; it is “taking the sword” and wielding it lustily too. Let the State do this; for this end was she ordained of God. But the Church may not touch the sword on penalty of perishing thereby. When the Synod of Pennsylvania says to a man: “If you manufacture or sell liquors as a beverage, we will ask the State to fine, imprison, punish you,” wherein does she differ from the Romish Apostasy, when it says to a man: “If you hold to heresy in doctrine or practice, we will ask the State to fine, imprison, punish you?” Surely it would take the traditional “Philadelphia lawyer,” who, we may suppose, was a member of that Synod, to detect the difference. Christian men may advocate the use of the sword as citizens of the State, but not as members of the Church, much less as members of a court of Jesus Christ. And this is a distinction often overlooked. While a Church Court, acting exclusively in the name of Christ, cannot “handle” Prohibition, or other civil matter, yet immediately after the adjournment of the court, the same persons composing it may assemble in mass meeting, as citizens of the Commonwealth, and handle lawfully Prohibition, or any other civil matter.

(c) The Church’s *power* is Spiritual only. Her King says: “Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Matt. xviii, 18.) Hers is the power of the keys only, a purely spiritual power. Now, it is vain for a body to adopt a law which

it has no power to enforce. This the Church does whenever she utters a command or passes a recommendation on civil or secular questions. She cannot enforce it, for she has no secular power, only spiritual, and this drives her, as it did the Omaha Assembly when in this predicament, to advise an appeal to "the strong arm of the civil law," (viz. this Assembly's action on the report of her Temperance Committee).

Is the Church, then, to stand aloof from the temperance question altogether? By no means. Temperance is a spiritual grace, a "fruit of the Spirit;" the Church must teach and enforce it; drunkenness is a spiritual evil, a "wart of the flesh;" the Church must go the full length of her power to resist and eradicate it. But she must use Spiritual power, the only kind she possesses, and the mightiest power committed to mortal man. In the exercise of this power, she must so imbue her members with an abhorrence of evil, with sentiments of temperance and humanity, with an unselfish love to God and their fellow-men, in short, with the Spirit of Christ, that they will go forth into the world, intelligent, patriotic, God-fearing citizens, who can be trusted to do all that philanthropy, humanity and patriotism can suggest for the amelioration of the race. But, chiefly, the Church must declare the law of her King in this matter. She must say to men: "You must not be drunken;" for Christ has said: "Drunkards shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." (1 Cor. vi. :10.) She must say to men: "You must not make your neighbor drunken;" for Christ says: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken also." (Hab. ii. :15.) And she must do this with authority, and enforce it, when needful, with the divine power of the Keys given her for this purpose. This is the Church's way of dealing with the Temperance question. It stands in favorable contrast to Prohibition. The latter is based upon the popular will, which is one thing to-day and may be another to-morrow, and is enforced by the penalties of human law; the former is based upon the immutable will of God, and is enforced by the sanctions of His eternal law. Let the State, let individuals, do what they may; the Church must adhere exclusively to this one way. If she will do this, she will be loyal to her King, she will keep herself from entangling and always damaging alliances with the world, and will save the souls as well as the bodies of men, which, after all, is her great mission on earth.

A. B. CURRY.