

BT
75
.F45
18376

THE
STUDENT'S HANDBOOK
OF
CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

BY THE
REV. BENJAMIN FIELD.

NEW EDITION.

EDITED, WITH EXTENSIVE ADDITIONS,
BY THE REV. JOHN C. SYMONS,
OF THE AUSTRALASIAN CONFERENCE.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE REV. L. TYERMAN

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

72 2093 64

STANDARD
NORTHWEST
NANAIMO, I.C.

BT
75
F
18
11

16770



RECEIVED BY THE POST OFFICE
MAY 17 1895

1895

My business, however, is not to write a critique on the book of Mr. Field, but to make a few remarks respecting the emendations and additional notes of the Editor of the new edition now introduced to the reader's notice. The Rev. John C. Symons has no more need of a puff than has the

Rev. Benjamin Field. His literary ability is well known, especially in the colonies of Australia; but a brief statement of what he has done in this new edition of the "Handbook of Christian Theology" can do no harm, if it does no good.

The book consists of twenty chapters; Mr. Symons' emendations, with the exception of a few useful footnotes in subsequent pages, are wholly confined to the first five chapters

Mr. Field's excellent chapter on "The Existence of God" has been omitted, and another on the same subject, and also an "Introductory" one, on the sceptical theories of the age, both by Mr. Symons, have been inserted in substitution. Regret may be felt at the loss of Mr. Field's chapter; but since his book was first published, in 1868, there have been such mischievous developments of the various forms of Rationalism as to make it, perhaps, desirable, if not important, to deal with them more fully than was done by Mr. Field nearly twenty years ago. In the present edition, Pantheism, Agnosticism, Positivism, Secularism, Materialism, Deism, and Atheism are all carefully defined by Mr. Symons; and in Chapters I. and V. are very ably refuted.

Chapter II., on "Divine Revelation," has been greatly enriched by Mr. Symons' really learned notes, which indicate a course of reading, on this important subject, that Biblical students cannot follow without immense advantage to themselves.

Mr. Symons' added notes on "The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures," though not numerous, are valuable.

In the chapter on "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity," there are nearly five pages of new matter, on "The Nature and Attributes of God," which Mr. Field's book greatly needed; and there are also an equal number of pages introduced on the Resurrection of Christ, as the "crowning proof of the Divinity of His Person and Mission." All this new matter is important, and displays great ability.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE REVISED EDITION.

At the earnest request of the proprietors and publishers of Field's "Handbook of Christian Theology," I have undertaken to prepare a new and revised edition. This work has been performed amid the pressure of duties which could not be put aside, and under conditions which it is due to myself to state.

These were, 1st, That any additions or changes should be homologous in style and character with the work as published by Mr. Field;

2nd, That such additions as I might make should be limited so as not to increase the price of the volume.

By the use of smaller type for the notes than in the previous edition, and thirty-six additional pages, the quantity of matter in this revised edition has been considerably increased.

I have done my best to comply with these conditions. How far I have succeeded I must leave others to judge. Yet no one can be so sensible as myself, that I have not been able to realise the ideal which I had set before me.

The circumstances under which the late lamented author prepared the first edition in 1868, he has told in the introduction (p. xxvii).

The work met a distinctly-felt want, and has been received with well-deserved favour. The first edition in Melbourne, of two thousand copies, was exhausted in less than a year. Of the English edition twenty-three thousand copies have been sold; and the sale regularly keeps up. Commercially, therefore, there is no reason for a new and revised edition, and its publication will involve a considerable financial sacrifice. It is, however, felt that the great changes in biblical and scientific criticism, which have taken place since the publication of the previous edition, eighteen years ago, render it most desirable that these new phases and arguments should be considered and discussed. This has involved the rewriting of some portions, and additions—mostly in the form of notes—in other parts.

STOCKS
North West
Nazarath
Nampal, India

The following will indicate the alterations and additions which have been made; viz.:-

1. An entirely new introductory chapter, relating to Theology, Religion, and the various theories of modern Rationalism and Scepticism.

2. A new chapter has been substituted for Chapter I., "On the Existence of God." This has been deemed necessary not because the arguments in the previous editions were weak or defective, but because the attack having shifted the defence must also be shifted. Modern scientific theories, under the guise of Positivism, Agnosticism, Materialism, questioning the existence of a personal Intelligent First Cause, necessarily called for a different treatment of the question from that adopted by Mr. Field.

3. Chapter II., "Divine Revelation," is substantially unchanged in the text, but has considerable addition in notes.

4. Chapter III., "The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures," is slightly abridged in the description of the principal theories opposed to plenary inspiration. What appears at first to be a somewhat important change, has been made in the use of the term "plenary," instead of "verbal," inspiration, in the closing pages of the chapter. But the change is more apparent than real. Mr. Field, though holding to the word "verbal," nevertheless inserted the following note:—"The reader should be apprised that there are divines who fully coincide with the views above given, but prefer the word 'plenary' as comprehending all that is involved in the term 'verbal,' and as being free from certain objections which they regard as attaching to the latter word." This note now disappears, together with one or two paragraphs in the text; and while the word "plenary" is substituted for "verbal," yet the views maintained remain substantially unchanged. Considerable additions have been made in notes to this chapter.

5. Chapter IV., "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity," has received some additions on the Nature and Attributes of God; a subject which was only very briefly referred to in the previous editions.

6. Chapter V., "The Creation of the World," has of necessity received considerable additions and some alterations, arising from the objections to the Scripture record which modern scientific speculations have raised, and which required to be dealt with.

7. In the remaining chapters no change has been made, except the occasional omission or alteration of a sentence, not in any way affecting the sense. A few notes have been added.

8. The Hebrew and Greek words are printed in Roman letters.

9. A copious Index replaces one which was altogether too brief for practical purposes.

In the brief notice of Mr. Field, prefixed to the previous editions, I remarked: "It is hoped that from the sale of this volume some assistance may be rendered towards the support of his orphan children." I am happy to say that this hope has been realised to a very gratifying extent. I trust I shall be pardoned if I add that I hope by the increased sale of this revised edition additional "assistance" will be rendered to Mr. Field's family.

I close my work in connection with this volume with the earnest prayer, that by God's blessing it may be increasingly useful to those for whose benefit it has been specially prepared.

JOHN C. SYMONS.

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA,

November 25th, 1886.

EDUCATIONAL
LIBRARY
MELBOURNE
VICTORIA
NAMES, 10/11/16

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

OF

THE REV. BENJAMIN FIELD.

WHILE this edition of the "Handbook of Christian Theology" was in the press, the mournful tidings reached us that its estimable author had been called to his reward. This event occurred in Melbourne, Australia, whither he had gone for the benefit of his health.

A very general, and certainly a very natural desire has been expressed to have some particulars of the life and character of Mr. Field prefixed to his work. The following brief and imperfect sketch is compiled, with a view of meeting—so far as time and opportunity enable me—this desire.* As I am on the eve of returning to Melbourne, it is impossible that I can prepare a memoir of any length of my friend; nor can I now engage with any one to do so.

Benjamin Field was born at Sevenoaks, Kent, of pious Methodist parents. He was their first-born son, and on the day of his birth was solemnly dedicated to the service of God by his father; who, for a long series of years, had been a useful and honoured local preacher.

At five years of age he was sent to the Sabbath school, and, as his mind expanded, it was evident that he was under the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit. He was never addicted to the follies and vices which are so often associated with youth, but delighted in the means of grace: and when his father—as was his wont—retired, at midday, for private devotion, his son would noiselessly creep into the room, kneel down, and join in the half-heard expressions of praise and prayer. When left at home on a Sunday evening, he was in the habit of standing on a chair, to conduct a service with his brothers and sisters; and,

* I am indebted for most of the information to a paper in the Melbourne *Wesleyan Chronicle*, from the pen of the Rev. G. Daniel; and also some particulars furnished by Miss Field, of Sevenoaks.

according to the testimony of the servant, would preach as good a sermon as a minister. "When scarcely twelve years old," he says, "the Spirit that I had so often grieved came upon me in all His enlightening, alluring, subduing, and almost constraining influences, and, with His light beaming on my soul, the world presented nothing but one scene of emptiness and vanity, and the religion of the cross was all-attractive. I heard the whisper of the Saviour's voice, 'Seek ye My face;' and my heart replied, 'Thy face, Lord, will I seek.' Satan desired to have me, that he might sift me as wheat; and among all the temptations incident to a young professor in that stage of his career, I was especially terrified by temptations to the follies and absurdities of infidelity and atheism; and had not my mind at that time been fortified with religious principles, and kept by the power of God, I should have been ruined—for ever ruined! But, supported by an unseen arm, I was shielded. I sought salvation with my whole heart. The first feeling of the morning was one of longing for Christ, and the last feeling at night was one of restlessness to obtain the hidden treasure. I could truthfully adopt the language, 'Mine eye runneth down with water, because the Comforter that should relieve my soul is far from me.' But so great was the lovingkindness of the Lord, that soon the cloud dispersed, and I saw His smile; and then, oh, then!

"Of my Saviour possessed,
I was perfectly blessed,
As if filled with the fulness of God."

It is believed that his conversion took place in connection with the ministry of the Rev. T. Collins. From that period he became a diligent student of God's Word. From a very early age, and even before his conversion, he had the impression that he should become a preacher of the Gospel.

Now, he says, that "thought was heightened to conviction, and I seemed to have a confident assurance that the Lord would make me an ambassador of His; and often, when the miseries of the heathen world were detailed, . . . my heart burned to be there." This yearning desire soon declared itself, and was recognised by the elders of the Church, who, seeing the grace of God in the young disciple, recognised in him those mental qualities necessary for the efficient discharge of the important office. After his having been usefully employed as a Sunday School teacher, he began to preach—under the direction of the superintendent minister—amongst the cottagers in the villages surrounding his native town. He was then sixteen and a half years of age; and as his early efforts were approved, he became an accredited local preacher. Having been blessed with fruit of his labours, and those qualifications expected by the Church—viz., grace, gifts, and fruit—been thus seen as belonging to him, he was recommended for the work of the ministry by

the March quarterly meeting of 1843, and was accepted as a candidate by the Conference. In June he was employed in the Guildford circuit as a hired local preacher; after which he entered the Theological Institution, Richmond. There he laboured assiduously, was a diligent student, and his "profiting appeared unto all." For the venerable men—the Rev. Thomas Jackson and John Farrar—then at the head of the institution, he ever entertained profound respect and regard; cherishing towards them the feelings of affection due to fathers, to whom in any circumstances of perplexity he could ever apply with fullest confidence. "How thankful," he says, "I feel for three years' residence in our institution, under the kind and efficient tuition with which we are there favoured! I have been more fully satisfied of the infallible truth of the Bible, have received more enlarged perceptions of the doctrines it reveals, and see more clearly the consistency of the doctrines and discipline which, as a Methodist preacher, I am called to enforce, with the leading principles which it embodies. And, above all, I am more deeply and permanently impressed with the need of a right state of heart, in order to bring men to the enjoyment of its glorious blessings."

At the close of his term at the institution he was appointed as a missionary to India. I am informed by one of his fellow-students that his appointment to India did not accord with his judgment or his wishes; these led him to believe that he should be employed in the home work. He was solemnly set apart, by the imposition of hands, to the work of the Christian ministry, at Richmond, July 2nd, 1846. None acquainted with the habitually reverent and thoughtful frame of his mind would suppose that he could pass through so solemn an ordinance but with a spirit deeply chastened, subdued, and prayerful. "I feel," he says, "the circumstances to be the most solemn and momentous which I have ever seen. I remember that I stand as one who is to receive an appointment and ordination to an office, than which none bears so close a relation to the glory of God, the honour of the Saviour, the salvation of the saints, the prosperity of the Church, and the welfare of the world. And this causes my spirit to sink within me; and I can only propose the question, which I have often proposed in anticipation of this period, 'Lord, who is sufficient for these things?' . . . I left the chapel, deeply feeling the responsibility of my position as one who had, before heaven and earth, made an avowal of consecration that was to be complete and lasting."

One short week in London, in preparation for the voyage, and then he says, "I went to Sevenoaks to take final farewell of friends, many of whom had known me from my infancy, and with many more of whom I had often been blessed in seasons of private intercourse, and in the services of the sanctuary. We had often spoken of the final separation, and had often been told of the 'pang of parting,' but not the half had

been told." Referring to this, when afterwards recording in his journal, he says,—“While I write, my heart bleeds afresh, retaining, as I do, a vivid impression of a father's looks, of a sister's tears, and, above all, of a loving mother's cries; from all these, with a broken heart, I was obliged to tear myself away.” He preached his last sermon before leaving home, and parents, and family, from “None of these things move me,” etc.

July 31st, 1846, in company with the Revs. T. Glanville and J. Morris, on board the ship *Macedon*, he sailed for Madras. The new and untried life on board ship was, as usual, somewhat irksome, and he records, “Never before did I so fully comprehend the meaning of the psalmist's cry, ‘My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth, for the courts of the Lord.’ . . . Yet,” he says, “there are pleasures in worshipping God on shipboard. . . . The thought that, in this way, we have communion with the ‘whole family in heaven and in earth,’ is peculiarly pleasing.” With his characteristic method and earnestness he applied himself to self-improvement, devoting the mornings to the study of the Canarese language, and the afternoon to reading the Greek Testament, with Bloomfield's Notes; Paley's Works, and such biographies as McCheyne's, Mrs. Cryer's, and others. Notwithstanding that, he records, “I find a seafaring life is to me so irregular and unpleasant, . . . producing great weakness of body and depression of mind.” Yet such was the ardour of his attachment to reading and study, that he writes, “I have just finished Mosheim's History in 6 vols.,” which is followed by three pages of closely written critique and reflection. His earnest longings for growth in the Divine life are manifest by the setting apart of the hours of nine and five for devotional reading of the Scriptures and prayer, in connection with which exercises he observes, “How much blessing do I daily realise through having praying friends at home. Lord, bless them! . . . I want more of the power of godliness.” “Indulge me, Lord, in this request.” For the souls of those who were voyaging with him he evidenced a yearning love. At the commencement of the voyage we find him laying down rules for his own governance, that his “walk may be so circumspect” that he “may be able at any time to speak with any about salvation, without a blush.” The effect of the Word preached upon the minds of the sailors was carefully watched, and when he is able to record, “One of the sailors came to me to-day, to say how much he and his companions had felt under my sermon,” he exultingly adds, “Glory be to God!”

The voyage to Madras occupied four months, and at its close Mr. Field thus comments:—“Reviewing the seventeen weeks, the most prominent feeling of my soul is gratitude. All lives have been spared. . . . To myself the voyage has been a positive blessing. During the whole time I have retained a lively and sometimes a depres-

ing sense of the high responsibility of my position, and of my utter unfitness, apart from the grace of God, for the fulfilment of the ministry among heathen people. I have had opportunities for reading, which I greatly needed. . . . We have had opportunity, whenever the weather permitted, of collecting the sailors together on Sundays, and offering to them the salvation of God; but it is a humiliating thought that three Wesleyan missionaries should have spent four months among men ignorant of God and of a Saviour, without having evidence of one being enlightened and saved. If I have been deficient in duty, I can only say, as the time is gone for ever, Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, Thou God of my salvation."

His entrance upon the scene of his future mission labours excited all the ardour, sympathy, and devotedness of his spirit. "I felt," he says, "as though I could weep my life away: it seemed such an overwhelming consideration that one so unworthy, who had desired and prayed from infancy to be employed in distant lands, should now be entering on a scene and country which has been an intolerable burden on the hearts of the pious for a succession of ages! Now (thought I) I have to live, labour, perhaps to die, here! The entire future is hid in dark obscurity, except as it is enlightened by the promises of a covenant-keeping God. The Lord shall have me, body, soul, and spirit; and if He can employ me in any way to accomplish the purposes of His mercy, I will say, Amen: do with me as seemeth Thee good."

His first station was Goobbee, in the Mysore country, at which he arrived some three months after reaching India. In a few months he had acquired sufficient knowledge of Canarese to enable him to commence holding short services with the natives, and was looking forward to a period of earnest and successful toil, when, in the order of the mysterious providence of God, he was suddenly stricken down; in a few days the raging fever had completely prostrated him, and no doubt his constitution received a shock from which it never recovered. At first his medical attendants predicted a speedy recovery, and regarded the attack as merely the ordinary seasoning; but attack succeeded attack, and it quickly became apparent that he was soon to swell the number who are sent to mission stations with every qualification except the primary one of physical adaptability to the climate, and who either succumb at once, and fill an early grave, or, at great expense and suffering, have to return to more temperate climes. The Neilgherries (Indian Blue Mountains) were tried, and a residence of some weeks brought partial restoration; but a return to the lowlands was followed by immediate attacks of fever. Madras was reached, and by the advice of his friends, medical and ministerial, a voyage was undertaken to Cape Town; and this was ultimately extended to his native land.

At no period of his life was he robust, but his Indian sickness gave a

shock to his constitution which it never recovered. Having been partially restored to health by the long sea voyage, and by partial rest at the home of his youth, he was directed by the missionary committee in London to proceed to Paris, where he laboured until the ensuing Conference, under the superintendence of the late Dr. Charles Cook, whose paternal counsels and kindness deeply impressed him. Returning to England, he was appointed to his first English circuit, Chatteris, in Cambridgeshire, in 1850; to Luton, 1853; Bradford, 1856; but his health was unequal to the climate, and in 1858 he removed to Hackney; from thence to City Road in 1861; and finally to Penzance in 1864, in the hope that its milder climate would be beneficial. During those years he was becoming increasingly known and respected as an able expositor of the Truth, an eloquent platform speaker, a diligent, kind-hearted pastor, a painstaking friend of youth, a man of literary taste and ability, and, above all, as a devout and humble Christian. Many passages in his carefully kept diary, through all these years, indicate the progress made in the Divine life—his constant growth in grace. Through much weakness he laboured on with diligence and perseverance; his aim was high, his purpose unfaltering, and his success great; often appearing before large and crowded audiences when his strength was scarcely equal to the task of carrying him to the pulpit, and returning to spend a restless, feverish night from sheer exhaustion. In connection with such circumstances we find such records as this:—"How a Sabbath seems lost when affliction prevents the full outburst of the soul!" In these various circuits many were the tokens of Divine and human favour with which he was blessed; and many the recorded instances of extensive awakenings and genuine conversions in connection with his ministry. During his residence in the Bradford circuit, in 1857, he became so seriously ill that for some months the general impression was that his active labours were at an end. During this time he writes: "Still moving on in full work, but consciously unfit for it. Most of all I sorrow that in time of health I have been so unfaithful to God to Whom I had plighted my vows. No language can describe the deep depression of mind with which this time of affliction was attended. . . Another Sabbath of quietness! When I saw Mr. Nye go into the pulpit, I could not refrain from tears! But why should I weep? I know the Lord hath done it, and that it was all ordered for my good; but God only knows how I love His work, and though I will not murmur at the arrangement which lays me aside, I cannot fail to regard it as a deep and heavy trial." A residence at a hydropathic establishment for some weeks was productive of so much benefit that he was enabled to return again to his circuit and fulfil his appointments to some extent. At the ensuing Conference, to the great grief of the officers and people connected with that circuit, he made up his mind to be directed by his medical advisers, and

go towards the south. The next six years were spent in London in much weakness, but with very marked success; and then, still acting under advice, he removed to Cornwall, and entered upon that which proved to be his last English circuit—Penzance. Here the Lord appears to have ordered his labours almost immediately upon his entry upon the work of the circuit; and, with exultancy of spirit, he records the first token for good in a remarkable case of conversion at Mousehole, "where, it is said, there has not been a single case of conversion for three years past." Dark and inscrutable are the movements of Divine Providence, however! Months elapsed, and then the entry was concerning another removal in search of health, this time to Australia. His last public act, which closed his ministry in England, was a sermon on improvement of the death of the late Rev. Robert Young. At the close of the sermon and the account of Mr. Young, he records, "I addressed the large congregation thus: 'Brethren, I close my sermon, and with it my ministry amongst you. . . . When fifteen months ago I came amongst you, it was with a deep and sincere desire to promote the work of God: and I will not suppose that what I have done has been all in vain. I rejoice to be assured that the Lord has been working amongst us. I hope that the arrangement which takes me away from the midst of you is of God. I have earnestly prayed for Divine direction. I would not for the world go in any path which the finger of God does not point out; but if He appoints me to go even to the farthest verge of the green earth, I am willing to go and bear the cross of separation from much-loved friends and even much-loved children. Whether my health is to be perfectly restored, as some predict, or whether I am still to suffer, I know not; I am glad to know my times are in His hands Who doeth all things kindly and well. . . . My earnest desire is that my supply may be far more useful than I could have been, and that my colleagues, with you, may have a year of blessing. Brethren, pray for us.'

The kindness shown him by friends when thus called to lay down his charge, and leave his native land, is recorded with evidence of deep feeling, and with earnest prayers that the Lord would reward them abundantly.

Monday, December 11th, 1865, Mr. and Mrs. Field, leaving their dear children behind them, embarked on board the *Highflyer*, at Gravesend, bound for Melbourne, where, after a rather tedious voyage, they arrived on Friday, March 16th, 1866. The Rev. John Eggleston and myself were the first to welcome them; we boarded the ship before she anchored, and this little attention deeply impressed them: it was on their part altogether unexpected. For the friends who received them and showed them kindness in the land of the stranger, Mr. Field records his high esteem and his earnest prayers: and, surely, seldom has kind attention been more needed or better bestowed. Seldom does the Lord permit any

of His children to exemplify the power and sufficiency of His grace amidst fires so fierce as those which kindled around this devoted servant. Seldom does He call, even as an example for the Church, His suffering children to exhibit the "blessedness of the man that endureth" under such scenes of reiterated and severe trial and discipline. Stroke fell upon stroke. It is a remarkable coincidence that on the very day upon which he entered Hobson's Bay, and almost the first news which fell upon his ear, was the appalling intelligence of the loss of the *London*!—that the first public service he ever attended in Australia was that one at which the sorrowing Church publicly acknowledged the chastening hand of God in the removal of the lamented D. J. Draper! and the first intelligence he received from England was the death of one of the dear children he had to leave behind him! No wonder that he records, "It seemed as though God had deserted us—as though He were leaving us to wander in the world without a comfort; but," he immediately adds, "we must try to cast away these desponding thoughts, we know that they are wrong! Blinded by our tears, heartstricken with our loss, and unable to penetrate the mystery of the dispensation, we would take up the psalmist's words 'I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because Thou didst it.'" Referring to the service just alluded to, he says, "Never did the doctrine of a Divine and special providence fall more pleasantly upon the heart than on this occasion. . . . I shall not soon forget the impression made upon my heart by the singing of that beautiful hymn:

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm."

It is not surprising that Mr. Field should at this time have been the subject of considerable depression. He felt that he was useless, because he could not preach. He had a passion for preaching, and this, for the time at least, made him overlook any other mode of usefulness. I suggested to him the preparation of a Handbook of Theology, expressing my conviction of the great need of such a volume, and that the author of such a work would lay the Wesleyan Church under great obligation. I urged him to undertake the task, promising him all the aid in my power, and engaging to take the responsibility of its publication. After some consideration and consultation with other ministers he commenced the work. How well he performed it I need not say.

In the pursuit of health, and in accordance with the wishes of some old and dear friends, he removed, shortly after his arrival, to Sandhurst, and, to the pleasure and profit of the friends in that circuit, was able to enter into an arrangement with their Quarterly Meeting to take one appointment per week in one or other of the churches. Referring to

this engagement, he says: "What pleasure it would be to me if I could at least take two services each Sunday! then I should feel that I was doing something to purpose; but I scarcely dare hope that I shall ever again have strength for that, and must feel thankful if I can for a little longer preach once." This foreboding seems not to have been literally realised; yet with much weakness, often to the amazement of those who witnessed it, he continued to fulfil his engagement. Finding that a residence at Sandhurst was not productive of the benefit he had hoped, he returned to Melbourne, where he shortly after received the intelligence of the death of his sainted father. Of him, he writes: "So closes the earthly career of my father! Few men have had a more quiet, monotonous life. He had been a local preacher for fifty years, and maintained in every relation of life the most unflinching integrity."

At the commencement of 1867, Mr. Field accompanied the ministers attending the Conference to Tasmania. Whilst enjoying the opportunity of meeting some whom he had known in years gone by, and of association with the leaders of our Israel, the passage to and fro was productive of great misery, and he returned thoroughly prostrate. The first sermon that he heard after his return was upon the thorn in the flesh. He says: "It was to me a time of many tears. I could not but feel how I carried about a thorn—a piercing thorn in my flesh; but oh, I can bear it without a murmur, if God vouchsafe the sufficient grace."

Subsequently he visited Geelong and Colac, and of the kindness and hospitality experienced from the friends at both places he speaks in the highest terms. Whilst at the latter place, his mind was much exercised in reference to a projected arrangement by which he seemed likely to be separated for a season from his beloved wife. It had been partly arranged that he should spend the ensuing winter at Sandhurst, leaving Mrs. Field for a season with kind friends in Melbourne. This, he says, "was presenting itself very painfully, . . . and I was greatly drawn out in prayer that the God Who careth for us would provide for us a suitable home, . . . when an invitation came from the Richmond Quarterly Meeting for me to spend the winter in Hawthorn, taking one service on the Sabbath, and leading a class during the week. . . . I was satisfied it was provided by the Lord. . . . To-day we have arrived at our house, and I anticipate great comfort in it." Little did he think of the dreadful trial that was shortly to befall him there!

Thursday, July 4th, 1867, thus he writes: "This morning, at quarter past ten, my precious Catherine passed away for ever! I could not help indulging the secret hope that, even at the last, when skill and care had done their utmost, God would interpose and have mercy upon her, and not upon her only, but upon me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow. If tender sympathy of friends, and earnest prayers from the Church, could have kept her alive, she had not died! But the decree had gone

THE
NORTHWEST NAZARETH
MELBOURNE, 1867

forth, from which there was no appeal. . . . I am a widower once more—a lonely, desolate widower, with two infant, motherless babes, the last only twenty-one days old! Oh, this is an awful day! Like a crane or a swallow, so did I chatter: I did mourn as a dove: mine eyes fail with looking upwards: O Lord, I am oppressed: undertake for me. What shall I say? He hath both spoken unto me, and Himself hath done it: I shall go softly all my days in the bitterness of my soul. . . . May God sanctify the dispensation! Oh, I do hope I shall be holier for this heavy trial! Dear Kate once said, 'Let us both get better, and live to God as we have never done.' Her opportunities are past! Surely I shall fulfil her desire."

Though thus crushed in spirit and broken in health, he continued to labour on. He had now taken the charge of a candidate for the ministry, whose studies he directed, making it matter of earnest prayer that he might be able to direct him aright; and finding a kind of melancholy pleasure in an undertaking by which his "painful solitude was relieved." He was likewise busily engaged, completing the work, "Handbook of Theology," upon which he had been employed through all his trials and sufferings during the past twelve months. He evinced a lively interest in everything which concerned the welfare of the circuit with which he was now identified, and many there remember with gratitude and pleasure, not only his valuable pulpit exercises, but his visits to their homes, and the kindly sympathetic advices there tendered. Ofttimes he mourns over his want of devotedness to God and His cause; complains of himself for allowing his troubles so to depress him; and stirs himself up by the remembrance of the many mercies still continued. But there is no moroseness, no peevishness, no stoical indifference, no cynical complaining. Thursday, September 24th, 1868, he writes: "My fear is realised at length. I have been struggling on with my preaching engagements, hoping that my voice would improve. But last night, while preaching at Hawthorn, I resolved that I would try no more till I could get through a service with something like comfort. No one can tell what I have suffered in my few last efforts, and instead of gaining attention for my subject, the minds of the hearers have been drawn away in pity for me. After trying to preach last night from Gal. ii. 20, I left with a strong conviction that my public work was done. God knows whether it is so or not. But oh, how thankful I should be if I could see a way of getting bread without attempting that for which I have now become so unfit!" Again the providence of God undertook for His poor suffering servant. An arrangement was entered into by which he removed to the occupancy of the "Home Cottage," and took charge of the *Wesleyan Chronicle* during my absence to visit England for a year.

On Sunday evening, May 30th, 1869, he writes: "Can it be possible that so many months have elapsed since I made an entry here? I have

only attempted to preach four times since September 24th, 1868, and I have now no hope that I shall ever resume my public work. But great changes have occurred since last I wrote. Then I was at Hawthorn; but in the middle of March we came to take possession of Home Cottage, Carlton, while Mr. Symons was in England, whose visit may probably extend over twelve months. I also undertook the editorship of the *Wesleyan Chronicle*, and was truly thankful at having such a means of employing my solitary hours, and of extending an influence for good throughout the colony. My heart burns with anxious desire to make this paper, so long as it is in my hands, a religious power amongst us. But my coming here has not been unattended by suffering. On the 15th of April I attended a breakfast meeting given in the Albert Street Baptist Church schoolroom, in honour of the Rev. Mr. Clarke who had just arrived from England to take the pastorate of that church; and I took a violent cold which kept me shivering all the time I was there. This resulted in a low fever, and though I kept about for a week, everything I did was with great difficulty; and on April 22nd, a walk to Dr. Guntz's house in Collins Street brought on a slight attack of pleurisy. At once I was perfectly prostrate. I went to bed, and remained there several days, not in the least expecting ever to rally. I never felt so sure of death's being at hand as then; and I was led to inquire, 'Is all well? Are my feet upon the Rock?' For two days there was a kind of inward struggle. 'May I,' I inquired, 'commit my soul to the great atonement just as I am, without any more deep feeling than I now possess?' But in the middle of one wakeful night the Blessed Spirit came forth to glorify Christ by revealing to me the fulness and sufficiency of the Saviour's merit. I saw, as I scarcely ever saw before, that the propitiation He offered was full, perfect, and sufficient; that it could not be otherwise as presented by *Him*. But, in connection with that, I saw that the Eternal Father was so well pleased with the oblation of His Son, that He had set Him forth—yes, 'Him hath God set forth' in the holy Gospel as a ground of hope, a way of access, a source of salvation to the whole race of sinful man; and all that was required of me was that I should accept of Jesus as *my* Saviour—take Him as revealed in the Gospel—and commit the keeping of my soul to Him as one who was 'faithful and just' to forgive, sanctify, and lift up to heaven. Oh, what light and power accompanied these revelations to my heart! How I did rejoice to have such a Saviour, and to cast myself in humble faith upon His infinite merits! During the night my brain reeled, and I thought I saw devils pass out of the room saying, with a smile of satisfaction, 'We will come for you again.' I replied, 'Not while Jesus is near.' In fact, from that glad hour Jesus became my all in all. I wanted to hear of nothing and to talk of nothing but Him. And I pray God that I may retain the blessed influences of glorious revelation till the hour of death. I am getting better now, but

303
 North West
 Nampal, India

the shortness of my breath, the cough, the expectoration, etc., tell me it is not for long. But I am not troubled. If I may but live to God, and glorify Jesus by my pen, and be the means of good to all that call upon me, and then pass peacefully to heaven—that will be a glorious finish to an unworthy life.”

His last entry in his diary was made Sunday evening, June 13th, 1869. “My Willie’s birthday! It seems utterly inconceivable that two years can have elapsed since I was in the midst of my great trouble, and that after all that I have passed through I can be so happily circumstanced with my children about me. I do feel devoutly thankful, and upon my bended knees I have been telling my God and Father that I will praise Him for all that is past, and trust Him for all that is to come.”

Writing to his father-in-law, June 18th, Mr. Field says: “I herewith post you another number of the *Chronicle*. I forget whether I have told you that the minister who is the responsible editor of it is in England for a few months, and has left his editorial duties with me. And this is a specimen of my work in my new capacity. Now that Providence has deprived me of all power to preach, or speak in public, I am thankful to have means by my pen of doing good through these columns. And I pray most earnestly that the articles which I write or select may be the means of blessing to hundreds who read the paper.

“I have been very ill since I last wrote to you. I took a serious cold which settled upon me in the form of low fever, and brought me very near eternity. I had no thought of recovering. But I had such a glorious manifestation of Divine mercy to my heart. The great atonement was unveiled before me in all the fulness of its merits, and I felt that I could without a fear commit my everlasting all to the hands of Him Who loved me and gave Himself for me. Oh, what happy hours were those as I lay prostrate with weakness, but ‘looking to Jesus’! I sincerely hope that in your last hours, if you are favoured with reason and memory, you may have a similar blessing. For five weeks I have been gradually improving, and now when quiet at home am scarcely conscious of anything wrong. . . . I am very jealous over myself, less with returning strength I should lose any measure of that blessing which I enjoyed in my illness. Even in my quiet, solitary life, where the greater portion of every day is spent quite alone, I find the need of constant watchfulness and prayer to keep up the fervours of spiritual life. I would be always walking with God, maintaining the faith of the heart in pure and uninterrupted exercise. All my sympathies, afflictions, and desires are with things spiritual and Divine. And I trust that through Him Who ‘liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore,’ I shall find an entrance through the gates into the city.”

One night, shortly before his death, he was awakened by a violent fit of coughing, which was followed by considerable hæmorrhage. His

faithful attendant was soon with him, and found him bathed in blood. Looking at her he faintly murmured, "It is come at last!" Medical aid was sought, and again death seemed to ungrasp his fainting prey. A few days of perfect quiet, and he was again able to rise from his bed, and engaged in what had now become an interesting employment to him, preparing for the next number of the *Chronicle*. On the evening of Wednesday, September 1st, he assembled his little ones around him for the last time. After tea, as they were retiring, one observed, "We will have tea together again to-morrow night, won't we, papa?" He briefly but significantly replied, "We must only live one day at the time." With a friend who called to see him he conversed cheerfully and hopefully during the evening, and then shortly after ten o'clock requested that a portion of Scripture might be read to him, and the 335th and 336th hymns in the Wesleyan collection. He then retired to his room, and had been in bed about half an hour when he was heard to knock for assistance. His housekeeper and son were immediately with him. The hæmorrhage had returned. There was a minute or so of apparent consciousness, and then the freed spirit, liberated from his frail suffering companion, bid a final farewell to trials, disappointments, and distresses, to weakness and weariness, to anguish and tears, for ever.

"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth : Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours."

The funeral took place on Saturday, September 4th. At two o'clock the procession accompanying the body moved from the "Home Cottage," Carlton, to Wesley Church, Lonsdale Street, where, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, a large congregation, sufficient to fill the body of the spacious church, had assembled, anxious to testify their respect for the lamented deceased. The Rev. J. Bickford, superintendent of the circuit, read portions of Scripture from Psalm xc. and 1 Cor. xv., after which the Rev. J. S. Waugh, chairman of the district, gave out a portion of the fifty-first hymn, delivered a short address, and offered prayer. The body was then removed to the hearse, and the funeral *cortège*, which was a very large one, again formed, and moved to the general cemetery. Upon arrival at the cemetery, the Rev. John Eggleston read portions of the burial service, and the body was lowered into the grave in which repose the remains of the late Mrs. Field; after which the Rev. George Daniel gave out two verses of the forty-first hymn, and engaged in prayer. After a sorrowful glance at the adjoining grave, in which lie the remains of the lately martyred Rev. W. Hill, silently and sadly the company dispersed, with thoughts in many cases, doubtless, raised to those scenes

"Where glorified spirits, by sight,
Converse in their holy abode ;

As stars in the firmament bright,
And pure as the angels of God."

On Friday evening, September 10th, a funeral sermon was preached in Wesley Church, Lonsdale Street, by the Rev. J. Bickford. The church was well filled, most of the Melbourne Wesleyan ministers being present, and many of the friends by whom Mr. Field had been known having come in from miles around the city. During the reading of the obituary notice many a breast heaved with deep emotion, and the tears of genuine sympathy bedewed many cheeks.

Mr. Field was a man who by his piety and earnestness was very successful in winning souls to Christ, and was greatly beloved. I have received numerous testimonies to this in various parts which I have visited in England. I never met with any one who, coming an entire stranger as he did into a strange land, so fully and so quickly gained the affection and love of the people; and surely, no one was ever so kindly and affectionately treated as he was by the Victorian Methodists. His unmistakable piety, his love for the cause of God, and yearning for souls, his superior pulpit abilities, his physical weakness, his accumulated sorrows, all conspired to draw towards him the warmest sympathy and Christian benevolence of all who knew him. Before the publication of the Handbook he had written a memoir of his sister, Mrs. Martin, of Sevenoaks; and also an admirable little tractate, "The Penitent's Enquiry," which has had a large circulation both in England and Australia.

Mr. Field was married twice. One son, about eighteen years of age, of the first, and a daughter and son, both very young, by the second wife, are left orphans. By the care and aid of their relatives, and the contributions of their colonial friends, they will be provided for. It is also hoped that from the sale of this volume some assistance may be rendered towards the support of the orphan children.

JOHN C. SYMONS.

LONDON,
December 24th, 1869.

INTRODUCTION.

The present work owes its existence to the following circumstances. The writer, under the pressure of physical weakness, was laid aside from the work of the itinerancy, in which for twenty years he had enjoyed many blessings, and, as he would humbly hope, had led many a soul to the enjoyment of the great salvation. On arriving in Australia, in search of health, it was suggested to him by the Rev. J. C. Symons that a pleasing and profitable occupation of his leisure hours would be the preparation of a work especially designed to benefit young students, whether Sunday School teachers, local preachers, or candidates for the ministry, who have few books and little time for reading, but who yet are anxiously desirous to understand "those things which are most surely believed among us," and to see the scriptural proofs by which they are sustained. On the subject being mentioned to other ministerial brethren, it was agreed by them all that such a work was greatly needed, nothing having yet appeared that seemed exactly to meet the requirements of the class above indicated.

To this task, therefore, the writer has devoted himself. His aim has been to give, in the simplest language, a summary of those grand and essential verities which are comprised in the Theology of the Wesleyan Methodists. All our standard authors have been consulted, and their definitions and arguments quoted, or their teachings summarised, as seemed desirable for the elucidation of the subjects in hand. And as no one can fully appreciate the proofs upon which our Theology is based, unless he has an acquaintance with the heresies that have sprung up in the Church, a brief account of those heresies and their advocates has been presented in connection with the doctrines which they have aimed to subvert. The form of question and answer has been adopted for the purpose of simplifying and bringing into prominence each particular point that is deserving of attention.

Some who peruse the book may, perhaps, regret that the passages of Scripture referred to are not given at length. It is conceded that in that case the book could have been read much more quickly, but whether

with greater benefit is very doubtful. It is an indescribable advantage to one who is beginning the study of Theology to have his own Bible at hand, to search out every passage for himself, and to ponder its bearing upon the doctrine for the confirmation of which it is quoted. The time lost by this method is far more than compensated by the deep impression which the truth has made upon the mind; besides which, the memory soon becomes a Scripture "concordance," furnishing in an instant the chapter and verse of any particular passage that may be discussed. The writer would earnestly advise every young student to try this method for himself, and he ventures to predict that in less than twelve months he will be surprised at the amount of Biblical truth that is indelibly written upon his mind.

It is probable that some of the readers of this book may be looking forward with anxiety to an examination before a Church Court, preparatory to their being admitted into the ranks of local preachers or ministers of the Wesleyan Church, and the writer would gladly afford them a brother's helping hand. What is to be done that such an examination may be passed creditably and with success? Most earnestly would he recommend that no pains be spared in order that every subject be thoroughly *understood*. It is humiliating to see the memory "crammed," while the understanding is dormant. Employ the memory to its utmost extent for the correct quotation of God's Holy Word; but rest not satisfied without the clearest apprehension of every doctrine discussed, and of every definition given. He would also advise that the present work should be regarded as but introductory to the perusal of our great standard authors. As time and opportunity allow, read with all possible diligence the works of Wesley, Fletcher, Watson, Bishop Pearson, etc., and thus lay up a good foundation against the time to come.

Every superintendent of a circuit and chairman of a district has his own particular mode of presenting the questions for the examination of young men. But there is little variety as to the subjects introduced. And if the candidate be prepared to give prompt, brief, intelligent answers to the following questions, supporting them with appropriate Scripture proofs, all things being equal, the result need not be feared:—

1. Define Inspiration.
2. Quote those passages in which the Bible declares itself to be inspired.
3. What are the direct evidences in authentication of the Bible as a Divine revelation?
4. What are the presumptive evidences?
5. What are the collateral evidences?
6. Define the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

How does this differ from Tritheism?

How does it differ from Sabellianism ?

How does it differ from Arianism ?

Who was Sabellius ?

Who was Arius ?

7. Quote a few passages which clearly teach the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.
8. What is the outline of evidence to prove the Divinity of Christ ?
9. Quote a few of the most striking passages that teach this doctrine.
10. What is meant by the *Divine* Sonship of Christ ?
11. How is this doctrine proved from Scripture ?
12. What is the meaning of the word "Person" ?
13. What is the outline of evidence to prove the personality of the Holy Spirit ?
14. Quote a few of the most striking passages that teach this doctrine.
15. What is the outline of evidence to prove the Divinity of the Spirit ?
16. Quote a few of the passages that teach this doctrine.
17. What was the image of God in Man ?
18. What do you understand by "Original Sin" ?
19. What do you understand by hereditary guilt ?
20. Prove from Scripture that guilt is transmitted from Adam to his posterity.
21. Prove from Scripture that man has a depraved nature.
22. Prove that this depravity is *universal*.
23. Prove that this depravity is *total*.
24. Prove that it is transmitted from Adam.
25. What is redemption ?
26. Prove that the death of Christ was strictly a sacrifice for *sin*.
27. Prove that the death of Christ was universal in its provisions.
28. What is repentance ?
29. How is your definition supported by Scripture ?
30. Is repentance the gift of God ?
Is it the act and duty of man ?
31. What is saving faith ?
How does Mr. Wesley define it ?
What is Dr. Bunting's definition ?
32. Prove that faith is the gift of God and the act of *man*.
33. What is justification ?
How does Mr. Wesley define it ?
34. Prove from Scripture that it is substantially the same as *pardon*.
35. Does it not signify more than *pardon* ?
36. What is adoption ?
37. Under what aspect is God regarded in the blessings of *pardon*,
justification, and adoption ?
38. What is the witness of the Spirit ?

THE
 NORTHWESTERN
 UNIVERSITY
 LIBRARY
 CHICAGO, ILL.

What is Mr. Wesley's definition ?

39. What is regeneration ?

How does it differ from justification ?

40. Justification, the witness of the Spirit, and regeneration are received at the same moment ; but is there not, in the order of thinking a succession of one to the other ? and between the two latter is there not a relation resembling that of cause and effect ?

41. What is the witness of our own spirit ?

42. What is entire sanctification ?

43. Is this attainable by all believers in the present life ?

44. May a Christian believer fall from grace, and be lost ?

45. In the general resurrection, will the same body, in the popular sense of the term, be raised again ?

46. Will the punishment of the wicked in the future state be strictly and literally eternal ?

47. Is the Christian Sabbath a Divine institution of perpetual and universal obligation ?

48. What is a Sacrament ?

49. How many sacraments are there ?

Such an array of questions may appear somewhat alarming to a young man who has but just began to study Theology ; but no one is fitted to be an expounder and a teacher of the Word of God who does not clearly understand, and is not prepared to defend, these momentous truths. There is, therefore, no time to be lost. The whole powers of the mind must be turned to the Bible, and to Bible truth. The leisure hours of night and morning must be carefully improved for the one great object of making you "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." Prayer, earnest, persevering prayer, must be daily offered up to God for the light and influence of the Holy Ghost ; and you will find, what thousands have found before, that prayerful, plodding industry will be crowned with the effectual blessing of God.

Young men, my labour is now commended to you. My prayer is that it may help you in your first efforts to grasp the truth and to make it known to others. And to each one who reads these pages I exhort :—"Meditate upon these things ; giving thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine ; continue in them ; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."

HAWTHORN, VICTORIA,

October 20th, 1868.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
RECOMMENDATORY PREFACE	v
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF REV. B. FIELD	xiii
INTRODUCTORY	i
CHAPTER I. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD	9
" II. DIVINE REVELATION	23
" III. INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES	53
" IV. DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY	82
SEC. 1. Nature and Attributes of God	82
" 2. Triune Jehovah	86
" 3. Supreme Divinity of Christ	93
" 4. Divine Sonship of Christ	111
" 5. Personality and Deity of Holy Ghost	120
" V. CREATION OF THE WORLD	123
" VI. MAN, HIS ORIGINAL STATE AND FALL	140
" VII. THE ATONEMENT	156
" VIII. THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT	17
" IX. REPENTANCE	193
" X. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH	197
" XI. ADOPTION AND THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT	208
" XII. REGENERATION; OR, THE NEW BIRTH	216
" XIII. CHRISTIAN PERFECTION; OR, ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION	224
" XIV. FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS	242
" XV. SECOND COMING OF CHRIST	247

	PAGE
CHAPTER XVI . RESURRECTION OF THE BODY	267
„ XVII. THE GENERAL JUDGMENT	277
„ XVIII. DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENTS	283
„ XIX. THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH	292
„ XX. THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS	305
SEC. 1. General view	305
„ 2. Baptism	308
„ 3. Lord's Supper	319
INDEX	325
TEXTS REFERRED TO AND EXPLAINED	333
SYSTEMS REFERRED TO, AND THEIR TENETS DESCRIBED IN THIS VOLUME	338
AUTHORS REFERRED TO, AND THEIR CHARACTER AND WORKS DESCRIBED	338

INTRODUCTORY.

I.—What is Theology?

Theology means literally discourse concerning the gods; thus Hesiod, Homer, Plato, and others were called theologians, because their writings contained so much about the gods. The word is from *Theos*=God, and *logos*=a discourse; it was adopted by the Christian Fathers, and applied to biblical truth. The word is variously defined as "The science of God;" "The science of the supernatural;" "The science of religion;" "The science which treats of the existence, character, and attributes of God, His laws and government, the doctrines we are to believe, and the duties we are to practise."

II.—What is Religion?

The word is derived from the Latin *relegere*=to reconsider, or from *religare*=to bind fast; the latter is the more generally accepted derivation. It is "the disposition and conduct of man, impelled by motives of hopes and fears, towards a power conceived as above man; or as the active and passive relations of the finite consciousness towards an unknown; or as the recognition of the relation of man to the invisible."

III.—What is Religion as revealed in the Sacred Scriptures, or, as it is sometimes called, Supernatural Religion?

"Religion is the life of man in personal communication with

¹ Mulford's "The Republic of God," 5th edition, p. 40. Max Müller defines religion as "A mental faculty which, independent of, nay, in spite of, sense and reason, enables man to apprehend the infinite under different names and under varying disguises." "An intuition of God, a sense of human weakness and dependence, a belief in Divine government of the world, a distinction between good and evil, and a hope of a better life, these are some of the radical elements of all religions." Herbert Spencer says, "Religion may be defined as an *a priori* theory of the universe" ("First Principles," pp. 43, 44). Matthew Arnold's definition is, "Religion is morality touched with emotion" ("Literature and Dogma," Popular Edition, p. 16).

God."¹ "An acknowledgment of our duties towards the law of God.) The recognition of all our duties as if they were Divine commands." "It is strictly the bond" (*religare*) "which, in the very constitution of his nature, unites man to God, faith 'that He is,' and consciousness of dependence and obligation."² Religion has its seat in the heart; its presence there is exhibited in a godlike life. It is the life of God in the soul of man manifesting itself daily in practical morality; separation between personal religion and practical morality is impossible.

IV.—Is not the term Religion often used to describe the truths which it teaches, as well as the conduct which it requires?

It is frequently used in this sense. With the first Christians, Christianity (meaning thereby the truths and doctrines of Christianity) and religion were identical. The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, were directed to prove that Christianity, as taught in the Sacred Scriptures, was the only religion which could satisfy man's spiritual wants.

V. Was there no Religion before Divine Revelation?

The revelation of God to man is twofold, Natural and Supernatural. The great book of nature has always been open to the study of man, and from it he has been able to learn the existence of a Supreme Being, upon whom he is dependent, and to whom he owes obedience and worship.³ This is called natural religion. Christianity is one of many religions; but of all these it is the one most worthy of God, if, indeed, it is not the only one worthy of Him.⁴

VI. What is the distinction between Religion and Theology?

1. *Religion* is experimental, and has reference to the heart and life; *Theology* is scientific. A theologian may be acquainted intellectually with systematic religious knowledge without possessing religion.⁵ A religious man is a theologian so far as his knowledge of God, His nature, His will, and His word are correct.

2. *Natural Theology* treats of the Being, attributes, and superinten-

¹ Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," p. 76. See Gen. v. 24, xv. 1, xvii. 1, xxii. 12; also Deut. vi. 5; Hab. ii. 4; Rom. xii. 1; James i. 27.

² Kant.

³ Pope's "Higher Catechism of Theology."

⁴ Rom. i. 19-21; Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 23-29.

⁵ Religion in ordinary language is used (a) as indicating the object or subject of belief; (b) as the power of belief; (c) as the manifestation of belief. Thus, we believe religious truth; we experience religious feelings or emotions; we live religious lives. The mental faculty which lies at the root of religion appears to be universal; for in some sort man universally recognises some object of belief and worship, and a definite course of life and conduct, as the result of that belief. Plutarch says: "A city without a temple, without worship, without prayers, no one ever saw." Cicero writes: "There never was any nation so barbarous, nor any people in the world so savage, as to be without some notion of gods; . . . this is to be looked upon as a law of nature." This is true of the most degraded tribes to-day.

⁶ See Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual Word," pp. 36-65.

dence of God, as these are taught by nature. "It is the knowledge of God from His works by the light of nature."

3. *Christian Theology*—or Theology proper—deals with: (1) The evidences which prove the Sacred Scriptures to be a divinely-inspired revelation to man; (2) The proper interpretation of these Scriptures; (3) The discoveries which they make to us of God, His nature, attributes, relations to, and dealings with, man; (4) Of man, his relations and duties to God and to his fellow-men; (5) Of the future life, with its rewards and punishments.)

VII.—What are the sources of this Theology?

1. *Reason*¹ is an original faculty given by God to individual man, and no *supra*-natural revelation can be given which is not addressed to him (a) As a rational being, and through the channel of his reason; and (b) As consistent with the unbiased deductions of reason, *acting legitimately* within its own sphere.

2. But reason has, by all experience, been *proved to be insufficient to guide man* as to his life and conduct; God has, therefore, put into our hands a supernatural and sufficient revelation of Himself, and the relations which He bears to us, and we to Him. It follows, therefore, that the ground and source of our theological knowledge is His inspired word, as revealed to us in the Sacred Scriptures.

3. Nevertheless, as this revelation is addressed to our understanding (including heart and conscience), its evidences are to be judged and authenticated by our intellectual faculties, and the record itself interpreted by our reason, according to its own laws.

VIII.—Is there not a danger of reason diverging into Rationalism?

There certainly is; and this is one of the great perils of the present day, and of modern criticism. By reason is meant that faculty of the human mind by which man arrives at truth without any super-sensuous aid: this implies his understanding, conscience, and experience, all acting under natural circumstances.²

The use of this faculty of reason in matters of religion is: 1. To examine and decide upon the evidences of Divine revelation; 2. To ascertain—by the application of the established laws of interpretation to the sacred writings—what are the truths therein revealed; 3. Having determined that certain truths and doctrines are revealed, to accept them upon the authority of God, even though they may be mysterious, or may appear not to be in accordance with human wisdom. "The question in regard to any fact [or doctrine] is not, is it reasonable? but first of all, is it clearly established?" That

¹ "The faculty of ideas, not separate from, but most closely united with, the heart and conscience."

² "Reason is that intellectual power by which we apprehend and discover truth, whether contained in the first principles of belief, or in the arguments and conclusions from these principles, by which truth not intuitive is investigated."
—Oostersee.

being so, the province of reason ceases, and faith comes in; reason cannot pronounce upon the reasonableness or otherwise of any statement of Divine revelation which reason itself has decided to be "clearly revealed" in Scripture.¹ "To improve revelation by means of reason," says Dr. John Duncan, "appears to me just as if I were to try and set the sun by my old wooden clock."

IX.—What is Rationalism?

1. *Rationalism* strictly so called is the dogma which insists that there is no higher source of knowledge than reason. It involves the denial of Divine revelation in the proper sense of the word, and, of course, rejects miracles and prophecy. Hence Inspiration is either denied, or regarded as "the enthusiasm of genius;" the Scriptures are reduced to the level of other writings of genius; what in them appears to be miraculous or supernatural is interpreted as the result of natural laws.²

2. In a wider sense Rationalism embraces the various forms of scepticism and unbelief which are held by those who deny supernatural knowledge.

X. What are the principal forms which Rationalism has taken?

Pantheism, Agnosticism, Positivism, Secularism, Materialism, Deism, Atheism.

1. *Pantheism*—from *Pan* = all, and *theos* = God—is "the doctrine that God includes all reality, and is identical with it, nothing besides Him really existing. He is the One and the All."³ "Besides God no substance can exist, or be conceived to exist."⁴ "All is God," or "God is All." "The Universe is God," or "God is the Universe." The God of Pantheism is not a Being—who can will, and think, and love,—but an essence pervading and permeating all things; which can be no object of trust, or love, or worship. It is a kind of Atheism, which makes God and the universe identical, and, consequently, denies the existence of a personal God, and His superintendence and sovereignty over the universe.⁵

2. *Positivism* teaches: (1) That all our knowledge is confined to physical phenomena; (2) That we can only know that such phenomena are, and the relations which we stand to them, which relations are all included under the head of sequence and resemblance. "The senses are the true source of all thinking, and we can know nothing except the phenomena which they apprehend,

¹ See Watson's "Institutes," pt. i., chap. ix., "On the Use and Limit of Reason." "Finite reason must submit itself to infinite; the never-fully educated human understanding, limited by time, matter, and individuality, must yield to the perfect truth which comes from God; a judgment which is subject to vacillations and disturbances to one that is ever settled and abiding" (Christlieb's "Modern Doubt," p. 130).

² See Christlieb's "Modern Doubt," pp. 125, 507, etc.

³ Manning.

⁴ Spinoza.

⁵ Herbert Spencer's "Infinite and Eternal Energy by which all things exist," is unquestionably Pantheism.

and the relation and sequence in which these phenomena stand to each other. Mental phenomena can all be resolved into material phenomena, and there is no such thing discoverable as either an origin or purpose in the world, as consequently either a creative or providential intelligence." Respecting the existence of God, or a future state, it is contended that "the mind should absolutely refuse to believe or disbelieve on such a subject. Positivism, however, has constructed a kind of religion which has its "*Grand Être*" in collective humanity, or "the continuous resultant of all the forces capable of voluntarily concurring in the universal perfecting of the world"—whatever this may mean.¹

3. *Agnosticism*, from *Agnostos* = unknown—the inscription upon the altar at Athens, referred to by St. Paul;² in plain English it means "ignorance." An Agnostic is avowedly a "know-nothing" in religion. He holds that the existence of anything beyond and behind phenomena is unknown, and (so far as can be judged) unknowable; and especially that a First Cause and an unseen world are subjects of which we know, and can know, nothing. The term was first applied by Professor Huxley to himself and others,³ who, while not denying the existence of an Intelligent First Cause and a supernatural revelation, yet insist that we do not know anything about these and cognate subjects, and that we have no means of knowing; both because we have no faculties capable of understanding such things, and that there are no methods by which they could be communicated to us. If there be a God, He is unknowable; and so with regard to Divine revelation and immortality. "As to another life after the dissolution of the body," we are told, "no Agnostic would categorically deny it; but one thing he will not do: he will not pretend to know, nor profess a belief in, absurdities and contradictions, even though the act be dignified with the sacred name of faith."⁴ "The Agnostic neither denies nor affirms God. He simply puts Him on one side."

4. *Secularism* does not say with the Agnostic that God, an unseen world, and a future state cannot be known; but that so little can be known about them that it is our wisdom to give attention chiefly to the present life. "Putting the two worlds into two

¹ Private adoration is to be addressed to collective humanity in the persons of worthy individual representatives, who may be either living or dead, but must in all cases be women; for women being *sexu aiment*, represent the best attribute of humanity, that which ought to regulate all human life; nor can Humanity be symbolised in any form but that of a woman." "Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy," by James McCosh, LL.D., p. 400. This is an able criticism of, and reply to, the Positive Philosophy of Comte, and his disciple J. S. Mill. See also an able exposition and answer to Positivism, by Rev. William Arthur, "Religion without God, and God without Religion," part i., "Positivism and Mr. Frederick Harrison."

² See Acts xvii. 23.

³ See "The New English Dictionary," by Dr. J. A. Murray: "Agnostic."

⁴ "Of all the senseless babble I have ever had occasion to read, the demonstrations of those philosophers who undertake to tell us all about the nature of God would be the worst, if they were not surpassed by the still greater absurdities of those philosophers who try to prove that there is no God."—Huxley's "Science and Culture," p. 241.

scales of value, the Secularist finds (or thinks he finds) that the one weighs much, the other either nothing, or nothing that can be appreciated." "The old policy of sacrificing the welfare of humanity on earth to the merely possible and altogether unknown requirements beyond the grave" the Secularist regards as absurd. Secularism assumes that God and a future state are so visionary, that faith in them, and concern about them, is opposed to "the welfare of humanity on earth."¹

5. *Materialism* recognises nothing but matter, and denies the existence of Spirit or of a spiritual world. The soul is but the result of a peculiar organisation of matter; the operations of mind are merely the effect of material forces; there is no existence beyond the grave, and, therefore, no moral accountability. Matter and force are the only entities, and these are sufficient to solve all the problems of the universe. "The fundamental affirmation of Materialism is, that all the phenomena of the Universe—physical, vital, and mental—are to be referred to unintelligent physical forces; and its fundamental negation is, that there is no such objective entity of mind or spirit."²

6. *Deism* is a belief in the existence of a personal God, but a denial of the necessity and fact of Divine revelation; together with the assertion that the light of nature and reason are sufficient guides for man's belief and practice. Of course, in such a theory Christianity is ignored.³ *Deist* and *Theist* have etymologically the same meaning—the former from the Latin, the latter from the Greek,—but they differ widely in their use. *Theist* is applied to any believer in God, whether he is a Christian, a Jew, or a Mohammedan; while a *Deist* is one who believes in God, but who disbelieves in Christianity, or, more accurately, who disbelieves in any supernatural revelation.

7. *Atheism*—without God. The absolute denial of a God, or an intelligent First Cause, or of a superintending providence. Whatever difficulty there may be in demonstrating the existence of God, it is not conceivable that proof can be found to justify the declaration "There is no God." Unless a man knows all things, he cannot know that the Being whose existence he rejects does not exist."⁴

The *Materialist* is necessarily an *Atheist*, though he will probably not admit it. The *Secularist* may be a *Theist*, but many avow themselves *Atheists*.⁵ The *Agnostic*, and the *Positivist*—who

¹ Secularism is so protean that it is impossible in brief space to give any exact definition of its teachings or creed. It may be best described as Ancient Epicureanism under a new name and garb (1 Cor. xv. 32). See an admirable lecture by Rev. A. J. Harrison, on "Secularism and Atheism," in "Popular Objections to Revealed Truth." Hodge.

² See Leland's "View of the Deistical Writers;" Watson's "Apology for the Bible;" Leslie's "Short and Easy Method with Deists." John Foster.

³ Bradlaugh says, "Although at present it may be perfectly true that all men who are Secularists are not yet Atheists, I put it to you as also perfectly true that, in my opinion, the logical consequence of the acceptance of Secularism must be that the man gets to Atheism, if he has 'brains enough to comprehend.'" "Debate with Holyoake," p. 16.

is in fact simply a systematic Agnostic—are not theoretically *Atheists*, yet their teachings lead almost directly to that goal.

Replies to all these systems of rationalistic unbelief will be found—practically in the arguments—in Chaps. I. and V., which see.

XI.—In what sense can Theology be called a Science?

Science means knowledge systematised. By science here is meant "accurate, well-founded, and well-ordered knowledge, in whatever manner that knowledge is acquired." The knowledge gained by faith has a right to be considered scientific, if it be well founded and systematised, as truly as that which comes from observation and reasoning. Its subject matter cannot be mathematically demonstrated, but in its own domain its truths are capable of moral demonstration; certitude is reached by a different process, but one which—in its own sphere—is quite as satisfactory as that of mathematics. It is a science of faith, not of credulity; its evidences are moral, probable, ontological, demonstrative; its arguments are analogical and inferential; "but it is the great business of life to draw inferences, and an inference, whether in Science or Religion, is an exercise of faith, and can be nothing else."¹

XII.—What is Dogma?

1. The term *Dogma* is from the Greek *dokēō* = to think; it is used to denote the form in which truth is presented or apprehended. It is synonymous with formula, canon, tenet, opinion. It is commonly used to signify an arbitrary article of faith; but that is neither its original, nor its correct meaning.²

2. In its ancient use it had two distinct meanings: one in the Old Testament translated by the LXX., and in the New Testament; the other in philosophical writings. In the *former* it meant a decree, or ordinance, *i.e.*, a command as to conduct or observance, either of human or Divine authority, as in Dan. ii. 13, 15, vi. 9; ³ Luke ii. 1; Acts xvii. 7; or Acts xvi. 4; Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14. In the *latter* meaning, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, and others used the word to describe the doctrines and theories formulated and taught by different schools of philosophy. In this latter sense the word came to be used by the early Christian writers, as describing either heathen, Christian, or heretical teaching, as the case might be.

3. Dogma is not peculiar to Theology or religion. All sciences—physical, mathematical, logical—have their dogmas, some of these arise from axioms, others from the results of observation and experiment. The rules and formulas of Arithmetic, Geometry, Chemistry,

¹ It is a great mistake to speak of "Science as inductive and Theology as deductive. No science is verified till we can reason deductively from an inductive discovery. We have no right to call it a law till we can rigorously apply it, and account for its apparent exceptions. In the same way Theology is only the deductive application of certain inductive discoveries in the open page of God's Word." See also Murphy's "The Scientific Basis of Faith," pp. 22-35, 91-106.

² See "The Encyclopædic Dictionary," articles "Dogma" and "Doctrine."

³ Revised Version, "Interdict."

Logic, are so many dogmas or canons, which have, at least in the beginning, to be accepted upon authority.

XIII.—What is Dogmatic Theology?

This designation was first given to Theology by a German divine in 1724. It is that branch of theology which systematises the dogmas or doctrines of Divine revelation, and which sets them forth in the form of a connected doctrinal system. Doctrine and Dogma are in most instances convertible terms. Dogmatic Theology includes:—

1. *Biblical Theology*, which embraces textual criticism, exegesis or hermeneutics, archæology, scriptural geography, history, etc.

2. *Historical Theology*, comprising ecclesiastical history, the progress and development of doctrines, and all that belongs to the external as well as the internal life of the Church.

3. *Systematic Theology*, which comprehends all the foregoing: it takes the system of doctrines as its basis, verifies it by Scripture, and illustrates it from history.¹

XIV.—In what form has Dogmatic Theology been presented?

Chiefly by Ancient Creeds and Confessions: *e.g.*,

1. The Apostles' Creed (so-called). The Nicene, A.D. 325. The Athanasian, *circa* A.D. 600.

2. The Confessions, or formularies of various Churches, viz., (a) The Lutheran, in the Augsburg Confession, A.D. 1530; (b) The Reformed or Calvinistic, in the Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1564; (c) The Presbyterian, in the Westminster Confession and Catechism, A.D. 1647; (d) The Anglican, in the Thirty-nine Articles; (e) The Arminian, in the Remonstrants' Confession, A.D. 1620; (f) The Wesleyan (English) in Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament," and certain of his sermons: (American) Wesley's "Abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles."

3. The Creeds and Councils of the Roman, and Russian (or Greek) Churches.

¹ Pope's "Compendium of Christian Theology," vol. i., pp. 27, 28. See "Is Dogma a Necessity?" by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

I. What is the relation of the existence of God to Theology?

The first and greatest question in Religion and Theology is—Have we sufficient grounds for believing in the existence of an Intelligent First Cause? Belief in God is the foundation of all religion. If we have not sufficient reason for this belief, then such questions as, "Is Revelation credible?" "Are miracles possible?" "Is prayer reasonable?"—everything, in fact, relating to man, the laws to which he may be subject, the authority of the Scriptures, his life here or hereafter—may be dismissed as of little or no consequence. If we have not sufficient evidence of the existence of God, moral accountability has no existence, personal immortality is a myth, and all that is included in the idea of religion is utterly destroyed.

Two theories are before the world: the one *Materialistic*,¹ the other *Theistic*. According to the *former* "the original, fundamental constitutive power in the universe is blind force," or "energy." According to the *latter* "it is a living, intelligent, personal God." Neither of these theories can be mathematically demonstrated. All that can be done in either case is to deduce from the examination of nature the existence of some power outside and beyond nature, as necessary to explain its various facts and phenomena. Which of these theories is the more reasonable? Which best explains the mysteries of the universe, of both matter and mind? Which is supported by the best and most convincing evidence? Which has the highest claims to be accepted?

This is the problem to be considered in this chapter; and though it is not possible to afford a complete solution, yet, so far as our limits permit, we hope to show that Theism offers the only, and the sufficient, explanation of the "Power,"² or "Force,"³ or "energy,"⁴ or "a double-faced somewhat"⁵ which Materialists, Agnostics, and Pantheists all recognise in the Universe.

II. How can we define the term "God"?

As that infinitely great, intelligent, holy Being, of perfect wisdom,

¹ Agnosticism and Positivism are Atheistic; though we must not be understood as saying that Agnostics and Positivists are Atheists.

² Tyndall.

³ Herbert Spencer.

⁴ Huxley and Büchner.

⁵ Bain.

power, and goodness, transcendently glorious, the Creator of the universe, who preserves it by His providence, and governs it according to His laws.¹ The name is derived from the Icelandic *Godi*—the Supreme Magistrate, which perfectly agrees with the scriptural name Jehovah, as the moral governor of the Universe. Dr. A. Clarke derives the word from the Anglo-Saxon, as synonymous with *good*; this is denied by Max Müller and others. Some trace the word to the Hebrew *eched* = unus = "The One Being."

III. By what names is God revealed to us in the Sacred Scriptures?

1. *Elohim* = "adorable," "strong." This name is usually plural, or used with plural adjuncts. The Christian Fathers held this to indicate a plurality of persons in the Godhead,—a belief which appears to be well founded, and which is still held.² The name is sometimes applied to angels (Psalm viii. 5, ciii. 20, 21); to magistrates or rulers (Psalm lxxxii. 6, 7); to heathen deities (Psalm xcvi. 5; Jer. x. 11).

2. *Jehovah* (or Yahveh or Iaheve), translated "Lord," and printed in capitals in the Authorised Version = "Self-Existent;" "The Being;" "I Am;" "I Am that I Am" (Exod. iii. 14). This name is never used except when applied to the Divine Being.

3. *El-Shaddai* or *Shaddai* = "The Strong;" "The Mighty One;" "Almighty;" "All-sufficient."

4. *Adoni*, or *Adon* = "Lord;" "Supporter;" "Judge;" "Master."

5. *El-Elyon* = "The Most High;" "The Supreme."

6. *Elyeh* = "I Am;" "I will Be."⁴

IV. What is Personality as applied to God?

It means that He is a living Being, possessing and exercising the functions of a rational and intelligent nature. He is some-one, not some-thing,—a self-conscious some-one, who can exercise volition, intelligence, approval or disapproval; in other words, a Being who possesses natural and moral attributes.

The personality of God does not involve limitation; it is the same as personality in man, only that, instead of being finite, it is infinite. "Perfect personality is to be found only in God, while in all finite spirits there exists only a weak imitation of personality."⁵ Herbert Spencer, the Positivists, and Agnostics, argue that personality and absolute existence are contradictions; that, if God be a person, He cannot be Infinite. The mistake here is, that human personality is made the standard of comparison, whereas human personality is only a limited copy of the real—the unlimited—personality of God. Man is made in the image of God; not God the extended image of man.⁶

¹ See also the Westminster Catechism and the Wesleyan Catechism.

² See Watson's and Farrar's Biblical Dictionaries.

³ See pp. 189, 190.

⁴ For the passages where these and other names of God are used, see Young's Analytical Concordance of the Bible or some other concordance. Also Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia, 3rd edition.

⁵ Lotze.

⁶ The true scriptural idea is not that of "a magnified man," as Matthew Arnold characterises it.

"God is a person; the chief attribute of God is freedom. He is the self-determined One, His determination is the perfect manifestation of Himself; this is the significance of the Will of God; the holiness of God is the central principle in that Will, the principle in which cannot become other than Himself; the righteousness of God is the expression of a person towards those who are persons."¹

"We know God as a person; but we feel that our conception of personality does not adequately represent the whole being of God." Even when aided by the revelation that God gives of Himself in His word, our conception can only be partial, though accurate.

"The Universe is a *thought* as well as a *thing*. As fraught with design it reveals thought as well as force. The thought includes the origination of the forces and their law, as well as the combination and use of them. These thoughts must include the whole universe. It follows, then, that the universe is controlled by a single thought, or the think of a single thinker."² A thinker is a person.

V.—What are the sources of our knowledge of God as a Person?

1. *Intuition.*³ The idea of a Being above and superior to man, and by whom all things exist, is born with him. So far as is known, there is not, and there never has been, any tribe or people who have not had some conception of God, however rude and visionary.⁴ "The concept of God is the revelation of Himself to the human soul."⁵ "Man has by nature an original deep-rooted sense of God's presence which precedes all observation and reasoning."⁶ "The belief in God . . . is an instinct. . . . There is a knowledge of God which all men have." "But our intuition or intuitive knowledge of God cannot be defined."⁷

"The intuition which demands a cause for every effect is satisfied when it reaches a Being with power adequate to the whole effect; and if on the contemplation of the nature of that Being we find no mark of His being an effect, the intuition makes no call for us to go further."⁸ "There are certain truths which the mind perceives to be true, without proof or testimony. Such are the axioms of Geometry, and such is the principle that every effect must have its cause; . . . this conviction is said to be an innate truth, . . . because

¹ Mulford's "Republic of God," pp. 33, also 22-31. Said Daniel Webster, "The greatest thought that ever entered my mind was my personal responsibility to a personal God."

² Porter's "Human Intellect." Descartes said, "I think, therefore I am a person. And I must have been brought into existence by a being at least as perfect as I am, for the fountain cannot rise higher than its source." See Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics."

³ Sometimes called the Historical Argument, or the Consensus Genitum.

⁴ See p. 2, note.

⁵ St. Paul assumes this as a truth self-evident to their consciousness, when addressing the Athenians and others. Acts xiv. 15-17, xvii. 24-29; Rom. i. 18-21, ii. 14, etc. * Oosterzee. * Dr. John Duncan.

⁶ McCosh. See also Pope's "Higher Catechism of Theology," p. 86; Jackson's "Philosophy of Natural Theology," chap. iv.; Winchell's "Science and Religion," pp. 265-67.

such is the nature of the mind that it cannot but see such things to be true."¹

"Within the range of every individual's momentary experience there occur the phenomena of *volition*, and there are large classes of phenomena, and these most important ones, which, we are quite sure, take place in virtue of such volition, and without which we are equally sure they would not take place at all." "In the only case in which we are admitted into any personal knowledge of the origin of force, we find it connected (possibly by intermediate links untraceable by our faculties, but yet indubitably *connected*) with volition, and by inevitable consequence with *motive*, with intellect, and with all the attributes of mind in which—and not in the possession of arms, legs, brains, and viscera—personality consists."²

2. *The evidence of Design*, or the *Teleological* argument. Everywhere throughout the visible universe there are evidences of adaptation of means to ends—purpose—and this necessarily implies personality and intelligence. Paley illustrates this by a man finding a watch, and upon examination of its mechanism he comes to the conclusion "that the watch must have had a maker; that there must have existed, at some time and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose which we found it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use."³ "Contrivance," he argues, proves "personality." The evidence of contrivance or design in the world proves that its originator must possess personality; while the whole structure of the universe proves Him to be a "Being infinite, as well in essence as in power; yet nevertheless a person."⁴ Cicero argues that it would be more reasonable to believe that the letters of the alphabet thrown together "would fall into such order as legibly to form the Annals of Ennis"

¹ Hodge. In the last century (and previously) one of the principal arguments used to prove the existence of God was that known as *à priori*, i.e., "from the nature of a cause to the nature of its effects;" we "lay down evident principles or axioms, and from these deduce other truths that are more complex; and as the principles from which we begin are *first* known to us, and in the order of our thoughts are *prior* to the truths deduced from them, we are said to argue *à priori*" (Bishop Hamilton's Works, vol. ii., pp. 26, 27, edit. 1809). Anselm, Descartes, Dr. Samuel Clarke, Bishop Hamilton, and others, stated this argument with great learning and force. It has, however, been always regarded by many theologians and metaphysicians as inconclusive, and calculated to perplex, rather than to produce rational conviction. Clement of Alexandria among the Fathers was of this opinion (see Works, vol. ii., pp. 269, 270, Clark's edition). Waterland, Dr. Gretton, T. Knowles, and others in the last century regarded the argument as defective. In the present state of the discussion respecting the existence of God, we may set aside this method of proof, not as having been exploded, but as being replaced by other and more satisfactory arguments. The term *à posteriori* is now seldom used, although the argument itself, i.e., from effect (seen and known) to cause (unseen and unknown), remains in full force, but is presented under other names.

² Sir J. Herschel on "The Origin of Force." The italics are the author's.

³ Hume says the finding of a watch on a desert island would show that men had been there, by an inference from effect to cause.

⁴ Design is thus defined by Dr. Whewell:—"We direct our thoughts to an action which we are about to perform, we *intend* to do it. We work out our *aim*, we place it before us, and act with *purpose* (propositum): we *design* it, or mark it out before-hand (*designo*)."

than "that the world was made by a fortuitous concourse of atoms which have no form, no colour, no sense." To this illustration Trevelenburgh adds, "It is perhaps more difficult to assume that by the blind combination of chemical and physical elements and forces any one even of the organs of the body—the eye, for example—much less the harmonious union of organs which make up the body, than that a book should be formed by chance, by throwing types about." Professor Owen insists that the analogy between the animal organs and systems of organs, to the machines of man's invention, is so close that "the healthy intellect studying the more refined and perfect natural structures," and their obvious adaptation and purpose, "cannot but conceive therein the like faculties in a transcendently higher degree."²

Of the argument from design J. S. Mill says, "It is the best; and besides, it is the most persuasive. It would be difficult to find a stronger argument in favour of Theism, than that the eye must have been made by one who sees, and the ear by one who hears."³

Hume, in his posthumous Essays, says:—"The whole frame of nature bespeaks an Intelligent Author; and no rational inquirer can, after serious reflection, suspend his belief a moment with regard to the primary principle of genuine Theism and Religion."

Sir John Herschel, speaking of the "relations, attractions, repulsions, and correlation" of atoms and "their actions according to the primary laws of their being," says:—"The *presence of mind* is what solves the whole difficulty; so far at least as it brings it within the sphere of our consciousness, and into conformity with our experience of *what action is*. We know nothing but as it is conceivable to us, from our mental and bodily experience and consciousness. When we know we act, we are conscious of will; and action without will and effort is to us, constituted as we are, unrealisable, unknowable, inconceivable."⁴ "It is but reasonable to regard the force of gravitation as the direct or indirect result of consciousness, or a will existing somewhere."⁵

Professor Baden Powell, speaking of the operations in "the laboratory of nature," where the results are seen, while the processes are invisible, says: "*Mind*, directing the operations of the laboratory or workshop, is no part of the *visible apparatus*, nor are its operations seen in *themselves*; they are visible only in their *effects*; and from effects, however dissimilar in magnitude or in kind, yet agreeing in the one condition of *order*, adjustment, and profound and recondite connection and dependence, there is the

¹ Philo Judeus says:—"No work of art is self-made; the world is the most perfect work of art; therefore the world was made by a good and most perfect Author. Thus we have the knowledge of the existence of God."

² Lecture before the Y.M.C.A. This argument he illustrates at large in his Reade Lecture.

³ Millon "Hamilton." And yet Darwin insists that the eye is not the result of design or intention of the Creator, but of slight alterations effected by natural selection among creatures, gradually developing for perhaps millions of years.

⁴ "Scientific Lectures." The italics are the author's. ⁵ *Ibid.*

same evidence and outward manifestation of *Invisible Intelligence*, as vast and illimitable as the universe throughout which those manifestations are seen."¹ "The inference of design, intention, forethought, implies intelligent agency or moral causation. Hence, again, we advance to the notion of distinct existence, or what is sometimes called personality; and thence proceed to ascribe the other Divine attributes or perfections as centring in that independent Being."²

"The Universe," Dr. Carpenter very accurately says, "is not governed by law, but according to law." Darwin quotes with approval Butler's definition, that "the only distinct meaning of the word natural is 'stated,' 'fixed,' 'settled,' and that it as much requires an intelligent agent to effect anything statedly, fixedly, regularly,—that is naturally,—as to effect it only once or supernaturally." Joseph Cook inquires, "What if natural law be only the magnetisation of all matter by God's will? He yet was, and is, and is to come, omnipresent, first, midst, last."

Adaptation of means to end shows purpose, design, a designing mind. Such adaptations are manifold in the structure of the human frame, the laws which regulate vegetation, and the definite purposes secured by the operation of various physical powers. Even Professor Huxley, who denies the argument from design as usually presented, makes the following important admission:—"The teleological and the mechanical views of nature are not mutually exclusive; . . . on the contrary, the more purely a mechanist the speculator is, . . . the more completely is he at the mercy of the teleologist, who can always defy him to disprove that the primordial molecular arrangement was not intended to evolve the phenomena of the Universe."

J. S. Mill admits explicitly that we cannot explain the adaptation of part to part in the eye, for example, without supposing that the *idea* of sight goes before the adaptation of these pieces to each other in such a manner as to produce light. He says, "This I conceive to be a legitimate inductive inference. Sight, being a fact, not precedent but subsequent to the putting together of the organic structure of the eye, can only be connected with the production of that structure in the character of a final, not an efficient cause. That is, it is not sight itself, but an antecedent *idea* of it, that must be the efficient cause. But this at once marks the origin as proceeding from an intelligent Will."³ "It must be allowed that the adaptations in nature afford a large balance of probability in favour of creation by intelligence." "The number of such instances (of adaptations) is immensely greater than is, on the principles of inductive logic, required for the exclusion of a random concurrence

¹ "The Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy," vol. ii., p. 174. The italics and capitals are the author's.

² Powell's "Connection of Natural and Divine Truth," pp. 183, 184.

³ Mill's "Three Essays on Religion." The italics are the author's.

of independent causes, or, speaking technically, for the elimination of chance."¹

"A German professor, to illustrate the evidence of mind and will in the collocation and adjustment of matter in the works of nature, took a book and tore it into shreds. Taking into his hand an uninjured copy of the same work, he said, 'Now, young gentlemen, is not the same book here as there?' 'Yes,' said they. 'No,' he thundered. 'What's the difference?' 'We do not see much difference.' 'Collocation,' was the emphatic reply. 'You have here, indeed, the same type, you have the same pages, you have the paper; but everything is in shreds there, everything in chaos, and here you have everything intelligently arranged.'"² Grove, in his "Correlation of Physical Forces," closes an elaborate argument on the subject of cause and effect with the striking expression, "A physical search after essential causes in vain. Causation is the Will, creation the Act of God."

3. *Conscience*—or more accurately consciousness—often called the *Moral Argument*. The sense of responsibility and accountability; the distinction between right and wrong; the operations of that mystery of our being which we call "conscience,"—all necessarily involve the existence of a personal Being (not a mere abstract Entity), who is superior to man, who is the Authoritative and supreme Lawgiver and Judge, who has graven His law of right and wrong upon man's heart, and to whom he is accountable for his actions. "Conscience is the great root of Theism. It is something supernatural within the natural, and there is no separating these two spheres if you are true to psychology. The webs of the natural and supernatural are so interwoven in the soul, that they cannot be untied."

Kant exclaims, "DUTY! thou great, thou exalted name! Wondrous thought! that workest . . . merely by holding up thy naked law in the soul, and so extorting for thyself always reverence, if not obedience—whence thy original? and whence find we the root of thy descent?" The answer which Theology and true Philosophy give to this question is—GOD; the great moral lawgiver, "in whom law abides as the uncreated light of perfect essential goodness." Thus our moral nature compels our belief in a personal God. "This argument was used by Cicero, and from it he deduced the conclusion that there is but one common Master as it were, the ruler of all things, God. He is the author, the propounder, and the bearer of this law."³ It follows inevitably that if we are the subjects of moral

¹ Mill's "Three Essays on Religion." Laplace estimated that the probability that the forty-three independent motions of the bodies of the solar system known in his day should coincide in direction by chance would be 4,400,000,000,000 times to 1 in "favour of some common cause for the uniformity of direction," or in favour of purpose or design. On Chance and Probability see also De Morgan on "Probability," Mill's "Logic," book iii., chap. xvii., McCosh's "Typical Forms."

² Joseph Cook's Lectures.

³ The "Nemesis" of the Greeks is but a personation of the reverence for law, and the anticipation of retribution for broken law. The great moral lesson taught

law, there must be a moral lawgiver: He must be a *Being*, not an abstraction; a Person, not a mere *stream of influence*; a something more than "The Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness."

Conscience forebodes punishment and anticipates reward; and this not only among those who have received instruction, but it applies universally to savage and civilised. The sense of dependence and of obligation implies the existence of a *some-one* and not a *some-what*.¹ "Conscience and the consciousness of God," *i.e.*, a personal Being, "are one."

4. *Revelation.* While Intuition; the evidence of purpose in nature; the instinctive consciousness of right and wrong—the sense of dependence and moral accountability—all go to demonstrate the existence of a Being who possesses intelligence and will, who gives us laws, and to whom we are accountable, and who from the very nature of the case must be a person;—yet it is only by Revelation from God Himself that we can have any adequate knowledge of His nature and attributes. The Scriptures never attempt to prove the existence of God—that is assumed as a self-evident truth; but they reveal Him to us as the Author and Source of all things;² as exercising a direct personal, intelligent superintendence over the Universe;³ and as bearing the relation to His accountable creatures of Father, Judge, and Sovereign.

Revelation emphatically declares God to be a Living Being—not a mere abstraction, or influence, or force, or energy. The highest words of Scripture concerning the Supreme Being are "God is Spirit;" "God is Light;" "God is Love." Holding fast to this conception of God as thus revealed to us, we have an idea which satisfies every demand of the intellect, and every claim of the heart; we, therefore, refuse to be entangled with the metaphysical discussions about "The Absolute," or the "Infinite," or the "Unconditioned," on the one hand; or the scientific negations about "The Unknowable," or "The Inscrutable," or the "Infinite and Eternal Energy by which all things exist," on the other.⁴

VI.—Is it not objected that, whether God exist as a Person or not, He is Unknowable?

Such is the contention of some metaphysicians and many scientists.

1. Sir William Hamilton and Dean Mansel, in their theories of the "Unconditioned," the "Absolute," or the "Unknowable," maintain,

by Æschylus was, that amid the apparent confusion of things moral, law violated would be followed by retribution. This same truth was recognised and taught by Hesiod and Homer.

¹ See Joseph Cook's lectures on "Matthew Arnold's Views of Conscience" and "Organic Instincts of Conscience." Also Row's "Lecture on Human Responsibility, in Popular Objections to Divine Truth," pp. 54-60.

² Isa. xl. 21; Acts xvii. 26-29; Psalm xix. 1-3; Rom. i. 20.

³ Prov. viii. 27-29; Job xxxviii. 9-12, etc.

⁴ Professor Clerk-Maxwell, not long before his death, said "that he had scrutinised all Agnostic hypotheses he knew of, and found that they one and all needed a God to make them workable."

that while God has an intelligent and moral nature, yet because He is Infinite and we finite, and because He is "Absolute," while our knowledge is "relative," that, therefore, it is impossible for us to say what kind of actions are to be expected from God, or, in fact, to assert anything respecting His righteousness, except the mere fact that it exists.

2. Various so-called scientific objections are raised to the conception of God as personal. Excepting the avowed atheist, all admit the existence of some power beyond and outside nature; but it is contended that we can know nothing respecting this cause of all things—only that it is. "God is utterly and for ever unknowable."¹ "An inscrutable power of which we know no more than Job did, when he said, 'Can man by searching find this power out?'"² "An Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed."³ "The Divine Power that cannot be identified with the totality of phenomena." These are among the scientific definitions of the Cause of all things.

Science admits the presence in the universe of a something which eludes all investigation, and exceeds all comprehension; but, because mathematical demonstration cannot be given that this "power" is intelligent and personal, many scientists insist that it is "unknowable." But the answer to this is, that moral, and not mathematical demonstration is to be sought here. Admit that there is a something outside nature, and the question arises, what is that something? Is it Force? "What do we know of force? Our conception of force is nothing but a generalised abstraction from our sensations of muscular resistance."⁴

Herbert Spencer tells us that the one thing we do know is, that "we are in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed." And what is "energy"? "Power of doing work, as the power of a bullet propelled from a rifle, to penetrate."⁵ These and other explanations of the "Unknowable" and "Unthinkable" are offered to us in the stead of a personal God. Which is the more rational? which the more probable? which best meets and explains the facts of the physical and moral universe? Surely, if the existence of God, as a person, is not absolutely demonstrable, yet the moral probability almost reaches demonstration, and is by a long way more reasonable of belief than "an inscrutable power," or "an Infinite and Eternal Energy" of the Agnostic or Scientist.⁶

But if a personal God be "unthinkable" and "unknowable," is not any other first cause just as inscrutable? Herbert Spencer says:—"Passing over the consideration of credibility, and confining ourselves to that of conceivability, we see that Atheism, Pantheism,

¹ Fiske's "Cosmic Philosophy."

² Herbert Spencer.

³ See Balfour Stewart's "Conservation of Energy," pp. 13, 15, 64-107; W. Lant Carpenter's "Energy in Nature," p. 2, etc.

⁴ Tyndall's "Belfast Address."

⁵ Fiske's "Cosmic Philosophy."

⁶ See also *ante*, pp. 9, 10.

and Theism, when rigorously analysed, prove to be absolutely unthinkable."¹ "It is our highest duty to regard that through which all things exist as the Unknowable."² To be consistent, the logical conclusion from all this must surely be, that "an Infinite and Eternal Energy," or, indeed, any other definition of a First Cause, is equally as "unthinkable" or "unknowable" as a Personal God; this is blank Agnosticism, stripped of its juggle of words. Does not this bear a striking family likeness to Anti-theism, or Atheism? Is it so reasonable as is belief in a Personal God?

VII. How can this objection that God is unknowable be answered?

I. It is necessary to have a clear understanding as to the meaning to be attached to certain words. Science has made no discovery when it tells us that God cannot be fully known by His creatures. Revelation told us that long ages ago.³ God cannot be known fully and absolutely; that would involve the absurdity of the finite being able to comprehend the infinite. If, when it is affirmed that God is "unknowable" or "inscrutable," it is simply meant that our knowledge of Him cannot be complete and perfect, we readily accept the statement.

But the *Agnostic* and *Positivist* mean more than this; they mean that we cannot know that such a Being as God exists, nor is there any capacity on the part of man which enables us to know anything about Him; that, in fact, the "idea" of God is "unthinkable," and that, therefore, God is "unknowable."

This, however, arises from a confusion of terms and things. Because knowledge is not complete, it does not consequently follow that it cannot be accurate, so far as it goes. No scientist will pretend that science has a complete knowledge, or even a complete theory, of the universe; will he, therefore, admit that the universe is unknowable, or that his knowledge of it is not accurate, though it is incomplete? The truth is, that the mind can carry its conceptions far beyond the power of words to formulate them. "The Scientific Use of the Imagination,"⁴ occupies a very important place in the region of science. Universal gravitation is not capable of demonstration; even now it is only a working hypothesis used to explain certain well-known physical phenomena.⁵ The theory of light necessitates the (supposed) presence of an ethereal medium boundless in extension, and which interpenetrates all space and matter, the existence of which cannot be proven.⁶ Of the grand law of "The Conservation of Energy," Balfour Stewart says:—"If true, its truth certainly cannot be proved after the manner in which we prove a proposition in Euclid. Nor does it admit of a proof so rigid as the somewhat analogous principle of the conservation of matter."⁷ "But if it be difficult to prove our

¹ "First Principles," p. 43.

² *Ibid.*, p. 113.

³ Job xi. 7-9, xxvi. 14, xxxvi. 26, xxxvii. 23; Isa. xl. 28; Rom. xi. 33, 34.

⁴ Tyndall's Address.

⁵ See "The Unseen Universe," 2nd edition, pp. 109-110.

⁶ "The Unseen Universe," 2nd edition, pp. 116-118.

⁷ "The Conservation of Energy," by Balfour Stewart, pp. 82, 126.

principle in the most rigorous manner, we are yet able to give the strongest possible indirect evidence of its truth."¹

Where is the power of intellect which can comprehend in its fulness and expansion the law of gravitation, of the ethereal medium of light, of the conservation of energy, of the correlation of physical forces, and other cosmical laws of the Unseen Universe? Will the Agnostic be consistent, and say of these physical laws that they are unknowable, because they cannot be known in their completeness? No one doubts the correctness of the theories by which it is attempted to explain these laws; and yet no one will affirm that they are fully understandable or explainable. Here, then, we have accurate, though partial knowledge. And so with regard to the knowledge of God as the cause of all things: we can know Him correctly, though we cannot understand Him perfectly.

It has been well said by a most eminent man, "The doctors of science as well as of Theology 'walk by faith, not by sight.'"² "I have a strong conviction that before a vigorous logical scrutiny, the 'reign of law' will prove to be an unverified hypothesis, the uniformity of nature an ambiguous expression, the certainty of our scientific inferences to a great extent a delusion."³ So that in regard to much of physical science demonstration is as impossible as it is in moral science; and this shows the inconsistency of those who are believers in scientific dogmas, but Agnostics as to the great truth of the personality of God.⁴

Dr. John Duncan very truly and beautifully says: "I do not know the whole of God, and many things I dare neither to affirm nor to deny; but what I do know of Him I find so grounded in my very being, so confronted by all the forms of all external being, so comforting to my heart, so fruitful in the life, that I affirm it beyond the possibility of denial."

2. A *First Cause* being acknowledged as a necessary conception of the universe, a *Personal First Cause* is no more inconceivable than any other First Cause. It is certain that we must predicate self-existence and eternity of something; the only problem is whether that something is personal or impersonal. Which then is the more rational, that an eternal impersonal force, or energy, or influence, should have filled nature with its marvellous adaptations and

¹ "The Conservation of Energy," by Balfour Stewart, p. 84.

² Professor Jevons, "The Principles of Science."

³ *Ibid.*, Preface.

⁴ "If we strike out 'from science' all which is in reality *scientific faith*, science is shrivelled up into a little residuum of proportions, whose contents are so scanty and insignificant as scarcely to repay the trouble of investigation."—*Ulrici*. "I hope to be able to make manifest how the existence of God follows as the result of the modern investigations of nature, with the same certainty, perhaps with even greater, than, e.g., the existence of a universal power of attraction operating at a distance, of a material of light or heat (ether), of an electro-magnetic fluid, etc. For it will be seen that these assumptions of natural science equally belong only to the sphere of scientific faith."—*Ulrici*.

For an expansion of this argument, see Paley's "Natural Theology," Jackson's "The Philosophy of Natural Theology," particularly part ii.; Winchell's "Science and Religion," pp. 83-99, 305-10; Joseph Cook's Lectures on "God in Natural Law," "The First Cause as Personal."

contrivances, and finally have evolved the personality of man; or that a self-existent personality should have created the universe?"¹

"There is no more hackneyed quotation than the one 'personality has a limit,' while God is illimitable." Where is the contradiction, where is the inconsistency of applying the two ideas to the same being? It would be contradictory to speak of a round square, but there is no contradiction in speaking of a white, or a crimson square. So the adjectives personal and absolute are not logical contradictions, nor are they contradictory in fact. When we speak of the absolute, we speak of it as the predicate of pure being, and what we mean is simply that the absolute is complete in itself, it has no conditions save the conditions contained in itself. When we speak of personality we ascribe it to being, regarded as pure spiritual being; and we simply mean that absolute personal being is, and must be, self-conscious, rational, and ethical; must answer to the idea of spirit. Why may not the Absolute Being be self-conscious? To deny this to Him would be to deny to Him one of the perfections which even finite beings may have."² "Does the ascription of life, intelligence, personality to God militate in any degree against the dignity of the Infinite?" While we affirm that our knowledge of God is true and trustworthy, we by no means affirm that it is adequate and exhaustive. "We know in part."³

The terms which are used by Sir W. Hamilton and Dean Mansel, "The Absolute," "The Unconditioned," are without meaning unless they recognise the personality of God. Matthew Arnold's "The Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness" is but a clumsy attempt to avoid, by the skilful use of words, the recognition of God as a person; for how can a mere influence, an abstract non-intelligence, *make* for anything, whether righteousness or unrighteousness?

3. But the Agnostics, while insisting that God is "unthinkable" and unknowable, are notwithstanding so inconsistent that they profess to be able to tell us what He is not. If nothing can be known,—for the Agnostic meaning of "unknowable" must be that, since all agree that complete knowledge cannot be obtained,—how comes it to pass that we have such dogmatic statements as to that which can neither be thought nor known? Herbert Spencer asks, "Is it not just possible that there is a mode of Being as much transcending intelligence and will as these transcend mechanical motion? It is true we are totally unable to conceive any such higher mode of being. But this is not a reason for questioning its existence; it is rather the reverse."⁴ In his last utterance he tells us that "amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious

¹ See Wright's "Logic of Evidences." A most able and useful book.

² See page 10, etc. ³ Inverach's "Is God Knowable?" p. 225. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵ "First Principles," p. 109. Here the argument of analogy is fairly used; but if applicable, it is double-edged, and will prove our position as fully as his. If intelligence and will are our highest conceptions of being, then until some means of our postulating any higher mode of being are found, we are logically bound to

the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty, that man is ever in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed."¹ These declarations are certainly surprising. Well might Frederick Harrison, the Apostle of Positivism, ask, "Has, then, the Agnostic a positive creed? It would seem so; for Mr. Spencer brings us at last to The one absolute certainty, the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. But let no one suppose that this is merely a new name for the great First Cause of so many theologies and metaphysics. In spite of the capital letters and the use of theological terms as old as Isaiah or Athanasius, Mr. Spencer's Energy has no analogy with God. It is Eternal, Infinite, and Incomprehensible; but still it is not He, but it."²

It is not necessary to point out the inconsistency involved in Mr. Spencer's conclusion. How can that be "unthinkable" which can be formulated in the definite terms which he uses? And how can that be "unknowable" in regard which he can describe the nature, the extent, and the duration of its existence?"

apply these qualities to God. J. S. Mill acknowledges, "It would no doubt be absurd to suppose that our words exhaust the possibilities of Being." From this he draws the illogical conclusion that God must be "unknowable;" as if what our words do express must be without meaning, because they do not express everything.

¹ "Religion: A Retrospect and Prospect," *The Nineteenth Century*, January 1884, p. 12. Is this "the higher mode of Being" of which Mr. Spencer elsewhere speaks? See p. 20.

² "The Ghost of Religion," *The Nineteenth Century*, March 1884, p. 494, etc. In this paper the believer in the Religion of Humanity trenchantly routs the Agnostic, and shows the logical absurdity of formulating anything respecting that which is "unknowable." In a passage of great pathos Mr. Harrison illustrates the utter hopelessness of those, the basis of whose religion is that they are in presence of the Unknowable Energy, and shows the superiority of the religion which consists in the worship of Collective Humanity. In the June number of the same Review Mr. Justice Stephen criticises both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Harrison. He pronounces the paper of the former as "an intricate game of which words are the counters. I can see nothing in it but a series of metaphors built one upon another, and ending where it began. The whole theory is a castle in the air, uninhabitable and destitute of foundations. Mr. Spencer's conclusion," continues Mr. Justice Stephen, "appears to me to have absolutely no meaning at all. It is so abstract that it asserts nothing. It is like a gigantic soap-bubble, not the subject not so serious, it would be amusing to witness this triangular duel by to be a consciousness of the presence of "An Infinite and Eternal Energy,"—that, and nothing more. The worshipper of "Collective Humanity" utterly demolishes the Agnostic, and sets up his theory of religion. The neo-Christian, with keen sarcasm and keener logic, smites both hip and thigh, and at the same time constructs a religion that would remain if Christianity were extinguished, and with which he thinks the world would get along very well, that is, if the world as it now is "would only last,"—a very important saving clause. Thus scepticism answers itself, and leaves faith practically master of the field.

Dr. James Martineau, in criticising Spencer's "Unknowable," says:—"To say that the First Cause is wholly removed from our apprehension, is not simply a disclaimer of faculty on our part; it is a charge of inability against the First Cause too. . . . And in the very act of declaring the First Cause incomprehensible, you do not permit it to remain unknown. For that only is unknown of which you can neither affirm nor deny any predicate."

³ Many things may be unthinkable to individuals, or to a number of persons, which are not so in themselves; the defect may be in the thinker, not in the subject of thought. See 1 Cor. i. 20, 21.

We may answer Spencer and the Positivists by the words of Professor Max Müller: "If philosophy has to explain what is, not what ought to be, there will be and can be no rest till we admit what cannot be denied, that there is in man a faculty, which I call a faculty for apprehending the Infinite, not only in religion, but in all things: a power independent of sense and reason, but yet a very real power, which has held its own from the beginning of the world, neither sense nor reason being able to overcome it, while it alone is able to overcome both reason and sense."¹

4. Four answers have been given to the question, "What is the First Cause of all things?" viz., 1. "In the beginning was Matter;" 2. "In the beginning was Force or Energy;" 3. "In the beginning was Thought;" 4. "In the beginning was Will." The first answer is Atheism; the second is Anti-theistic; the third is Pantheistic; the fourth is Theism, and is, we venture to affirm, supported by true science.²

To sum up the various arguments which we have presented, the conclusion appears inevitable, that the First Cause of all things must be personal, that there is "behind ourselves, and all things that we see and know, a Mind, a Reason, a Will, like our own, only incomparably greater."³ The evidence of this is seen in the works of nature, in the common consent of mankind; is felt in man's inner consciousness, and in his sense of moral accountability. The God of the Scriptures and the First Cause of true science are One!⁴

Of the Nature and Attributes of the Divine Being we must speak in Chapter IV., which see.

¹ "Lectures on the Science of Religion," new ed., p. 20. See also, on the use and meaning of the words Infinite and finite, in which he combats the opinion that finite is a negative idea. "Lectures on Language," 2nd series, p. 576. See Jackson's "Philosophy of Natural Theology," chap. iii.

² See Dr. Cocker's "Theistic Conception of the World," quoted in Winchell's "Science and Religion," p. 285.

³ Will implies intelligence, affection, efficiency—in other words, Personality.

⁴ See "Religion without God, and God without Religion," by Rev. W. Arthur—particularly pp. 407—543. The whole volume is a remarkably able, incisive, and crushing criticism of Positivism, Agnosticism, and Deism, and should be carefully studied.

CHAPTER II.

DIVINE REVELATION.

I.—What are we to understand by Divine Revelation?

Revelation means to disclose, or unfold; to communicate. Divine revelation means the communication by God to man, in certain ways and for certain ends, of the secrets of His will and nature.¹

The Book of Nature is a Divine Revelation, which makes manifest the existence of God,² His natural attributes,³ His works,⁴ and awakens man's sense of obligation or accountability to Him.⁵

Supernatural revelation, in a theological sense, is the communication of sacred truth to man, which could not have been known from the Book of Nature, or by any process of human reasoning, or by the exercise of our faculties without supernatural assistance or means. "A Divine Revelation is a discovery by God to man of Himself, or His will, over and above what He has made known by the light of reason."⁶

We have, then, in our hands a book that professes to be a revelation of truth and duty given by God to His intelligent and sinful creatures; a book whose last page has been written about eighteen hundred years; a book that has been transcribed by numberless pens, translated into many languages, scrutinised by the scholar, and loved and revered by millions; and we must consider the evidences by which this particular record is commended to our faith.

II.—Is there any reason for perplexity among the numerous pretended revelations that are found amongst men?

Infidels have always been accustomed to say much concerning false religions, in order to throw discredit upon the true one. They have argued thus: "Every nation in the world pretends to a revealed religion. Each community has its own, which boasts its irresistible proofs, its miracles, its prophets. To believe them all is impossible, since they contradict and anathematise each other; and to discriminate between them is equally impossible, for were

¹ Oosterzee.

² Acts xvii. 23-29.

³ Rom. i. 19, 20.

⁴ Psalm xix. 1.

⁵ Acts xvii. 28.

⁶ T.H. Horne. "By Revelation we imply either the process by which God makes Himself known to man, or the knowledge thus obtained."—"Bib. Educator"

there a true revelation it would be vain to attempt the discovery of it in the midst of so much confusion." Now, how numerous soever the religions may be which falsely boast their Divine origin, this is no proof that a true revelation does not somewhere exist. On the contrary, so many groundless pretensions are an evidence that a just claim does somewhere exist. No one would have made counterfeit money, had not the true coin first existed; and charlatans in medicine only exert their influence over the minds of people, because there are physicians and real remedies. So if God had not spoken to man, what Rousseau calls "the fantasy of revelations" would never have had its rise. And thus, instead of concluding that there is no true revelation because there are so many false ones, we should say that there are so many false ones because there is a true revelation. And it is a great mistake to suppose that the task of discovering the true religion is perplexing and impracticable. Of course, it would be idle to allege against us the claims of such religions as have no written testimony, and of which anything may be affirmed that fancy or caprice can suggest. We must confine ourselves to those revelations which have a written evidence; and of these how many are worthy to be put in competition with the Bible? We are referred to the *revelation of Zoroaster*.¹ But even were not tradition involved in so much uncertainty as to reckon as many as six different Zoroasters, and were not the authenticity of the Zend-Avesta² a contested point, as is the case, still this book is rather a treatise of theology, philosophy, and other matters, than a professed revelation. The author is less a false prophet than a legislator; and he may be compared to Solon³ and Lycurgus,⁴ who invoked the authority of the gods in support of their laws, without declaring themselves to be prophets. As to Confucius,⁵ he lays so little claim to this character, that the books of which he is considered the author are especially distinguished by the fact that no

¹ Zoroaster (or in modern Persian Zerduscht) was the founder of the religious system set forth in the Zend-Avesta; he is believed to have reformed the Magian religion. The Parsees, or fire-worshippers of Western India, are the only followers of Zoroaster. Irreconcilable differences exist as to the time he lived, varying from ten centuries B.C. to the time of Darius Hystaspes, circa 500 B.C. Tradition says he retired to a cave in the mountains of Elburz when ten years old, remained there for twenty years, and received revelations from Auramazda and attendant spirits, which he recorded in the Zend-Avesta, or "the living word." Another Zoroaster is said to have flourished earlier, and was the father of Chaldea astrology and magic.

² Zend or Zend-Avesta, attributed to Zoroaster, but now believed to have been written at different periods, the earliest extending back to 1200 B.C. Only a small part of the original work remains. The Parsees accept the book as their sole rule of faith and manners. Baumgarten affirms that it contains doctrines, opinions, and facts borrowed from the Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans; from which, and other circumstances, he concludes that the history and writings of this sage were probably invented in the later ages.

³ Solon was one of the seven sages of Greece and the celebrated legislator of Athens, who was born 638 B.C.

⁴ Lycurgus, the celebrated Spartan legislator, who is supposed to have flourished about B.C. 850.

⁵ Confucius was the most eminent and most justly venerated of all the philosophers of China; he was born about B.C. 550.

trace of the doctrine of a Divinity, or of a future state, is to be found in them. Of *Sanchoniathon*¹ we have only a fragment, and that is more than doubtful. It has passed through four different hands before it reaches us. It is to be found in the Fathers of the Church, who quote from Porphyry—the declared adversary of Christianity, who quotes from Philon of Biblos, who quotes the Phœnician author. *The Hindoos*, indeed, possess books which they believe to be inspired, but the origin of these books is anything but authentic. The most impenetrable mystery covers their origin.²

In fact, we find no religion which claims Divine inspiration for well-known writers except these three: that of Moses, of Jesus Christ, and of Mohammed, and all these spring from the same source; for the religion of Jesus Christ is based on that of Moses, and Mohammed pretends to rest his claims upon those of the two others. The Old Testament—the most ancient book in existence—clearly proclaims its Divine inspiration; and it is from this common head that all accredited revelations, whether true or false, have their rise; and amongst these there are only three whose authority it is either possible or necessary to bring to the test. The inquiry is thus brought within very narrow limits; for the Jewish and Christian religions hold together in such a manner that if the second is of God, the first, to which it bears testimony, must be of God also. They are one: they stand or fall together. And the Christian religion is so strongly opposed to Mohammedanism that if the one is Divine, the other cannot be so.³ Let us, then, examine the claims of the Christian religion, and of the documents on which it rests, namely, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We maintain that they not only *contain*, but are, a revelation from God. And the evidences by which this is proved are usually distributed under these general heads: Presumptive, Historical, Direct, Internal, and Miscellaneous.

The Presumptive Evidences.—These are certain facts, or preliminary considerations, which yield a presumption in favour of such a revelation, and which may fairly predispose us to examine its

¹ Sanchoniathon was a Phœnician philosopher and historian, who is said to have flourished before the Trojan war. Of this most ancient writer the only remains extant are sundry fragments of cosmogony, and of the history of the gods and first mortals, preserved by Eusebius and Theodoret. Several modern writers, however, of great learning, have called in question the very existence of Sanchoniathon, and have contended with much plausibility, that the fragments which Eusebius adopted as genuine upon the authority of Porphyry, were forged by that author or the pretended translator Philo, from enmity to the Christians, and that the Pagans might have something to show of equal antiquity with the Book of Moses. These opposite opinions have produced a controversy that has filled volumes.—“*Encyclopædia Britannica*.”

Attempts have been made to show that the Christian Scriptures have been borrowed from the Vedas and Buddhist sacred books. See this successfully answered by Professor Max Müller, in the *Contemporary Review*, April 1870, and “*Selected Essays*,” vol. ii., pp. 442–78. As to the age and character of the Vedas, see Max Müller’s “*Selected Essays*,” vol. ii., pp. 120–24, 454; Monier Williams’ “*Indian Wisdom*,” p. 9, etc.; “*The Hindu Religion, a Sketch and a Contrast*,” by J. Murray Mitchell, M.A. LL.D., in “*Present Day Tracts*,” vol. vi. * Rev. A. Monod’s “*Lucilla*.”

more direct and proper proofs."¹ These facts relate to the necessity, the possibility, and the probability of an express revelation from God.

9 III.—Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation necessary?

Modern infidels are loud in their assertions that the light of nature will suffice to conduct mankind to truth and virtue and happiness. This point can be easily tested by an inquiry into the state of those nations which are altogether without revelation, either real or pretended. It would not be fair to refer to systems of Natural Theology which have been framed in Christian lands, even though the men who framed them were avowed opponents of the Bible; for some of their best views and precepts have been derived, not from the dictates of their own unassisted reason, but, as Rousseau himself confesses,² from those very Scriptures which they despise and revile, from the early impressions of education, and from living in a country where, in spite of themselves, they imbibe some portion of that religious knowledge which the sacred writings have everywhere diffused. "If the inquiry really be concerning the sufficiency of natural light without a direct revelation, we ought, in all justice, to confine ourselves to those, whether in ancient or modern times, who have enjoyed the light of nature alone; or, at most, the light of nature with a few faint rays of early traditionary revelation." Examine, then, the most authentic records concerning the religion and morals of the heathen world. Bring forward as witnesses the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome.³ Let our inquiries relate to the time when the human mind was in a condition of strength and culture, quite equal, if not superior, to anything developed in the history of the world. And what is the result? Did man, simply by his own unaided reason, rise to a right conception of his Maker? did he discover the true relation in which he stood to the Supreme? Was he able to tell with certainty whether there was pardon for the guilty, or whether there was power in prayer? Did he erect an infallible standard of morality, and exercise a steady belief in a future state of being? In short, without the Bible, did he realise and fulfil the great end for which he was created, and all this in a way conducive to his own happiness as an immortal being, and quite in harmony with the principles of the Divine government and the character of God? Alas! all history testifies that "the world by wisdom knew not God;" that the most eminent of the heathen philosophers never rose above a gloomy scepticism or a low and grovelling idolatry; and that vice in its most revolting shape stalked about, not in solitary and isolated cases, but under the

¹ Dr. Hannah.

² Works, vol. ix., p. 71, 12mo, 1764.

³ See "Anno Domini, or a Glimpse at the World into which Messias was born," by J. D. Craig-Houston, B.D.; "Gesta Christi, or a History of Humane Progress under Christianity," the earlier chapters. This is a most valuable and able book. The "Apologies" of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, in Clark's "Anti-Nicene Library." But, perhaps, best of all, the writings of the historians and philosophers before Christ.

professed sanction of the national religion, and its degrading rites and ceremonies. Read the abundant evidence furnished on this subject in Dr. Leland's "Necessity and Advantages of the Christian Revelation," Bishop Porteus' Tract on "The Beneficial Effects of Christianity," Horne's "Introduction," Watson's "Institutes," and Dr. Macknight's Notes on the First Chapter of Romans. And what have the modern opposers of revelation left us to prove that our unaided reason, the light of nature, or call it what you will, will serve us better than it did the sages of antiquity? What can we find in their writings which may be regarded as a perfect rule of duty, or an infallible standard of truth? The Rev. T. H. Horne has been careful to collect in his "Introduction," vol. i., the recorded opinions of Herbert, and Hobbs, and Hume, and Blount, and Collins, and Tindal, and Morgan, and Bolingbroke, and Voltaire, and Diderot, and D'Alembert, etc.; from which the proof is but too abundant, that were there no guide for man but that which they have attempted to furnish, his condition would indeed be hopeless, and his destiny perplexing, unmeaning, and sad. If men are not altogether blinded by prejudice or passion, if they are not altogether deaf to the voice of history, they cannot but see the inadequacy of human reason to the moral necessities of man. *We need a revelation*: this the philosophers of antiquity painfully felt; and this every thoughtful spirit will feel, who, like them, is left to the misery of mere conjecture on the most momentous subjects connected with human happiness.¹

IV.—Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation possible?

There are those among modern sceptics who answer this inquiry with an emphatic "No," although others have felt themselves compelled to concede this point. Says Bolingbroke, "An extraordinary action of God upon the human mind, which the word inspiration is now used to denote, is not more inconceivable than the ordinary action of mind on body or of body on mind." Those who allege the impossibility of a Divine revelation to man should in all fairness show where the impossibility lies. *Is it in God?* Is He not a Being of amazing and even of unbounded power? and whatever difficulties may be involved in a Divine revelation, are they such as omnipotence can never overcome? *Is the alleged impossibility in man?* Has he not perception, judgment, and will sufficient, if rightly directed, to apprehend and embrace what God may be pleased to reveal? To deny this were to deny the gift of our intellectual and rational nature, and to degrade ourselves to a level with the brutes. (Psalm xlix. 20.) Does the impossibility, then, lie in the discovery of a *proper medium of communication*? Shall we suppose that He who formed man, and endowed him with intelligence, is unable to devise a way by signs, inspiration, language, or the like, to disclose to him his mind and purposes? If we ourselves can in various ways transmit our inward thoughts, and sentiments, and

¹ See Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 112-16.

feelings to each other, can we entertain the thought that God, who has supplied us with this faculty, is ever at a loss to convey to us by some most efficient medium, the knowledge of His will and designs? ¹ We must surrender ourselves to the boldest Atheism ere we can deny that He can, if He sees fit, make a communication of Himself and of His will, and accompany it with evidences sufficiently clear to convince every lover of truth of its credit and authority. ²

V.—Is a Divine, Supernatural Revelation probable?

If any argument can be drawn from the general persuasion of mankind, it is strongly in favour of this supposition. For we shall scarcely find a people that believed the existence of a God, who did not likewise believe that some kind of communication already subsisted between God and man, or would at some future time be vouchsafed to dispel the cloud of darkness in which they were involved. But further than this: all our acquaintance with the Divine nature leads to the conclusion that He will concede to His rational and responsible creatures a communication of His nature and will. *He is a holy God*, infinitely and eternally holy; and it is in the nature of holiness to desire in all others a resemblance to itself, and to hold all impurity, wherever it exists, in utter abhorrence. But if our infinitely wise Creator designs us to be holy, He will undoubtedly supply every necessary assistance; for it is altogether inconceivable that a wise Being should will an end without willing also the means essential to that end; and is not a revelation of His will one of the means essential to that end? ³ *He is a God of goodness too.* "The goodness of God endureth continually." It arrays the lilies of the field, marks the fall of the sparrow, numbers the very hairs of our head, feeds the fowls of the air, and munificently supplies the wants of the whole creation. Man, as the chief and prince of this lower world, partakes of the especial care and bounty of the Most High. And shall his best interests be dis-

¹ Dr. Hannah's Lectures.

² The possibility of a Divine Revelation was held by the Greek and Roman philosophers, many of whom claimed to have received revelations and communicated them to mankind, see pp. 24, 25. It was predicated of them by the early Christian Fathers and apologists. Clement of Alexandria says, "Perchance, too, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, till the Lord should call the Greeks." "But all" [the philosophers] "in my opinion, are illuminated by the dawn of light." "So then, the Barbarian and Hellenic philosophy has torn off a fragment of eternal truth." In his "Exhortation to the Heathen," after quoting admiringly from Plato, Antisthenes, Socrates, Xenophon, Cleanthes, and the Pythagorians, he concludes, "For the knowledge, these utterances, written by those we have mentioned through the inspiration of God, and selected by us, may suffice." (See Winchell's "Science and Religion," pp. 179, 180.)

The objections to the possibility of Divine Revelation arising from Positivism, Agnosticism, Pantheism, etc., are practically met in the previous chapter, and do not need further notice here; for if we have evidence which proves the existence of a personal God, the Maker and Governor of the universe—"a Being who thinks and loves,"—it follows that He can and will make known His will to His intelligent and rational creatures.

³ Trellis's "Lectures on the Evidences."

regarded? Shall his body be fed, and his soul be left to pine away in dreary and unrelieved destitution? shall he find plentiful provision for time, and none for eternity? Is this the lesson which Divine goodness teaches? this the conclusion to which its past and present manifestations guide us?¹ Surely it may be presumed, with Socrates, however much the modern infidel may doubt it, that He, the loving Father of our spirits, will break the awful silence, and speak to man in the voice of love whatever may be necessary to his present and eternal well-being.²

If, then, these considerations afford presumptive evidence in favour of a revelation from God, the next inquiry relates to

The historical evidences of the credibility of the Scriptures.

The volume that is offered us as a revelation from God contains many separate books, written by different persons; are all these *genuine*? It abounds in historical facts; are they *authentic*? It has come down to us from very ancient times; can we be certain of its *uncorrupted preservation*? Historical evidence respects these three points.

VI.—Have we sufficient proof of the genuineness of the sacred books?

A book is *genuine* if it was written by the person whose name it bears. The word has relation only to authorship. Is it the legitimate production of the person to whom it is ascribed, or is it spurious? "Now, the greater part of the books of Scripture plainly appropriate the names of those by whom they were written; but the other books do not appropriate the names of their respective writers, while yet they claim to be the genuine productions of competent persons though unknown or undetermined."³ We must keep this distinction before us, and by the ordinary rules of criticism, the same rules that we should apply to the records of any profane writer, test the genuineness of the sacred books. The process of proof in respect to the Old and New Testament is of course distinct, and must be treated of separately.

Concerning the Books of the Old Testament.

1. Those which are assigned under God to a known and certain human authorship, have been received from the time of their alleged publication as the production of the men whose names they bear; and there is not, even in contemporary authors, in the contents of the works themselves, or in the traditions by which they are accompanied, the shadow of a testimony to the contrary.⁴ And the books

¹ Dr. Hannah.

² The probability of a Divine revelation is stated with great force in Paley's "Evidences"—Preliminary Considerations. See also Watson's "Institutes."

³ Dr. Hannah.

⁴ It should be remembered that the *onus probandi* that the books of Scripture are not genuine and authentic lies upon the objector. We are in possession, and the objector brings an action of ejectment. We have not to prove, but only to defend our case. Before we can be called upon to give up the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, positive evidence must be furnished that the reasons which were sufficient to prove this in the past, are insufficient, and are

which are assigned also under God to a competent human authorship, though unknown or unascertained, have been always received on a prevalent and satisfactory authority as the genuine works of men guided by God, and thus divinely fitted to instruct the Church and the world. And they afford ample internal evidence of their genuineness, in their strict harmony with other parts of Scripture, and in their uniform character. Did our process of proof pause here, we should be bound to admit the genuineness of these records.

2. The Old Testament is in the hands of two classes of men, who, in a theological sense, are utterly at variance—Jews and Christians. They possess no interest in common, no ties by which they could possibly be bound in a common scheme of fraud; and yet these hostile bodies have for ages jointly maintained the genuineness of the Old Testament: on this point there has been neither doubt nor disputation. And is it possible that an acknowledgment so universal could have taken place, had not these writings been demonstrably what they profess to be?

3. We have *direct* testimony to the genuineness of the Old Testament; for Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, who lived at the beginning of the Christian era, and who was without temptation to state anything that was not perfectly and notoriously true, gives a catalogue of the sacred books among the Jews, in which he expressly mentions the five books of Moses, thirteen of the Prophets, and four of Hymns and Moral Precepts. Now, the ancient Jews united the book of Ruth to that of Judges, made the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, Jeremiah and the Lamentations, and the twelve minor Prophets, respectively one book; and, therefore, the enumeration of Josephus precisely corresponds with that of our Bibles: another conclusive proof of the genuineness of these records.

4. But we have further proof on this subject in the fact that, more than three hundred years before the age of Josephus, the Jewish Scriptures were admitted into the celebrated Library of Alexandria, which was formed by the immediate successors of Alexander the Great. For this purpose they were translated into Greek about 280 B.C. This version is commonly called the "Sep-

outweighed by the proofs now offered in opposition. This we affirm has not been done.

"The genuineness of these writings really admits of little doubt, and is susceptible of as ready proof as that of any ancient writings whatever. The rule of municipal law on this subject is familiar, and applies with equal force to all ancient writings, whether documentary or otherwise; . . . every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves upon the opposing party the burden of proving it otherwise.

"If it be objected that the originals are lost, and that copies alone are now produced, the principles of municipal law here also afford a satisfactory answer. For the multiplication of copies was a public fact, in the faithfulness of which all the Christian community had an interest; and it is a rule of law that in matters of public and general interest all persons must be presumed to be conversant with their own affairs." "Testimony of the Evangelists," by Dr. Greenleaf, Professor of Law in Harvard University.

tuagint," and is now in our hands.¹ It consists of the same books as those which compose the Old Testament in our Bibles; and thus are we assured that we still have those identical books, which the most ancient Jews attested to be genuine; a benefit this which has not happened to any ancient profane books whatever.

5. Besides all this, the genuineness of the Old Testament Scriptures is attested by a mass of internal evidence, arising from the language, style, and manner of writing that are used, and the very great number of particular circumstances of time, place, persons, etc., that are mentioned. These are given in detail, and with great force, by Rev. T. H. Horne in his "Introduction," vol. i., and in Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences," lecture ii.²

Any one who will carefully examine the arguments now adduced will see how strong—we may add, indisputable—is the evidence of the genuineness of the Old Testament Scriptures.

VII.—Do not passages occur in some of these books which it is said really could not be written by the person to whom the work is attributed?

"We do not deny that a few insertions may have been made on the authority of subsequent inspired men, as Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra; and that marginal glosses may have accidentally crept

¹ For a history of this translation, etc., see Smith's "Concise Dictionary of the Bible,"—a most useful abridgment of the larger work.

² The Pentateuch has been the chief battle-ground as to the genuineness and historical accuracy of Old Testament Scripture. Colenso's attack is all but forgotten, and was a signal failure, which excited attention chiefly because of the boldness of its assertions and the ecclesiastical position of the author. On the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch see Barrow's "Introduction to the Study of the Bible," pp. 82-93; Ellicott's "Commentary:—Introduction to Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy;" "Speaker's Commentary," note on Lev. xxvi., end of chapter; Introductions to Numbers and Deuteronomy. See also Keil's "Introduction to the Old Testament," vol. i., pp. 79-196, for a full and almost exhaustive discussion of this question, and likewise the Documentary, Fragmentary, and Supplementary theories of the Book of Genesis.

The most recent, as well as the most learned, attempt to prove the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is that of Dr. W. Robertson Smith, following the teaching of Kuenen and Wellhausen. Their theory briefly stated by Dr. Cunningham Geikie is, that the Pentateuch consists of various documents incorporated in its books (this is admitted by all critics, the only difference of opinion being the extent of such incorporations), "That portions said to have been written by him may, indeed, be all that he himself with his own hand set down. But that Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, except a few fragments, date from nearly a thousand years after Moses; that the story of the Tabernacle, of the institution of the great yearly feasts, of the Levitical economy, and, indeed, even the laws which governed the Jewish people, are all 'legal fictions,' invented as long after the dates they attempt to bear as the interval of the present year from the reign of King Alfred in Wessex." All this, and more, Dr. Smith tells us "is quite certain;" "There is no doubt;" "The conclusion is inevitable." This "Newer Criticism," as its advocates call it, is not received by the highest authorities in Germany, and is rejected by almost every Biblical critic of note in England. Among the replies to Dr. Robertson Smith's Lectures, that of Professor Dr. Robert Watts, of Belfast, is one of the most able, viz., "The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of Faith, a reply to lectures by W. Robertson Smith, D.D., on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church," second edition. An admirable brief statement is found in "The Mosaic Authorship and Credibility of the Pentateuch," by R. Payne-Smith, Dean of Canterbury, in "Present Day Tracts," vol. iii. See also on this and kindred questions "The Higher Criticism and the Bible, a Manual for Students," by Rev. W. B. Boyce,—an admirable and useful volume.

into the text. But they do not affect the proper genuineness of the work."¹ Let us, however, consider a few examples. They may be comprised under one general head; viz., expressions and passages found in the Pentateuch, which could not have been written by Moses.

1. *In Gen. xiv. 14* it is said that Abram "Pursued them unto Dan," whereas it appears from *Judges xviii. 29*, that the town of Laish was not called Dan till above 330 years after the death of Moses. Hence it is argued that Genesis was not written till after the Israelites had taken possession of the Holy Land. "But is it not possible that Moses originally wrote Laish, and that after the name of the city had been changed, transcribers, for the sake of perspicuity, substituted the new for the old name?"² "But if this solution does not please you, we desire it may be proved that the *Dan* mentioned in Genesis was the same town as the *Dan* mentioned in *Judges*. We desire, further, to have it proved that the *Dan* mentioned in Genesis was the name of a town and not of a river. A river was fully as likely as a town to stop a pursuit. Lot, we know, was settled in the plain of Jordan (*Gen. xiii. 14*); and Jordan, we know, was composed of the united streams of two rivers, called *Jor* and *Dan*."³

2. *In Gen. xiii. 18* it is said that Abraham dwelt . . . in Hebron;" but in *Joshua xiv. 15*, we are told that "Hebron before was Kirjath-arba." Yet Hebron might be the name of the district even in the time of Moses; and till evidence to the contrary is adduced, the argument against the genuineness of the text is without foundation,

3. *In Gen. xxxv. 21* we read, "Israel spread his tent beyond the tower of Edar;" and it is said that, as this was the name of a tower over one of the gates of Jerusalem, the author of the Book of Genesis must at least have been contemporary with Saul and David. But "the tower of Edar" signifies, literally, the tower of the flock, and is so translated in *Micah iv. 8*; and as this name was undoubtedly given to many towers or places of retreat for shepherds in the open country of Palestine, which in the days of the patriarchs was covered with flocks, it is unnecessary to suppose that the phrase in this passage had any reference to a tower that, many hundreds of years after Israel was dead, was built in Jerusalem.⁴

4. *Exod. xvi. 35, 36* has been adduced to prove that the book could not have been written by Moses, as the Jews did not reach the borders of Canaan, or cease to eat manna, until after his death. It is acknowledged that the passage is evidently inserted by a later hand. It forms a complete parenthesis. "It might have been added by Ezra, who, under the direction of the Divine Spirit, collected and digested the different inspired books, adding such supplementary,

¹ Dr. Hannah.

² Horne's "Introduction." See also Speaker's and Critical commentaries in *loc.*

³ Bishop Watson's "Apology," letter iii.

⁴ *In Gen. xxiii. 2, and Numb. xiii. 22*, we have Hebron identified with Kirjath-arba, so the objection is without force. See also "Speaker's Commentary" in *loc.*

⁵ Horne's, "Introduction." See also Speaker's and Critical commentaries in *loc.*

explanatory, and connecting sentences, as were deemed proper to complete and arrange the whole of the sacred canon."¹

5. *Numb. xxi. 3* is another passage which appears to have been added after the days of Joshua; as it is certain the Canaanites were not utterly destroyed at the time here spoken of; nor were they till after the death of Moses. Probably, therefore, the verse was added afterwards by Joshua or Ezra: or else the word *Vaiyacharem*, which we translate "utterly destroyed them," should be rendered "devoted them to utter destruction,"² which not only makes a good sense, and is not repugnant to the Hebrew, but which the context shows to be the true meaning.³

6. *Numb. xii. 3* is supposed to prove that Moses could not have been the author of this book, as no man, however great his egotism, could have written such an assertion of himself. But "who would be so fastidious as to find fault with an illustrious man, who, being calumniated by his nearest relations as guilty of pride and fond of power, should vindicate his character by saying, 'My temper was naturally as meek and unassuming as that of any man upon earth'?" There are occasions in which a modest man, who speaks truly, may speak proudly of himself, without forfeiting his general character; and there is no occasion which either more requires or excuses this conduct, than when he is repelling the foul and envious aspersions of those who both know his character and had experienced his kindness; and in that predicament stood Aaron and Miriam, the accusers of Moses."⁴ This appears to be a sufficient answer to the objection. But it is pleaded by able critics that the word *Anav*, which is translated "meek," is derived from *Anah*, to act upon, to humble, depress, afflict, and ought to be understood in this sense here. "He was depressed or afflicted more than any man," etc. And why was he so? Because of the great burden he had to bear in the care and government of this people; and because of their ingratitude and rebellion, both against God and himself. Of this depression and affliction see the fullest proof in the preceding chapter. The very power they envied was oppressive to its possessor, and was more than either of *their* shoulders could sustain.⁵

7. In *Deut. xxxiv.* the death of Moses is described; and, therefore, that chapter could not have been written by him. Most commentators are of opinion that it was added either by Joshua, or some other sacred writer, as a supplement to the whole. Or, it may formerly have been the commencement of the Book of Joshua, and was removed from thence and joined to Deuteronomy by way of supplement. This latter opinion "will not appear unnatural, if it be considered that sections and other divisions, as well as points and pauses, were invented long since these books were written; for in

¹ Dr. A. Clarke's Note. ² The Revised Version reads in the margin, "Heb. devoted" instead of "destroyed."

³ Dr. A. Clarke's Note. See also "Critical Commentary."

⁴ Bishop Watson's "Apology."

⁵ Dr. Clarke's Note. Also "Speaker's Commentary."

those early ages several books were connected together, and followed each other on the same roll. The beginning of one book might, therefore, be easily transferred to the end of another, and, in process of time, be considered as its real conclusion."¹

8. *Gen.* xxxvi. 31, and *Deut.* iii. 14, contain the most formidable objections that have been urged against the genuineness of the Pentateuch; for the one implies a writer who lived after the establishment of monarchy in Israel; the other a writer who lived at least some ages after the settlement of the Jews in Palestine. "But I have no scruple," says Bishop Watson, "in admitting that the passage in question, viz., *Gen.* xxxvi. 31-39, containing the genealogy of some kings of Edom, might have been inserted in the Book of Genesis after the Book of Chronicles (which was called in Greek by a name importing that it contained things left out in the other books) was written." "Or it is quite possible they might have been, at a very early period, written in the margin of an authentic copy to make out the regal succession in Edom, prior to the consecration of Saul; which words being afterwards found in the margin of a valuable copy, from which others were transcribed, were supposed by a copyist to be a part of the text, which having been omitted by the mistake of the original writer, had been since added to make up the deficiency; on this conviction he would not hesitate to transcribe them consecutively in his copy."²

And so also the clause of the second example (*Deut.* iii. 14), "unto this day," could not possibly have proceeded from the author of the rest of the verse, who, whether Moses or any other person, would hardly have written, "He called them after his own name *unto this day.*" The author of the Pentateuch wrote, "He called them after his own name:" some centuries after the death of the author, the clause "unto this day" was probably added in the margin to denote that the district still retained the name which was given it by Jair, and this marginal reading was in subsequent transcripts obtruded on the text.³

These are the principal passages that have been adduced to disprove the genuineness of the Old Testament Scriptures. And now let any one decide impartially as to their bearing upon this question. Is there anything in any or in all of these passages to induce us to lay aside the sacred books as spurious or counterfeit? Did any one ever deny the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* to be the work of Homer, because some ancient critics and grammarians have asserted that a *few* verses are interpolations? And may we not even say that the few instances of interpolation that have been discovered in the text of Scripture, so far from impeaching the antiquity and genuineness of the original narrative, rather confirms them? "For, if this were a compilation long subsequent to the events it records, such additions would not have been plainly distinguishable, as they now are, from the main

¹ Dr. Clarke's Note. Also "Speaker's Commentary."

² Dr. Clarke. Also "Speaker's Commentary" and the "Critical Commentary."

³ Horne's "Introduction."

substance of the original; since the entire history would have been composed with the same ideas and views as these additions were; and such explanatory insertions would not have been made, if length of time had not rendered them necessary."¹

Concerning the Books of the New Testament; their genuineness is a question easily determined. It is proved by the common consent of all ages of the Christian Church from the times of the apostles down to our own.² "Had the books which bear the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, etc., been published after their death, when they had never before been heard of, would not the several persons and Churches to which some of them were addressed, and Christians in general, as supposed to have been acquainted with them during the lives of the apostles and evangelists, have declared them to be forgeries? The claim, it is evident, would have been absurd, and the imposture manifest. The doubts that arose concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, which bears not the name of Paul; that of James, which perhaps was *then* thought, as it has *since* been, irreconcilable with Paul's doctrine; the Second Epistle of Peter, which seems to have been written just before his death; and the Second and Third of John, in which he only calls himself the elder, prove this. Some of these books, and perhaps the Revelation of John, might not be generally known among Christians during the lifetime of their authors, or they might not be publicly acknowledged by them; and therefore, after their death, the scrupulous caution of the Church long hesitated about admitting them as genuine and Divine; till *internal evidence* fully convinced the most accurate judges that they were entitled to that regard."³ And, now, the early catalogues that we possess of the New Testament books, the references to them by name in the earliest Christian writers, the quotations, from almost all the books, that are found in their writings, are such as put the question of the genuineness of the Christian Scriptures in a position of certainty incomparably beyond any writings that ever existed.⁴ Such, in fact, is the accumulation of testimony, that it would be far more rational to question whether Milton was the author of "Paradise Lost," than whether the books of the New Testament were written by the authors whose names they bear.⁵

¹ Horne's "Introduction."

² See Lardner's "Credibility of the Gospel History." An abridged view of the evidence adduced in this work is given by Paley, in his "Evidences." See also Horne's "Introduction," vol. i.

³ Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences."

⁴ The canon of the New Testament was not finally settled until the Council of Carthage, 397, but the books themselves were accepted as inspired long before.

⁵ On the genuineness of the books of the New Testament there are two works of inestimable value, Isaac Taylor's "History of the Transmigration of Ancient Books," and his "Process of Historical Proof Exemplified and Explained." They are as interesting in respect of the facts they embody as they are convincing in argument.—Rev. T. Jackson. Rénan says, "It is known that each of the four Gospels bears at its head the name of a personage known either in the apostolic history or in the evangelistic history itself . . . they assume a high value, since they enable us to go back to the half-century which followed the life of Jesus, and even in two cases to eye-witnesses of His actions." "As to Luke doubt is scarcely

VIII.—Have we sufficient proof of the authenticity of the sacred books?

"An *authentic* book is that which relates matters of fact as they really happened. A book may be genuine without being authentic; and a book may be authentic without being genuine."¹ *Genuineness* teaches us that a book is its alleged author's real performance; *authenticity*, that it contains the truth, and in consequence possesses authority. Now, we maintain that the Holy Scriptures are not only genuine, as we have proved them to be; but, also, authentic. *The facts* related contain the truth, and nothing but the truth. And since these facts are inseparably identified with all the other parts of Scripture, if you establish *them*, you may be said to give authentication to the entire revelation.²

Those statements of the Bible to which this part of our inquiry refers, may be classed under three general heads.

I. Such as *appertain to ordinary history*, and which must be judged of by the rules applicable to history in general. Such, for example, are the facts that Moses was the leader and lawgiver of the Jewish people; that David was the second and the most eminent of the Israelitish monarchs; that Jesus Christ was the founder of the Christian faith; that He was crucified by the command of Pilate; that after His death His disciples extensively preached the doctrines which He taught, and the like relations. Now, all that is necessary to prove the truth of these statements is, that they were published about the time when these facts are said to have occurred, and that they were then admitted as authentic. It is impossible for a fictitious narrative of public events to be believed by those who lived in the times in which they are affirmed to have taken place. If, a thousand years hence, a question should arise as to the conquests of Napoleon Bonaparte, it will be a sufficient proof on the subject that

possible . . . the twenty-first chapter of St. Luke, which is inseparable from the rest of the work, was certainly written after the destruction of Jerusalem, but not long after. We are, therefore, here on solid ground, for we are dealing with a work proceeding from the same hand, and possessing the most complete unity." "One point which is beyond question is, that the Acts are by the same author as the third Gospel, and are a continuation of that Gospel. One need not stop to prove this proposition, which has never been seriously contested." "To sum up, I admit the four Canonical Gospels as serious documents, all go back to the age which followed the death of Jesus." The author of "Supernatural Religion" admits "That our third Synoptic exists in Marcion's time" . . . "about the year A.D. 140, and it may of course be inferred that it must have been composed at least some time before that date." Holtzmann—a German rationalistic critic—says, "The first Canonical Gospel was entirely and unanimously attributed by the ancient Church to the Apostle Matthew;" see Westcott's "History of the Canon;" Sanday's "Gospels in the Second Century;" Tischendorf's "When were the Gospels written?" Kennedy's "The Gospels, their Age and Authorship;" Bleek's "Introduction to the New Testament," vol. ii., pp. 233-82; Row's "Bampton Lectures;" Paley's "Evidences," edited by Birks, particularly pp. 103-71; Martin's "Origin and History of the New Testament;" Wace's "Authenticity of the Four Gospels;" Harris's "Christianity Historically True;" Gritton's "Christianity not the invention of Impositors or Credulous Enthusiasts;" Maclear's "Difficulties on the Side of Unbelief in Accounting for Christianity."

¹ Bishop Watson's "Apology," letter ii.

² See "The Facts of Christianity Historically True," by G. B. Cowper, in "Christian Evidence Lectures;" Cooper's "Bridge of History."

the narratives of these conquests were published and universally received in our own age. Thus, therefore, we prove the truth of Scripture history in general; because we have abundant proof that it was published and admitted about the time when its events are said to have occurred.¹

2. Such as *narrate public occurrences of a supernatural order*; e.g., the plagues of Egypt, the parting of the Red Sea, the manna, the passage of the Jordan, the preternatural darkness, with the other phenomena, attendant upon our Lord's crucifixion. Here, also, the evidence of the genuineness of the books of Scripture is a sufficient proof of their authenticity; for if these relations were published while multitudes were alive who must have witnessed the facts, had they really transpired, it is manifestly impossible that any narrative could have been received which was not strictly true.²

3. Such as *we believe principally upon the testimony of the writers of Scripture*; e.g., a large proportion of the teachings and miracles of our Lord, and the incidents of His private life, the miracles of the apostles, etc. Here we have testimony that is every way trustworthy, abundantly sufficient to command our faith. To confine our remarks to the New Testament:

(1) The witnesses were in a position to judge accurately concerning the facts which they relate.

(2) Their character was such as to preclude the possibility of fraud. They were men of the most eminent virtue, followers of one "who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth." Their purity and virtue and self-denial, all belie the supposition of their having spent their lives in the attestation of a known lie, in the name and with the pretended authority of the God of truth.

(3) They had no interest in making their story good. All deceivers have some object in view, which, by their imposture, they expect to accomplish. What, then, was the object here? Why, the forfeiture of all the good on which men in general set their hearts, and the endurance of the evils from which human nature revolts, and to which no sane man that could help it would expose himself. At the same time, in the very doctrine which they promulgate in connection with the alleged facts, they doom themselves, as conscious impostors and liars, to the damnation of hell. And it would be an utter outrage on all the common principles and feelings of our nature to suppose men thus to relinquish good, and to encounter evils, in attestation of what they know to be false.

(4) Their narratives present every appearance of the most perfect simplicity and candour. They contain no rhetorical embellishments and no peculiar opinions of the writers. They related facts just as they occurred, and even detailed their own errors and faults without the slightest attempt at concealment or extenuation.

(5) Their writings contain several undesigned coincidences which

¹ See "The Facts of Christianity Historically True," by G. B. Cowper, in "Christian Evidence Lectures;" Cooper's "Bridge of History."
² Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences."

are a decisive mark of truth. Our space precludes enumeration; but the subject is fully brought out in Paley's "*Horæ Paulinæ*," Blunt's "*Veracity of the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles*," and Birks' "*Supplement to Paley's Horæ Paulinæ*."

(6) Their testimony is in harmony with contemporary history. They are most minute and circumstantial in their narratives, giving dates, names of persons, places, and a thousand other things, which, had there been any design to deceive, would certainly have been omitted, since every one of them supplied facilities for detection. And yet their statements are confirmed by the testimony of profane historians, by the public and national records of the time, and even by the bitterest enemies of the Christian faith.¹

From these cursory remarks we are warranted in affirming that Scripture history is accredited to a degree to which no other narratives can make the slightest pretensions, and consequently is worthy of our most implicit faith.

IX.—Have we sufficient proof of the uncorrupted preservation of the sacred books?

Observe, this question does not relate to verbal inaccuracies, such as may result from inadvertency. Before the art of printing, books were multiplied by the pen. The transcribing of books was a distinct profession; and the perfection to which the art was carried is almost incredible to those who have not inspected ancient penmanship. Yet the most careful were not infallible; hence the various readings which have been collected from existing manuscripts. But of what do they consist? Almost wholly of inadvertencies in transcription; such as, the insertion or omission of an article, the substitution of a word for its equivalent, the occasional transposition of a word or two in a sentence, or the insertion of a marginal note in the text. All this was to be expected. But our question now is, are the Scriptures preserved to us in all material and important circumstances without corruption? And we maintain that they are.²

¹ For information on these points we refer to Treffry's "*Lectures on the Evidences*;" but especially to Horne's "*Introduction*," vol. i.; and Leslie's "*Short and Easy Method with Deists*;" "*The Authenticity of the Four Gospels*," by the Rev. W. Wace, D.D., in "*Present Day Tracts*," vol. iii.; "*The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead*," by the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., in "*Present Day Tracts*," vol. i. For evidence of contemporaneous history see "*The Witness of Ancient Monuments to the Old Testament Scriptures*," by A. H. Sayce, M.A., in "*Present Day Tracts*," vol. vi.; "*Assyrian Life and History*," by E. M. Harkness; "*Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*," by A. H. Sayce, M.A.; "*Babylonian Life and History*," by E. A. Wallis Bridge, B.A.; "*Galilee in the Time of Christ*," by Selah Mervile, D.D.; "*Records of the Past*," various series; Rawlinson's "*Bampton Lectures*;" Geikie's "*Hours with the Bible*," six volumes; Layard's "*Nineveh and Babylon*;" the publications of the Palestine Exploration Society; Keith's "*Evidence of Prophecy*," and other publications, all of which present a united testimony of the most convincing character that the sacred writers were true historians.

² The Revised Version of the Bible abundantly confirms the statement in the text, and proves that all the various readings do not affect a single doctrine or fact.

With respect to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, this will appear—

1. From the moral improbability of the corruption of such writings, guarded as they were by a succession of holy men, publicly read, made the subject of frequent appeals, and identified with the various institutions of the country in which they existed.¹

2. From the precautions employed for their preservation. There was one tribe, that of Levi, to whom their safe custody was confided. One copy of the Pentateuch was preserved in the ark. So great was the reverence of the Jews for their Scriptures, that Philo and Josephus testify that they would suffer any torment, and even death itself, rather than falsify a single point. And a law was enacted by them which denounced him as guilty of unpardonable sin who should presume to make the slightest alteration in the sacred books. Shortly after the completion of the Old Testament canon by Ezra, there arose the doctors of the Masorah, or the "Masorites"—the most learned men of the Jewish nation, who directed their attention exclusively to the preservation of the sacred text. And on the cessation of the Masorites in the eleventh century of the Christian era, as we learn from the celebrated Rabbi Maimonides, it was a constant rule to destroy a book of the law rather than allow a single error in word or letter to be perpetuated.²

3. From the entire silence of our Lord and His apostles on the subject of any corruption of the ancient Scriptures. Would they have referred so frequently to Moses and the Prophets, urging the people so emphatically to "search the Scriptures," appealing to them in proof of what they did and what they taught, had they cherished any doubt as to the perfect state of these writings? Had such doubt existed, would they not rather have lifted up their voice like a trumpet to denounce the men who had wilfully corrupted the word of God?³

4. From the harmony of the ancient versions. We have the Samaritan Pentateuch, which undoubtedly existed many centuries before the Christian era. We have the Greek translation, "the Septuagint," executed about 280 B.C. And we have the ancient Syriac version, made about the commencement of the Christian era. The first was in the hands of the most virulent ancient enemies of the Jews, the Samaritans; the last was held by their most strenuous opponents of a subsequent age, the Christians of Palestine and Syria. It was impossible, therefore, that any material alteration could be made upon the sacred books without at once being detected and exposed. And the general agreement of those important versions shows that, in fact, no attempt to alter or corrupt was ever made.⁴

5. From the harmony of all existing manuscripts. Of these we

¹ Dr. Hannah.

² Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences."

³ See Lord Chancellor Hatherley's "Continuity of Scripture,"—a most valuable book by one of the shrewdest equity lawyers of the present century.

⁴ Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences." See also article "Bible Versions" in Dr. Schaff's "Cyclopedia of Biblical, Historical, and Doctrinal Theology."

have now extant some which are upwards of one thousand years old. The whole number examined and compared with each other by Kennicott and De Rossi was one thousand three hundred and forty-six; and the published editions subjected to their most careful inspection was three hundred and fifty-two; making a grand total of one thousand six hundred and ninety-eight; and though, of course, there are in these a very large number of minor differences, yet, as Dr. Kennicott stated to King George III., there is not one which affects the truth of any Scripture fact, or the certainty of any doctrine of faith or moral duty.¹

With respect to the Scriptures of the New Testament, their incorrupt preservation is attested by the following facts:—

1. They were widely dispersed from the time at which they were written. In the apostolic age Christianity was extended through the greater part of the Roman empire;² and Justin Martyr, who wrote in A.D. 148, and Tertullian, who wrote above fifty years after, in their "Apologies for the Christians," which they addressed to the highest authorities of the state, declare that in all the religious assemblies of these people the Gospels were regularly read as a part of the service. It follows, therefore, that copies were circulated in Egypt, Judea, Syria, Greece, and Italy. No man could corrupt books so widely dispersed; especially when a peculiar sacredness was attached to them, and the wilful adulteration of them was regarded as a most atrocious sin.³

2. They were early translated into various languages. A translation of the New Testament into Syriac was made, according to the general opinion of the learned, at the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. Translations into Latin were also made for the use of the Christians who spoke that language; and out of these St. Jerome, in the fourth century, formed the version called the Vulgate. Other translations followed, and every version of the New Testament is an additional security against adulteration. If any corrupt copies were circulated, the other copies which are extant, and of an earlier date, would enable any one to detect the fraud.

3. Christians were early divided into sects; and these sects were

¹ Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences." See also article "Bible Versions" in Dr. Schaff's "Cyclopedia of Biblical, Historical, and Doctrinal Theology."

² For proof of this see Tacitus—who tells us that Nero, having set fire to Rome, in order to remove suspicion from himself "inflicted the most exquisite torments" upon the Christians, of whom Tacitus says, "They derived their name and origin from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius had suffered death by the sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilate. For a while this dire superstition was checked, but again it burst forth, and not only spread itself over Judæa, the first seat of this mischievous sect, but was even introduced into Rome, the common asylum which receives and protects whatever is impure, and whatever is atrocious." Also the letter of Pliny, governor of Bithynia on the Black Sea, to the Emperor Trajan—written about seventy years after the crucifixion—"The number of the culprits (Christians) is so great as to call for serious consideration. The contagion of the superstition hath spread, not only through cities, but even villages and the country." He speaks of some of the Christians having been so, much more than twenty years: thus within fifty years of the crucifixion Christianity had extended even to this distant part of the Empire.

³ Rev. T. Jackson's MS. Lectures.

involved in continual disputes, all of them, however, regarding these sacred records as Divine compositions, possessing an authority belonging to no other books. Now, these sects were a check upon one another; and it was morally impossible that any man or body of men should corrupt or falsify what was universally regarded as the supreme standard of truth, should hoist into it a single expression to favour some peculiar tenet, or erase a single sentence, without being detected by thousands. It is thus that the God of providence overrules what may seem at first sight to be unmitigated evil for the production of permanent good.

4. All the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that are known to exist are in substantial agreement with each other.¹ These MSS. are far more numerous than those of any *single* classic author whomsoever. Upwards of three hundred and fifty were collated by Griesbach. They are not, indeed, all entire; nor was this to be expected; for not a few have been much read and damaged. They were written in different and distant parts of the world; several of them are upwards of 1,200 years old; and they all present to us the books of the New Testament without any variations that affect the substance of Christianity. The thirty thousand various readings which Dr. Mill published, and the hundred and fifty thousand which have been collected by Griesbach, while they seem in some particulars to restore the genuine text, seem also to prove that the text has not been wilfully or injuriously corrupted. In fact, it is the remark of one every way qualified to judge: "The very worst MS. extant would not pervert one article of faith, or destroy one moral precept, not elsewhere given in the most explicit terms." And so far are the various readings contained in these manuscripts from being hostile to the uncorrupted preservation of the books of the New Testament (as some sceptics have boldly affirmed, and some timid Christians have apprehended), that they afford us, on the contrary, an additional and most convincing proof that they exist at present, in all essential points, precisely the same as they were when they left the hands of their authors.²

Here we complete our inquiry into the Historical Evidence of the Credibility of the Scriptures.³ They were written by the persons whose names they bear, and about the period in which they are said

¹ The oldest and most important MSS. of the New Testament are codices A, B, C, and N. A, or the Codex Alexandrinus, is in the British Museum, and is believed to be of the fourth or fifth century. B, or Codex Vaticanus, is in the Vatican library at Rome, and is of the fourth century. C, or Codex Ephraemi, is a palimpsest of the fourth century. N, or Codex Sinaiticus, is in the royal library of St. Petersburg; it was discovered in a monastery at Mount Sinai by Tischendorf, on February 4th, 1859, and is believed to be the oldest known MSS.

² Horne's "Introduction."

³ The historical argument as to the New Testament may be thus epitomised:—

(1) The facts of the New Testament were publicly known early in the second century.

(2) That Christianity itself—within about seventy years after the crucifixion—had spread over the whole of the Roman empire.

(3) That early in the second century, or about seventy years after the crucifixion, the existence of the Gospels, and several of the Epistles, and their circulation among

to have been written, and we, therefore, affirm their *genuineness*. They contain a true relation of facts, and a correct statement of doctrines, and we affirm their *authenticity*. They have undergone no alterations except such as in the lapse of time were unavoidable, and we affirm their *uncorrupted preservation*. Our next inquiry will be, whether the Bible is accompanied with evidence sufficient to satisfy every candid mind that it really is a Divine revelation.

X.—What are the direct or external evidences of Divine revelation?

If God should commission certain men to be the messengers of His truth to others, He will certainly enable them to produce to their fellow-men satisfactory credentials of their speaking with His authority; in other words, sufficient evidence that what they affirm to be from Him really is of such Divine origin. And it is sufficiently manifest that it must be evidence presented to the senses of men; something of which all are competent to judge. It must also be something which Divine power and wisdom alone can effect; something undeniably superhuman and supernatural. This is what we call direct or external evidence, and is found in the miracles wrought and in the prophecies uttered—miracles, which display the Almighty power of God—prophecies, which attest His omniscient wisdom. These constitute the unequivocal seal of heaven to the commission of His servants and to the testimony which they bear. For the discussion of these subjects, we refer the reader to Chapter III.

XI.—What are the internal evidences of Divine revelation?

This is furnished by the character and the discoveries of the book itself—the sublimity of its doctrines, the purity of its precepts, the harmony of its parts, the exactness of its adaption, the blessedness of its influence, etc., etc. Inquiry and examination, the most acute and penetrating, into these various departments of testimony, will serve to make good the position that these Scriptures are incomparably superior to aught that unassisted human wisdom had ever produced.

XII.—What are the most prominent features of the internal evidence?

the Christians under the names they now bear, is admitted by most of the eminent sceptics.

(4) That these documents were accepted by the Christians throughout the Roman empire as true histories of the life and teachings of Christ and His Apostles; and they received their teachings as the rule of their lives.

(5) That Institutions commemorative of some of the most important events of the New Testament were adopted; among which are the Lord's Supper in memory of His death, and as taking the place of the Jewish Passover; Sunday—or the Lord's Day—as the day of rest, and worship, on the First, instead of the Seventh day of the week—as a memorial of Christ's resurrection. These institutions have existed without break from the very time of the events themselves. To these may be added the festival of Easter, in commemoration of the death and resurrection of the Saviour, which was instituted, at least, not later than the middle of the second century. The festival of Whit Sunday—in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, is traceable to a very remote antiquity—and there is good reason to believe that it was instituted during Apostolic times.

We have space only to adduce but two or three.

1. *The pure and spiritual conceptions which the Bible has furnished of the Deity.* There is nothing which the writers upon natural religion have demonstrated more clearly than the insufficiency, the absurdity even, of those results to which the lights of nature and reason have actually brought men as to the character of the Deity. We take even the writings of the sages, the wise men in Egypt and Greece and Rome, and in the most brilliant periods of the philosophical and literary history of such countries, and we find their opinions of the Supreme Being, not only loose and undefined, but misshapen and preposterous, and to the last degree stupid. We take up the Bible, and we find there something so transcendently superior as to admit of no comparison. We find it declaring, "God is one," "God is a Spirit," "God is light," "God is love." In fact, we find here every view of God that is fitted at once to inspire fear and love; to command adoring veneration; and to conciliate and fix affectionate and confiding attachment. Are we not constrained to say there must be something more than human wisdom here?

2. *The clear and consistent account which the Bible gives of the redemption of man.* The most unenlightened pagans have acknowledged man to be in a state of vice, ruin, and misery; but they could discover no method of recovery. "How can a man be just with God?" was an inquiry to which their profoundest philosophy furnished no reply. But the Scripture revelation makes this the constant theme of its discoveries; and the arrangement which it reveals is so high and wonderful as to extort the exclamation: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!" Here is mercy extended to the guilty, but in perfect accordance with the claims of law, of justice, and of truth. "The law is magnified," sin is punished, justice is vindicated, and yet the sinner is pardoned and saved. In every part of the scheme there are the most emphatic indications of profound and unsearchable wisdom. It is a procedure so remote from the apprehensions of men as to preclude all ideas of human fabrication.

3. *The light which the Bible throws around the destiny of man.* The greatest teachers of antiquity were perplexed with doubts concerning the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the rewards and punishments of a future state. Some of them had weak and imperfect notions on these subjects, while others discarded them as vain and superstitious terrors. But the Bible supplies us with all needful information. It alone has furnished an answer to the inquiry, "If a man die, shall he live again?" It has opened the portals of immortality; its glorious sunshine has dispelled the darkness of the grave. It has so unveiled the eternal future to our gaze, that every right inquiry can be answered, every real necessity relieved, every substantial interest secured. Human wisdom has never produced anything at all like this.¹

¹ See "The Adaptation of the Bible to the Needs of Man," by the Rev. W. G. Blackie, D.D., in "Present Day Tracts," vol. vi.

We cannot pursue the subject further ; and must refer for other aspects of the subject to Chapter III. The Scriptures carry with them a self-evidencing power. They have the impress of God upon them. They plead their own cause ; and the more their contents are understood, the more will they manifest the source from which they come.

XIII. But do not Sceptics derive their chief objections to the Bible from its internal character ?

They do, and the reason is obvious.

I. They do not come to the inquiry with a becoming sense of the limitation of the human faculties. They find in the record certain doctrines (such as the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the God-head) which they are unable to comprehend, and certain acts of the Divine government (such as the destruction of the Canaanites by the people of Israel) which they cannot reconcile with their notions of what is right. It never occurs to them to inquire with Zophar, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" or to say with David, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me." They evidently suppose that in a revelation from God there should be nothing which they cannot fathom—nothing the reasons of which they are unable to perceive. And in view of these difficulties and mysteries, they at once pronounce the volume which contains them to be an imposture and a lie.¹ Now, is this wise? Are there not inscrutable mysteries in every department of nature, in every branch of science, and even in our own physical frame? and is it reasonable to expect that we should find nothing of the sort when we pass from nature to revelation? If we cannot comprehend ourselves, is it reasonable to expect that we should comprehend God? If we are baffled at every point in our investigation of the physical universe, is it matter of wonder that we should find some things beyond our reach in God's moral administration? And are we not justly chargeable with a high-minded self-sufficiency that is utterly repugnant to the dictates of sound common sense, if we bound truth by the limits of our own capacity, refusing to receive whatever we cannot fully comprehend, and indignant at everything difficult or mysterious that does not immediately yield to our penetration? Our first work, undoubtedly, is to examine the great body of external and historical evidence that proves the Bible to be of God. This is an examination of which reason is capable. And if we find, as we shall, that this book possesses valid claims to be acknowledged as a revelation from God, our only legitimate course is at once determined; namely, to sit down to the record as humble learners, meekly receiving as

¹ See "Moral Difficulties connected with the Bible," by the Rev. J. A. Hessey, D.C.L. First to Third Series. These contain a very able defence and explanation of many confessedly difficult passages. Also "The Moral Teaching of the Old Testament Vindicated," by the Rev. J. H. Titcomb, M.A., in "Popular Objections to Revealed Truth," "The Moral Teaching of the New Testament viewed as Evidential to its Historical Truth," by the Rev. C. A. Row.

truth whatever it teaches, and implicitly practising as duty whatever it enjoins. This may be very mortifying to the pride of reason; but it is self-evidently rational and imperative.

2. There are some passages which through ignorance are misunderstood by them, and, therefore, uninterpreted. For example, on reading Exod. iii. 22 and xi. 2, they suppose that Moses represents the just God as ordering the Israelites to *borrow* the goods of the Egyptians under pretence of *returning* them; while He intended that they should march off with the booty. Now, this mistake arises from ignorance of the meaning of the original word *shaal*, which signifies simply to *ask, request, require, demand*.¹ "God commanded the Israelites to *ask* or demand a certain recompense for their past services, and He inclined the hearts of the Egyptians to *give* liberally; and this, far from being a matter of oppression, wrong, or even charity, was no more than a very partial recompense for the long and painful services which we may say 600,000 Israelites had rendered to Egypt, during a considerable number of years." There was, therefore, no *borrowing* (in the ordinary sense of that term) in the case; and if accounts were fairly balanced, Egypt would be found still in considerable arrears to Israel.² Many other similar cases might be adduced which require but to be fairly examined, and all difficulty disappears.

3. They overlook the fact that the gift and light of revelation were progressive; in consequence of which things might be permitted under an inferior dispensation, but are not permitted now; as examples, we may mention slavery and divorce under certain circumstances.

4. They make the most of all the apparent discrepancies they meet with, and allege them to be sufficient to set aside all claim to the inspiration of the Bible. Now, we admit that freedom from error is an essential property of whatever is Divine; all Scripture as it came from God is pure, unmixed, and unchanging truth; and none have given more attention to the discrepancies that appear, than devout believers in the authority and Divine origin of the Word. But they have discovered that many seeming discrepancies have arisen from the errors of transcribers and translators; and many from the brevity of the narrative, or from our ignorance of local scenes and circumstances, or from the ambiguity of certain words, etc.³ They have also discovered that many of the most formidable discrepancies disappear before a rigid and exact inquiry, and many more before the light of advancing science and discovery. And they think it only fair and honest to conclude that, if a few yet remain, we have but to wait the results of investigation and dis-

¹ The Revised Version reads "ask," instead of "borrow."

² Dr. A. Clarke's Note on Exod. iii. 22.

³ "It is useless to carp at minor details. All histories contain variations, or, if you like to call them contradictions, on minor points. This has been the case with every history from Herodotus to Froude." *Westminster Review*, January 1873. See "The Facts of Christianity Historically True," by B. Harris Cowper, in "Popular Objections to Revealed Truth."

STOCKS

Supplication

covery, and light will break in upon the obscurity, and the authority and inspiration of the Bible be put beyond dispute.¹

XIV.—What are the collateral or miscellaneous evidences?

"These evidences are so styled because they are subsidiary to such as have been produced, and because they do not exactly fall under any of the classes of proof which have passed under our review. It is to be observed, however, that they are not of an inferior character; the more they are examined, the more fully will it be seen that they are of singular value and use." We take a more particular survey, under this head, of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus to the Christian Faith; the early propagation of Christianity; and the actual benefit which it has already conferred upon mankind.

XV.—In what way does the conversion of Saul attest the Divine authority of Christianity?

The scriptural account of that event in Acts ix. assigns a miraculous manifestation as its cause. There can be no debate whether Paul himself thought that something supernatural had happened. And on no other supposition can we account for a change so unexpected, and requiring so costly a sacrifice.

1. *It is not possible that he could have been deceived;* for (1) The events that occurred were of a tangible and obvious kind, in which there was no room for delusion or misapprehension. What took place was at noon and in the highway. And the light from heaven which struck him to the ground, the voice addressing him by name, the total blindness which followed, the restoration of his sight by one who was commissioned to visit him, his instruction by special revelation in all the mystery of the doctrine of Christ, his ability at once to confound the opposition of unbelieving and prejudiced Jews—these were not matters of mere fancy; the case was thoroughly sifted by friends and foes; it became a matter of greatest notoriety; and amongst all his enemies who pursued him with virulence and malice, not one was ever able to contradict or disprove the tale. (2) The character of his mind was such as to raise him above the possibility of deceit. His naturally vigorous and capacious understanding had been strengthened by years of careful study under the best of teachers, so that "he well knew how to trace distinctions, to strip off disguises, to detect each species of false or feeble reasoning, and to subject everything to the most searching scrutiny." (3) He was inflamed with ardent zeal for a religion which he believed to be Divine. It was his religion by the accident of birth, by the deliberation of choice, by the force of habit. It was identified with his first thoughts, associated with his

¹ "Science and Scripture not Antagonistic," by Rev. G. Henshaw, M.A., F.G.S., in "Popular Objections to Revealed Truth, Science, and Religion," by Alexander Winchell, LL.D., pp. 11, 158, 159, 209, etc.

² Dr. Hannah.

deepest feelings, interwoven with his fondest recollections. (4) He was publicly committed to the task of opposing and destroying the religion of Jesus. His fame was spread through all the region of Judea as the prop and champion of the old religion, the avowed and notorious exterminator of the new. He was, therefore, armed against Christianity by a combination of mighty causes which precluded the possibility of imposition or deceit.

2. *He could not intend to impose on others;* for there was no motive that could prompt him to feign what he was not, and no end that could be answered by assuming the profession of Christianity. His position as an enemy of Jesus was one of honour and prosperity. The chief priests honoured him with their approbation and patronage. His country's gratitude followed him, and its rulers hailed him with the most flattering commendations. Even to relax in his zeal would cover him with disgrace; but to change sides, and to defend the faith he had laboured to destroy, would draw upon him universal execration, and expose him to all sorts of privations, sufferings, hardships, dangers, and death itself. These were not only the unavoidable consequences of espousing the cause of the Nazarene; but he had them fully in his apprehension. And would he be likely under such circumstances to feign attachment to doctrines which he did not believe, and to a person whom in his heart he contemned? Who ever heard of a cheat whose only object was to secure to the actor the loss of property, of position, of friends, a life of labour and ignominy, and a death of scorn, and all in exchange for association and honour and applause and goodwill? He could not be imposing on others.

3. *We are, therefore, necessarily led to the conclusion that his conversion was the result of a real miracle.* The brightness which struck him to the ground, the voice by which he was arrested, proceeded from a Divine interference. The great change that he underwent was from heaven. It is certain, therefore, that the religion to which that conversion introduced him is not an imposture, but that it is indeed of God. If challenged for proof that Christianity is Divine, we can point to Saul of Tarsus. There he stands, a monument of the power of grace, such as may fix the attention of every age, and witness to the end of the dispensation that the religion he embraced is the infallible and eternal truth of Jehovah. This argument is ably developed in Lord Lyttleton's "Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of Paul."

XVI.—In what way does the early propagation of Christianity attest its Divine origin?

The argument will unfold itself if we keep in mind a few important facts.

1. Within the first century of the Christian era the Gospel had made a progress that is altogether unexampled and without a parallel. In less than a single year after its Founder was accused as a male-

factor, and on the very soil where his blood was shed, its conquest amounted to nearly ten thousand; in less than two years it overran Judea: and in less than a single century it pervaded Syria and Lybia, Egypt and Arabia, Persia and Mesopotamia, Armenia and Parthia, the whole of Asia Minor, and no small part of Europe.

2. The doctrines which were promulgated with success were, in all their essential facts and principles and requirements, in perfect opposition to the prejudices, desires, and propensities of mankind, whether Jew or Gentile.

3. The instruments that were employed were mostly plain, unlettered men, artless and simple in their manner and objects, without polish of address, without friends, power, or property; and were consequently the most incompetent and ineligible, in all earthly and secular respects, for such a work (1 Cor. i. 26-29; 2 Cor. iv. 7).

4. The opposition that was directed against the Gospel was the most determined and inveterate. Jews and pagans made common cause against the religion of the cross, bringing all their resources to destroy the workmen and to stop their work; and for three centuries Christian blood never ceased to flow.

5. Christianity did nothing to conciliate its foes by yielding itself to the claims of Judaism and Paganism. It was exclusive and unaccommodating in its pretensions and claims; demanding to be received, not only as from God, but as *alone* from God, to the denying and setting aside of every other system.

6. If, therefore, Christianity triumphed under these circumstances, that triumph was a satisfactory evidence of its being from God, and of its having Divine power and influence on its side. The true principle of the argument, in this view of it, was perceived by the penetrating shrewdness of Gamaliel: "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought," etc. (Acts v. 38, 39). He meant to say, "such was its nature, and such were its circumstances, that if it really was indebted to human wisdom alone for its origin, and to human authority and human power alone for its support, it could not possibly maintain its ground;" from which the inference is immediate and plain, that if it were not overthrown, but did maintain its ground, and did prosper, the fact would be a satisfactory proof of its possessing an origin, an authority, and a power, more than human.¹

XVII.—Does not the success of Mohammedanism weaken the force of this argument?

No; the two cases are, in every respect, widely different. (1) Mohammed was a man of rank, of a powerful and honourable family, and possessed, by marriage, of great wealth. Such a person, taking upon himself the character of a religious teacher in an age of ignorance and barbarism, could not fail of attracting attention and followers. (2) Mohammed propounded no doctrine that would be unpalatable to the carnal mind. On the contrary, he indulged in the

¹ See "Gesta Christi," or a "History of Humane Progress," by C. L. Brace.

grossest pleasures, and gratified his passions without control; laying claim to a special license from heaven to riot in unbounded sensuality. He also courted the weaknesses, and humoured the evil propensities, of his followers, allowing them, in this world, a liberal indulgence to their animal appetites and their natural fondness for sensual gratification; and holding out to their hopes the promise of a paradise of carnality and voluptuousness. (3) But, attractive as his system was to all that was sensual and worldly in the human heart, so long as Mohammed employed argument and persuasion only his success was singularly small. His converts in three years amounted, it is said, to fourteen; and in seven years to no more than a hundred. It was not till he began to use a very different weapon that his followers greatly multiplied. He proclaimed the Koran at the head of his armies. With the book in one hand, and the sword in the other, at once a prophet and a warrior, he forced his religion upon the people. In all these points of view Christianity and Mohammedanism, and their respective histories, stand in contrast. The success of the latter can be traced to the attractions of wealth, the allurements of vice, and the fear of the sword. The success of the former was "not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."¹

XVIII.—In what way do the benefits conferred by Christianity attest its Divine origin?

1. *That benefits of the highest order have been conferred by its influence admits of abundant proof.* (1) What a mighty and blessed change has it produced upon individual men, transforming them by the renewing of their minds! "It has weaned the drunkard from his deadly cup; it has tarnished the gold of the miser, and made him turn from his enslaving passion to lay up treasure in heaven; it has shed over the dogged soul of misanthropy the sunshine of a meek, a glad, and a quiet spirit; it has silenced the tongue of profanity, and filled its polluted mouth with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs; it has spread the smile of love over the face of envy; it has washed the hands of dishonesty and purified the treacherous heart; it has subdued the tiger to a lamb, and turned the child of infamy into a worthy citizen, a devoted Christian, and a steady friend; it has brought light in darkness, strength in weakness, joy in sorrow, and abundant consolation in the hour of death." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." (2) How rich and salutary are the blessings it has conferred on domestic life! It has thrown a holy sanctity around the marriage relation; cutting off that grand source of domestic wretchedness, polygamy; and confining the dangerous liberty of divorce to one only cause. It

¹ See "The Rise and Decline of Islam," by Sir William Muir, in "Present Day Tracts," vol. iii.; "The Success of Christianity, and Modern Explanations of it," by Rev. J. Cairns, D.D., in "Present Day Tracts," vol. i.

has given to woman her proper place and appropriate occupations, making her no longer a beast of burden and a slave, but an equal and a helpmeet for man. It has abolished infanticide, and succeeded the cruel rites of that bloody superstition by the gentle dealings of parental love. It has made "home" a new word, investing it with charms and endearing associations unknown before. It has taught parents to love their children, children to honour their parents, servants to obey their masters, masters to be just to their servants, and all of them to cultivate "whatsoever things are lovely and of good report." (3) How multiplied the advantages it has bestowed upon nations! Wherever it has been welcomed, even though it may have produced but slender spiritual results, "the inferior benefits which it has scattered have rendered its progress as traceable as the overflowing of the Nile is by the rich deposit and consequent fertility which it leaves behind." It has exerted a humanising influence upon penal statutes; it has been the Magna Charta of true liberty, the enemy of oppression and slavery, the friend of the poor, and the patron of learning; it has softened in some measure the cruel spirit of war, and will, when its spirit shall universally prevail, spread peace and good-will among all the nations; it has secured to the toiling multitudes the inestimable boon of a weekly Sabbath; and has raised everlasting monuments of its benevolence in hospitals and edifices of charity, and in the emollient influences which it has spread over the heart of society.

2. *Benefits like these have never been conferred in the absence of Christianity.* Sceptics are fond of attributing them solely to the benign influence of a human philosophy, and the gradual improvements of the human mind. But let them tell us how it was that, before the appearance of the Gospel, philosophy and humanity were perfect strangers to each other, though they are now, it seems, such close and intimate friends. The philosophers of Greece and Italy were at least equal in natural sagacity and acquired learning to the philosophers of modern Europe, yet not one of those great and wise and enlightened men of antiquity seems to have had any apprehensions that there was the least cruelty in a husband repudiating an irreproachable wife; or a father destroying his new-born infant, or putting his adult son to death; in a master torturing or murdering his servant; or in any of those horrid acts of oppression which the page of history records. On the contrary, it would be no difficult task to show that the more the ancients advanced in letters and the fine arts, and the more their communication and commerce with the different parts of the then known world was extended and enlarged, the more savage, oppressive, and tyrannical they became.¹ And as to the philosophy of the present age, which assumes to itself the exclusive merit of all the humanity and benevolence that are to be found in the world, we learn what it would do, if left to itself, for

¹ Bishop Porteus' "Beneficial Effects of Christianity." "Gesta Christi, or a History of Humane Progress," by C. L. Brace.

the promotion of love and gentleness and national prosperity, in the events of the French Revolution, when Reason was erected as the nation's god. Seeing then that philosophy and learning have never of themselves exerted a benignant influence over the destinies of man, and that wherever Christianity has spread, uninjured by the superstitions of men, she has exercised the most beneficial influence on the outer and inner life, we are bound to award to her the palm as the source of the high and matchless benefits that have followed in her train. And if the sceptical philosophers of modern times have thrown off the insensibility and hard-heartedness of their ancient brethren in Greece and Rome, or those of France in more modern days, and have become the patrons of gentleness and philanthropy, it can only be because they live under a light, and draw from a source, which they ungratefully ignore—the light and teachings of our blessed Christianity. “If they can show that they have added one iota to the original stock of benevolence to be found in the Gospel, or advanced one single human sentiment which is not either expressly or virtually comprehended in the Christian revelation, they may then be allowed to arrogate some praise to themselves on the score of their philanthropy; but till they can prove this, the claim of Christianity to all those happy changes in the face of human affairs, which have been here specified, stands unimpaired.”¹

3. *Here, then, we take our stand. “A tree is known by its fruits.”* The religion of the Bible has done more for the real good of man than any other system, yea, than all other systems put together have ever done; its leading principles and characteristic precepts are exactly such as would naturally produce (when not impeded by any accidental obstructions) those very effects which we ascribe to them. It cannot, therefore, have emanated from an evil source. It must have come from God, for it bears the impress of His nature.

4. *Nor is the argument weakened by the evil things which have been done by men who bear the Christian name.* We are not ignorant of the monstrous vices which have been practised under covert of the Christian profession. We know all the cruel atrocities, the foul abominations, and the baby fooleries of Popery, that system of baptized Paganism, which is styled in Scripture “the mystery of iniquity.” And we know that many a man who professes to be guided by the Bible has proved himself to be worthless, cruel, and treacherous. But is the Bible chargeable with these things? Have they not been produced by a grievous disregard of its principles, and disobedience to its laws? And can anything be more unfair, more dishonest, than to make the Word of God answerable for what it condemns? Is this honourable? Is it what any infidel or sceptical philosopher would relish being done with any system or theory of his own invention? Either judge of the Bible altogether by itself or take a genuine specimen of true faith in its principles,

¹ Bishop Porteus' “Beneficial Effects of Christianity.”

and a pure life governed by its precepts ; if this be done, we do not fear the result ; for the Bible and its religion will be found profitable for the life that now is, and for that which is to come.¹

¹ For an exhaustive treatise respecting the various schools of sceptical, rational, and infidel writers, in ancient and modern times, I would especially refer the reader to Farrar's "Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion."

Inspiration of the Holy Spirit
Time 3:16 God
The Peter 1. 16-12 spirit of Christ
The Peter 1. 16-21 Holy Spirit

CHAPTER III

THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

I.—What is the distinction between revelation and inspiration ?

By *revelation* we understand a direct communication from God to man, either of such knowledge as man could not of himself attain to, because its subject matter transcends human sagacity or human reason; or which (although it might have been attained in the ordinary way) was not, in point of fact, from whatever cause, known to the person who received the revelation. By *inspiration* we understand that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, guided by which the human agents chosen by God have officially proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.

II.—What are we to regard as the proper view of inspiration as applied to the Holy Scriptures ?

Inspiration literally signifies a breathing into; and it denotes "that extraordinary agency of the Holy Spirit on the mind, in consequence of which the person who partakes of it is enabled to embrace and communicate the truth of God without error, infirmity, or defect."¹ "Divine Inspiration is the imparting of such a degree of Divine assistance, influence, or guidance, as should enable the authors of the Scriptures to communicate religious knowledge to others without error or mistake, whether the subjects of such communications were things then immediately revealed to those who declare them, or things with which they were before acquainted."

¹ Dr. Hannah.

² Rev. T. H. Horne. The Belgian Confession says: "We believe that holy men of God, moved by the Holy Ghost, spoke the word of God: God Himself afterwards commanded the prophets and apostles to commit these revelations to writing. He Himself, indeed, wrote the two tables of the law with His own fingers; this is the reason why we call such writings the Holy Scriptures."

"The Theopneustia of the Sacred Writers must generally be conceived of, not as a momentary assistance exclusive of the act of writing; but as a natural consequence of their being personally led by the Holy Ghost, who controlled all their thinking and working, and in this way also their writing."—Oosterwee.

Inspiration is "the inbreathing of God and the result of it."—Pope.

"By inspiration we mean that influence of the Holy Spirit which, when in-breathed into the mind of man, guides, and elevates, and enkindles all his powers to their highest and noblest exercise."—F. W. Farrar.

This view is sustained by such Scriptures as 2 Sam. xxiii. 2; 2 Peter i. 21.

It will be seen from these definitions that the inspiration of which we are now speaking is to be distinguished, first, from the *inspiration of genius*—the inspiration of a Plato, a Bacon, or a Shakespeare. This has nothing in common with the special inspiration which we claim for the Holy Scriptures. The former refers to the workings of nature in her highest sphere, but still of nature, and of nature only; the latter is supernatural and miraculous, revealing truths above nature, shedding a clear and unerring light on a path on which all earthly guidance fails.

It is to be distinguished, secondly, from the *inspiration of moral goodness* or of ordinary spiritual influence; in other words, the illuminating and sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost, bestowed in larger or lesser measure on all believers, to lead them in the way of truth and create them anew unto good works. In this sense, every Christian, from the simplest child to the loftiest saint and master of Christian thought, is inspired. But this inspiration, bestowed on all who ask it, may co-exist with much of ignorance and error; whereas that higher and rarer gift of which we speak is extraordinary and infallible. The inspiration of genius unveils the deepest truths of nature, but goes not beyond nature; the inspiration of grace apprehends and realises the truths of revelation, but does not reveal. The inspiration of the sacred books does both. It is the inspiration of which Paul speaks in Gal. i. 11, 12: "I certify you, brethren," etc.¹

So much for the positive aspect of the doctrine; it will be necessary to consider it also on its negative side. Thus:

1. It does not imply any suppression or abeyance of the natural powers and faculties of the writers. It neither extinguishes their individuality, nor restrains the free play of their human thoughts and feelings. It elevates, illuminates, guides, informs the essential and indestructible powers of the soul, but does not supersede them.² It is not the supplanting of the human by the Divine, but the blending and mutual interaction of the human and the Divine. The sacred writers speak and write not only what they have received, but what they have learned, felt, and realised; so that the words they utter come forth, not from the depths of the Divine mind only, but from the depths also of their own hearts. Hence one of the peculiar excellences of Holy Scripture; it is as utterly human as it is truly and absolutely Divine. It comes as closely near us as it rises above us. Hence, too, the endless variety of the sacred writings, and their marvellous adaptation to all sorts and conditions of men. Where, however, the human and the Divine are so inextricably blended in one common result it is

¹ Rev. Islay Burns, *Sunday Magazine*, 1865.

² "Divine inspiration did not, in the case of the writers of Holy Scripture, supersede the use of ordinary methods of obtaining knowledge (see 1 Kings xl. 47, xiv. 19, 29.)"—*Rawlinson*.

absolutely impossible clearly to discriminate the one from the other, or to fix any definite point where the one element ends and the other begins.

2. Inspiration does not imply an equal clearness and fulness in the exhibition of Divine truth in every part of the sacred book. On the contrary, it is one of its excellences that it is progressive. It proceeds from the simplest lessons to the highest truths. The religion of the Old Testament and the religion of the New are different, and yet parts of the same,—complementary though not identical; neither is in itself complete, but each contributing to the completeness of the whole.¹

III.—Do the Scriptures themselves claim to be divinely inspired?

Direct and repeated affirmations of its own inspiration and truth are not appended to each particular chapter or particular book, which, indeed, would be incongruous with the dignity and self-consciousness of a Divine Author. But the scriptural writers speak freely of their commission and of the authority attached to it; and by necessary inference assert in the strongest manner their inspiration by God. Moses was directly commissioned by God (Exod. iii. 14), and the book of the law was written by His express commandment (Exod. xxiv. 4-7). Joshua, his successor, went forth to his task by the same Divine appointment (Joshua i. 1, 5, 9), and his addresses to the people were prefaced with the words, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel" (xxiv. 2). Of Samuel, we are told "The Lord revealed Himself to Samuel by the word of the Lord" (1 Sam. iii. 20, 21). The books of the Prophets are composed almost entirely of direct messages from heaven. And if these testimonies appear to be in any degree defective, the language of our Lord and His Apostles supplies the void. Our Lord recognised the whole body of the Old Testament, included by the Jews in the threefold division of "the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets;" paid the highest honour to those ancient records; repelled every onset of the tempter with, "It is written" (Matt. iv. 4, 6, 7, 10); extended His full sanction to every "jot and tittle" of "the law and the prophets" (Matt. v. 17, 18); enforced the precepts of the Pentateuch as still binding on the Jewish people (Matt. viii. 4); quoted the writing of Hosea (Matt. ix. 13), of Malachi (Matt. xi. 9, 10), of the Book of

¹ Rev. Islay Burns, *Sunday Magazine*, 1865. The reader will often meet with the words Mechanical and Dynamical Inspiration. The theory of *Mechanical* inspiration is that which teaches that the Spirit acted on man as in a purely passive state. It represents the prophets and apostles, when under the influence of the inspiring spirit, as mere soulless machines, mechanically answering to the force which moved them—the pens not the penmen of the Holy Ghost. This purely organic theory of inspiration was taught by some of the disciples of Calvin shortly after the Reformation, but it rests on no scriptural authority; and, if we except a few ambiguous metaphors, is supported by no historical testimony. *Dynamical* Inspiration is the phrase used to describe an influence acting upon living powers, and manifesting itself through them according to their natural laws: man is not converted into a mere machine, but all his mental faculties and habits are used and directed by the Divine Spirit in the work of making known the will of God.

Samuel (Matt. xii. 3, 7), of Isaiah (Matt. xiii. 13-17), of the Decalogue (Matt. xv. 1-9), of Genesis (Matt. xix. 4, 5), of Zechariah (Matt. xxi. 5), of the Psalms (Matt. xxi. 16), of Exodus (Matt. xxii. 31, 32, etc.); recognising in every instance their full authority as the written word of God, and even giving to them the distinctive name of "the Scriptures," in contradistinction to all other writings. (Matt. xxi. 42, xxii. 29; Mark xiv. 49; Luke iv. 21; John v. 39. vii. 38, x. 35.) In imitation of their Lord, the Apostles and Evangelists quote largely from the various books of the Old Testament,¹ appealing to them as authoritative upon all questions of faith (Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 22), giving them the title of *Scriptures* (Acts xvii. 2, 11; Rom. i. 2, xv. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; 2 Tim. iii. 15); "the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 1 Peter iv. 11); and declaring that the Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of His ancient servants. This is expressly declared of David (Mark xii. 36; Acts i. 16), of Isaiah (Acts xxviii. 25), and of all the holy Prophets. (Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; 1 Peter i. 21.)

Turning to the writings of the New Testament, we have the same positive assertions of inspiration and authority. A special promise of the presence and help of the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles (John xiv. 25, 26; John xvi. 13). The Spirit of Truth, thus promised, was (1) To recall to their minds whatever the Lord had declared to them; and (2) To teach them all things; old truths are to be brought back to their recollection, and new truth is to be imparted from above. In virtue of this Divine endowment, our Lord places their authority on a level with His own, and with that of the earlier prophets (Matt. x. 40, 41). The Apostles themselves distinctly claim that the Holy Ghost *and* they are witnesses to Christ; not independent witnesses, but He witnessing through them (Acts v. 32). They do not scruple to say, "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (Acts xv. 28); they identify their words with the words of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. ii. 13), even announcing their message as "in truth the word of God" (1 Thess. ii. 13); they claim the same Divine inspiration that they claimed for the ancient prophets (1 Peter i. 11, 12), and declare that their Gospel message was "the word of the Lord that endureth for ever" (1 Peter i. 25); they place "the commandment of the Apostles" on a level, in point of authority, with "the words of the holy prophets" (2 Peter iii. 2); they reject and even anathematise man or angel who shall declare any other doctrine than theirs (Gal. i. 8); and this doctrine they never pretend to have discovered by the use of their own reason, but they refer it to the gift of God and the illumination of the Spirit (Eph. iii. 5). While, if any one should be inclined to fancy that all this relates to the teachings by *word*, and not to the *written* instruc-

¹ There are 291 quotations of passages from the Old Testament made by the New Testament writers. Of these 30 are from Genesis, 36 from Exodus, 11 from Leviticus, 50 from Deuteronomy, 81 from the Psalms, 71 from Isaiah, and the remainder from other books. See "The New Testament View of the Old," by David McCalman Turpie, M.A., pp. 1-16. This is a most valuable work. See also Lord Chancellor Hatherley's "Continuity of Scripture."

tion of the Apostles, John xx. 31, and 2 Thess. ii. 15, ought to show that no such distinction existed in the minds of the Apostles. The epistles of Paul are identified with the general body of the Scriptures (2 Peter iii. 16). The epistles of St. John are pervaded by the two ideas, that they are the teaching of the Holy Spirit and the truth of God; and the Apocalypse is presented to us with its high title, "the Revelation of Jesus Christ" (Rev. i. 1), which was to be written in a book by the direct command of Him who is "the First and the Last" (Rev. i. 11). Thus, in various forms, the contents of the Holy Scriptures are declared to be "God-inspired"¹ (2 Tim. iii. 16). They issue directly and solely from Him. They breathe the pure spirit of His goodness, and carry the stamp of His authority.

IV.—Does not St. Paul disclaim inspiration, at least for a portion of his writings?

Certain passages in 1 Cor. vii. are often adduced to prove that the Apostle distinguishes between what he says by inspiration, and what he says by himself; and the conclusion is drawn, that some parts of his epistles are inspired, and some are not. Let us examine them:—

1 Cor. vii. 6.—The apparent difficulty here arises from the ambiguity of our word "permission." Had the better word, *indulgence* or *allowance*, been employed, the meaning of the passage would have been unequivocally presented; namely, "I say this by allowance for you, not of command to you."

1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.—The idea is that, in this passage, he distinguished between his *own* commands and those received by revelation from Christ. But this is not so. He is, says Dean Alford, "about to give them a command, resting not merely on inspired Apostolic authority, great and undoubted as that was, but on that of the Lord Himself—(the command of Christ is in Mark x. 12)—so that all supposed distinction between the Apostle, when writing of *himself* and of the Lord, is quite irrelevant." In other words, he is re-stating a command which our Lord gave while He abode on earth; and the contrast lies simply between *that* and what he, as an inspired Apostle, might give; not between different commands of his own, given at different times and under different conditions.

1 Cor. vii. 12, 25.—Here, again, the Apostle is supposed to intimate that in certain parts of Scripture he wrote according to his own uninspired judgment, although guided in other portions of his work by the Holy Ghost. But the fallacy lies in supposing that the expression, "commandment of the Lord," means a communication made by the Holy Ghost to the Apostle; whereas it merely signifies an express direction of Christ, given while He abode on earth, and which had now become historical. So that the Apostle is not here contrasting what he says by the Spirit, and what he says of himself; but what he says that had already been expressly commanded by

¹ The Revised Version reads, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," etc.; but in the margin, "or every scripture is inspired of God and profitable," etc.

Christ, and what he says by the Spirit in reference to cases of which, since they did not then exist, our Lord had not, while He was on earth, spoken.

In none of these cases, then, does the Apostle disclaim inspiration. In the first case his meaning is, that what he said was matter of permission, as to the persons whom he addressed, and not of command or positive injunction. In the second case he declares that he is reiterating a law once spoken by our Lord's own lips, and is not uttering the inward suggestions of the Holy Ghost. In the third case he declares that he is not reiterating such a law, but is giving utterance to these inward suggestions. Still, in every case he speaks as an inspired Apostle. In the former, the Spirit is fulfilling one part of our Lord's twofold promise, "He shall bring all things to your remembrance," etc. In the latter, he is fulfilling the other part, "He shall teach you all things," "He will guide you into all truth." The objection therefore fails; and the witness which the New Testament Scriptures give to the inspiration of their authors is untouched, consentient, and complete.¹

V.—What are the principal theories which are urged against the common doctrine of plenary inspiration?

1. "That an authoritative external revelation is impossible to man;"² meaning that no external revelation of spiritual truth is trustworthy, or can have sufficient evidence to warrant our faith.³ If no external revelation of God be authoritative, *i.e.*, truthful or trustworthy, whence and how can we have any knowledge of God? It is contended by the advocates of this theory that "what God reveals to us He reveals within, through the medium of our moral and spiritual senses."⁴ But a revelation of God, His nature, our relation and responsibility to Him are needed for the regulation of the life and conduct, not only of individuals, but of the race,—a revelation which can be appealed to as a rule or law of life and conduct. That God can give such a revelation cannot be denied; that, if given, it must be authoritative must follow; the evidence in proof of its having been given is altogether another question, and is dealt with elsewhere.

2. That "Revelation is a process of the intuitional consciousness gazing upon eternal verities."⁵ Upon this ground it is maintained that revelation is purely an inner work in the soul, an act or process of intuition, and so not a communication from without; and that inspiration denotes the condition of those in whom, through supernatural influences, these intuitions have been the most clear and distinct. Nor is it allowed that this intuitive vision, this elevating

¹ *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. v., No. xvii., Art. 4. See also Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy," Appendix.

² "The Soul: its Sorrows and its Aspirations," by Francis W. Newman. Fifth Ed. See reply in Rogers' "Eclipse of Faith."

³ *London Review*, No. 20, p. 297.

⁴ "Philosophy of Religion," by J. D. Morell, M.A.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 298.

of the mental faculties to apprehend spiritual realities, was confined to a few men, constituting them authorised teachers to us; but that all men in whom these supernatural influences have operated to the quickening of religious thought and sentiment have received, though in varying degree, the same inspiration. Against this theory we, who receive the Bible as the inspired word of God, maintain that our knowledge of spiritual realities cannot be intuitive, and must, therefore, be revealed through the understanding.¹ We might go through every item of intelligence contained in the Bible, and show that it could not be known by that natural light, that immediate consciousness which is called "intuition." If men are left to their own intuitive knowledge, their views will be obscure, uncertain, and varying, and therefore unauthoritative. None but God can give us such a revelation of truth as will assure either our mind or heart; and the Bible furnishes exactly what is required. There we have the truth of God, truth which He, the wise and good Father of spirits, has revealed to us, and which must have been communicated by Him through words, images, or some other transcendental mode of informing the understanding.²

3. That inspiration is "that action of the Divine Spirit by which, apart from any idea of infallibility, all that is good in man, *beast*, or *matter*, is originated and sustained; . . . it seems to us to be the Bible's own teaching on the subject of inspiration, namely, that everything good in any book, person, or *thing*, is inspired, and that the value of any inspired book must be decided by the extent of its inspiration, and the importance of the truths which it well (or inspiredly) teaches. Milton, and Shakespeare, and Bacon, and Canticles, and the Apocalypse, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the eighth chapter to the Romans, are in our estimation all inspired; but which of them is the *most valuable* document, or whether the Bible as a whole is incomparably more precious than any other book, these are questions which must be decided by examining the observable character and tendency of each book, and the beneficial effect which history may show that each has produced." According to this view, wherever there has been the co-operation of God at all, then the epithet "inspired" is justified. The blossoming of flowers, the flowing of rivers, the fattening of cattle, are the result of inspiration. Genius is inspiration; therefore the lustful tales of the "Decameron" and the infidelity of "Queen Mab" are inspired. Clever mechanics are inspired; therefore Dr. Guillotin was inspired. Nay, the power of God sustains the energies of infernal spirits. His Spirit is present in hell, therefore the Devil is inspired, and assuredly, if cleverness, genius, tact, knowledge, are all the product of inspiration, none are more inspired than the great deceiver, "the prince of the power of the air." What arrant nonsense all this is! But it is the legitimate consequence of the doctrine that wherever the creating, sustaining power of God is present, there is inspiration. The great

¹ See p. 11, as to the argument for the existence of God.

² *London Review*, No. 20, pp. 208—28. Pearson, "On Infidelity."

mistake upon which this theory is based consists in not seeing that God energises in the universe in essentially different ways, and that inspiration denotes one kind of Divine action, and not another.¹

4. That inspiration in the sacred writers extends only to those portions of the Bible which have reference to doctrine, or spiritual truth; but that on all other matters they were no more free from error than other intelligent and honest men of their age. It is a common formula by those who hold this view, that "The Bible contains a Word of God," not that it is "*The Word of God.*" It is argued that this meets the difficulty of the alleged errors, contradictions, and inconsistencies, which are found in the sacred writings.

The reply to this, is—1. What is spiritual truth? 2. What are the value and authority of the portions of Scripture which do not deal with this? Who will undertake the task of making the separation? What and how much of the Bible would be left to us, when the different advocates of this theory have each performed the part of Jehoiakim's penknife? Infallibility, in the sense of entire freedom from error in the Bible, we do not insist upon,² but that the Bible is not only a *sufficient* witness to the truth of salvation, but one that is rich and abundant above measure."³

VI.—By what credentials were the writers of the Old and New Testaments authenticated as divinely inspired?

The word written was, in the first place, the word spoken, and the credentials of the speakers consisted in their possession of superhuman power, or of superhuman knowledge, or both. The one we find in the *miracles* they performed; the other, in the *prophecies* they uttered. If they could perform works that were really supernatural, and foretell, with the greatest accuracy, remote events such as no sagacity of man could possibly conjecture, it may be confidently concluded that, so far, they were the subjects of inspiration.

VII.—What is the proper definition of a miracle?

"By a miracle, in the strict and theological sense, we understand a direct interposition of God's power, controlling or suspending the established laws of nature, for the purpose of giving His sanction to the ministrations of His servants, whom He has sent to reveal His will."⁴ We do not think every strange event a miracle, nor what

¹ See *London Review*, No. 20, July 1858, pp. 285-342, for an elaborate and able discussion of, and reply to, these theories.

² Such as arise from errors of copyists and other contingencies to which all ancient MSS. are liable (see p. 71).

³ Lange. The Hon. Robert Boyle says:—"We must carefully distinguish between what the Scripture itself says, and what is said in the Scriptures. Many of the alleged difficulties and contradictions of the Bible arise from the forgetfulness of this distinction."

⁴ Rev. T. Jackson. "A miracle is an entirely extraordinary phenomenon in the domain of natural or spiritual life, which cannot be explained from the course of nature as it is known to us, and must, therefore, have been brought about by a direct operation of God's almighty will, in order to attain a definite object."—*Oosterzee*.

"It signifies (1) any act of God which is distinguished from those ordinary Divine operations, the laws of which we know; and (2) any act of God which is performed for the sake of confirming His Word."—*Pope*.

uninstructed men, from their ignorance of the laws of nature, etc., might consider miraculous; but consider that event only to be miraculous which manifestly exceeds the extent of human power, as measured by those limits of its exertion which uniform experience has defined, which, as it overrules the established laws of nature, must argue the agency of a Divine control, and which is so connected with the promulgation of a professed revelation as clearly to be designed to authenticate it."¹

VIII.—How shall we sustain the view now given?

By the scriptural designations of these supernatural works, which severally shadow forth the several constituents of a miracle. These designations are *semeion*, signs, *teras*, wonders, *dynamis*, mighty deeds (2 Cor. xii. 12). According to the teachings of these three words, a miracle is (1) *A wonder* surpassing the powers of man and nature; therefore, rightly called (2) *A power*, as being produced by the immediate exercise of supernatural and Divine power; and (3) *A sign or token*, as proving that he who works it, or by whom God works it, has the seal of a Divine commission, of speaking by Divine inspiration, and acting by Divine authority.² In Acts ii. 22, we find a concise but sublime summary of scriptural teachings relative to miracles. The scattered rays are here brought to a focus. It is expressly asserted (1) That they are the immediate work of God, in distinction from those events which He brings to pass by the immediate efficiency of second causes. (2) That they were enacted openly and publicly, when all had opportunity not only to witness, but to scrutinize and test them. (3) That they were such, and so wrought, that the people among whom they occurred could not but know their existence and character, "as ye yourselves also know." (4) Their purpose was to demonstrate to beholders, and all others cognisant of them, that Jesus Christ was a man approved of God. (5) Thus miracles are important proofs of Christianity. By them an obligation was laid on the people to believe in Christ, and to obey His Word.³

IX.—Are miracles appealed to in the Bible as conclusive tests of a Divine mission?

They are. Moses was accredited to the Hebrews of his day by the miracles of the exodus and of the wilderness (Exod. and Numb.) When his commission from God was called into question, the matter was decided by an outward and visible miracle (Numb. xii. xvi.) And Joshua, Elijah, Daniel, etc., were attested to be the sent of God by special signs of Divine power. Our Lord referred to miracles as accrediting His own ministry (Matt. xi. 1-5;

¹ Watson's "Catechism on the Evidences."

² "Marvel" (or wonder) denotes a phenomenon in human experience; 'mighty work' an effect of special Divine action; 'sign' an instrument for the attainment of moral ends. "Can we Believe in Miracles?" by George Warrington, p. 29.

³ *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. v., No. xvii., art. 3.

John v. 36, x. 25, 37, 38); the Apostles appealed to the same in proof of our Lord's Divine authority (Acts ii. 22), and of their own mission (Mark xvi. 20; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 4). And the conclusiveness of the evidence is such, that the rejection of it is declared to be a heinous sin, meriting the severest infliction of Divine wrath (Numb. xiv. 22, 23; Matt. xi. 20-24; John xv. 24). If it be asked, in what way and under what circumstances miraculous works authenticate the Divine mission of those who profess to be sent by God to teach His will, the answer is, "that as the known and established course of nature has been fixed by Him who is the Creator and Preserver of all things, it can never be violated, departed from, or controlled, but either immediately by Himself, or mediately by other beings at His command, and by His assistance or permission; for if this be not allowed, we must deny either the Divine omnipotence or His natural government; and, if these be allowed, the other follows."¹

X.—What are the objections that are brought against miracles as proofs and tests of a Divine revelation?

1. *David Hume's well-known objection*, which has been variously repeated in modern times, is in substance this: "It is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true; but not contrary to experience that testimony should be false. No testimony, therefore, can ever render a miracle probable." Dr. Wardlaw pronounces this argument "a piece of the sheerest and most puerile and pitiful sophistry that ever had the sanction of a philosopher's name." The grand sophism lies in the ambiguity of the word "experience." Whose experience does he mean? Does he mean the *universal* experience of mankind in all ages and in all nations? Then, who does not perceive that to affirm anything to be contrary to experience, in this sense, is a simple way of saying that a miracle never took place?—the very thing he should have proved. But perhaps he means that it is contrary to his *personal* experience, and to the *general* experience of mankind, that a miracle should be wrought; and of course it is, or the miraculous character of the event would cease.² But are we to suppose that the experience of the present generation, or of any individual in it, can disprove what is alleged to have taken place eighteen hundred years ago? The fact is, no fact or event is *contrary to experience* unless it is said to have occurred at a time and place, at which time and place, we being

¹ Watson's "Institutes."

² "This expression 'contrary to experience,' is, as has often been pointed out, strictly speaking, incorrect. In strictness that only can be said to be contrary to experience which is contradicted by the immediate perceptions of persons present at the time when the fact is alleged to have occurred. But the terms 'contrary to experience' are used for 'contrary to the analogy of our experience,' and it must be admitted that, in this latter, less strict sense, miracles are contrary to general experience, so far as their mere physical circumstances visible to us are concerned. This should not only be admitted, but strongly insisted upon, by the maintenance of miracles, because it is an essential element of their signal character."—Smith's "Concise Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Miracles." The italics are the author's.

present, did not perceive it to occur; as if it should be asserted that in a particular room, and at a particular hour of a certain day, a man was raised from the dead, in which room, and at the time specified, we being present and looking on perceived no such event to have taken place. Here the assertion is contrary to experience, properly so called, and this is a contrariety which no evidence can surmount.¹ Nothing of this kind can be asserted concerning the miracles of the Bible. Here we have a record of the testimony of the only competent witnesses, those who lived at the time, and in the place when and where the alleged facts are dated. That is, we have *experience* in the only form in which, from the nature of things, it is possible for us to have it, in favour of the facts, and we have no recorded counter experience against them.²

2. A modern philosophical objection against the miracles of the Law and the Gospel is couched in these words: "Our ideas of Divine perfection tend to discredit the notion of occasional interference. It is derogatory to Infinite Power and Wisdom to suppose an order of things so imperfect that it must be interrupted and violated to provide for the emergency of a revelation."³ The objection proceeds from low and unworthy views of the vast importance of that revelation to attest which the miracle is said to be wrought. For what purpose is that revelation given? Is it not to promote the present and eternal well-being of intelligent, immortal, and morally responsible agents? And is not this infinitely more important than the mere regulation of the movements of a material system? The two are not to be compared. Is there, then, anything unworthy the universal Governor if He should make the material or physical world subserve the interests of the moral and spiritual? Or is there anything incredible in the assertion that the deviations from the

¹ Hume says, that when any one bears testimony to a miracle, "if the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to demand my belief or opinion." No statement could be more reasonable; and the Christian maintains that he has testimony to produce whose falsehood would be a mightier wonder than the miracle attested. What, then, is the next step to be taken? Clearly, to take up the miracles which Christians allege to be true, to set their evidence fully and distinctly forth, and to point out that, however plausible that evidence might be, its fallaciousness would be no miracle compared with the miracle it affirmed. But every reader of Hume's essay knows that he has done nothing of the sort. Christian miracles are quietly put by him out of court; and he calls to the bar certain "miracles" with which Christianity has nothing to do, enters upon their evidence, condemns them as falsities, and then calmly informs the court that the Christian miracles are disproven. "Jesus Christ," he virtually proceeds, "is alleged to have given sight to the blind. He may stand aside. Here is a miracle performed by the god Serapis,—a bull, with some specialty about the tail,—through the instrumentality of Vespasian, and we shall take it up instead. Jesus Christ is said to have made the lame walk. Well, the Cardinal Retz was informed that a man who rubbed holy oil on the stump of his leg recovered powers of walking. Yet there was no miracle; and, of course, none was performed by Christ. Jesus is affirmed to have raised the dead. We shall prove the negative if we can make it appear that certain persons falsely or mistakenly alleged themselves to have derived advantage from touching the tomb of Abbe Paris." Such is literally Hume's mode of applying his theory. There is not, to my knowledge, in the whole range of literature an evasion like that.—Bayne's "Testimony of Christ to Christianity."

² Paley's "Evidences."

³ "Essays and Reviews," Ess. iii., pp. 107-14.

order of the physical world may form an essential branch of the arrangements and provisions of the moral branch of the Divine administration? Why so morbid a jealousy of any departure from the laws of the material universe, if by such departure a high end is to be answered in the moral and spiritual world?

3. *It is objected that miracles have been wrought in defence of acknowledged falsehood, or in connection with it, and that this circumstance deprives the miracles of Scripture of their worth.* It is undeniable that, within certain limits, evil spirits, the powers of darkness, are suffered, in God's sovereign wisdom, to counterfeit miracles, and that these have a sufficient resemblance to true miracles to deceive those who have not received the love of the truth.¹ (See Rev. xvi. 14, xiii. 11-14, xix. 20; 2 Thess. ii. 9-11.) But let a full examination be made of the signs and wonders that have ever been employed in giving currency to falsehood; let them be compared with the miracles by which the Scriptures are attested; and it will be manifest that they were pure deceptions, destitute of those conditions by which a real miracle is sustained. *The Egyptian Magicians* wrought many wonders in imitation of the works of Moses, and were perhaps assisted in their "enchantments," or sleights of hand, by diabolical power; but when Moses went beyond what could be imitated by sleight of hand or subtle contrivance, as in the plague of lice, they were themselves obliged to confess the interposition of "the finger of God," and we hear no more of their attempts.² *There were certain false prophets in Israel*, who gave "signs and wonders" to support the claims of idolatry (Deut. xiii. 1-4); but when it is remembered how frequently miraculous works are claimed on the part of Jehovah, as the conclusive evidences of His authority and truth, and how He challenges all the gods of the heathen and their devotees to the production of similar proofs of their Divine claims (Deut. xviii. 21, 22; Isa. xli. 21-23, xlv. 7, 8), the inference is inevitable that "the signs or wonders" spoken of did not involve anything really miraculous—any deviation from, or suspension of, the laws of nature—but were mere wonders of power or knowledge, such as a superior acquaintance with those laws, and a more shrewd and penetrating foresight of the results of symptomatic events and circumstances, might readily enough account for. And the Israelites, always prone to idolatry, are warned against all hasty and rash conclusions, as if such wonders occasionally coming to pass, the secret of which they might not be able fully to discern,

¹ *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. v., No. xvii., art. 3.

² Celsus compared the miracles of the Gospels with the tricks of magicians, and suggested that they were from the same source. To this Origen replied with great force, that "there would indeed be a resemblance between them, if Jesus, like the dealers in magical arts, had performed His works for show; but no juggler by his proceedings attempts to persuade men to reform their manners or 'to live as men who are justified by God.'" But Jesus, both by His life and His miracles, strove to lead men to live new lives and to have "constant reference to the good pleasure of the universal God." His life and miracles showed "that He was God, who appeared in human form to do good to our race." For the full passage see Origen against Celsus, Origen's Works, vol. i., p. 475; Clark's "Anti-Nicene Library."

Involved anything really miraculous, really evidential of Divine claims. *The case of the Witch of Endor* is often adduced in proof that genuine miracles have been wrought by other than Divine power. But read the whole case, as recorded in 1 Sam. xxviii. 11-14, and is it not evident that the appearance of Samuel was effected, not at all by any of the arts and incantations of the sorceress, but by the immediate intervention of the power of God, to the astonishment and terror of the woman herself, and for the purpose of prophetically admonishing the apostate King of Israel?"¹ *Our Lord's temptation by the Devil* is regarded as evidence that Satan can work miracles (Matt. iv. 1-11); but whatever may be the difficulties attending some particulars of its explanation, there does not appear to be anything in it necessarily miraculous, or which is not capable of explanation, without the supposition of any miracle at all. The Devil set Jesus on a pinnacle or wing of the temple, but there is no proof that he transported Him through the air. He "showed Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time;" but these universal terms, *oikoumenē* and *kosmos*, are often used in a less extended sense, and are, we apprehend, to be interpreted in the present instance as signifying a large extent of inhabited country, in all its variety, riches, and glory. And if so, there is nothing supernatural in the matter. This subject might be pursued at great length; but the conclusion of an attentive examination would be, that no *genuine* miracle was ever wrought in attestation of anything but truth, nor, under the Divine government, ever can be.

XI.—Do the miracles of the Bible satisfy the required conditions for the purpose of attesting and confirming messages from God?

These conditions may be reduced to four:

1. *They must be of an unusual and exceptional character.* When they become habitual with any regular law of recurrence, they cease to be miraculous; and if they become frequent, but remain irregular and unaccountable, they will cease to startle or surprise, and will come to be classed with the unexplained phenomena of the natural world. And the Bible teaches clearly that miracles were a rare exception, and not the ordinary rule of Divine Providence.

2. *They must be publicly wrought.* It would contradict their great object if they were "done in a corner," and there were no adequate witnesses of their reality. This condition, again, is satisfied in the highest degree by the main body of the miracles, both of the Old and New Testament.

3. *There must be a consistent plan in their distribution and occurrence.* If they are the real credentials of Divine messages, we should expect them to abound at marked eras of revelation, when there is some conspicuous unfolding of the Divine will, and to be more sparingly exhibited in those intervals, when there is merely a

¹ This view has been adopted by Delany, Waterland, Clarke, Farmer, Henderson, Wardlaw, and others.

continuation of former degrees of light, and no sign of any new message from God to man. And it is plain that this character belongs to the whole series of miracles which the Bible records. Occasional miracles were wrought from Adam to Moses. But when the new dispensation was to be ushered in at the time of the exodus, and the revealed will of God was to be embodied in a written and permanent form by the great lawgiver of the Jews, then we meet with a profuse display of miraculous agency, which lasted till the chosen people had entered into their promised inheritance. After that the miracles were few, till the Theocracy under the law began to wane, and new revelations were to be given by Prophets to complete the old covenant, and link it with the Gospel that was to follow. Then public miracles reappear, which continued through the two generations of Elijah's and Elisha's ministry. When the Sinaitic covenant was waxing old, and the code of Old Testament prophecy was nearly complete, signs and wonders were withdrawn through the long space of five hundred years. Then came the dispensation of the Messiah, and we are suddenly confronted once more with "mighty deeds" to ratify the messages of the Gospel, which, like the others, reach through a space of forty years and upward. But when the Church is founded, and the sacred canon is brought to a close, miracles suddenly cease or insensibly melt away. Thus, every feature of their arrangement confirms the faith of the Church, that they are credentials appointed by God to confirm and ratify His own messages of holiness and grace.

4. *There must be the presence of a moral purpose*, and so form one part of the message which they seal. And this feature severs the Bible miracles from the idle tales of marvels with which a sceptical criticism would confound them. The miracles of our Lord, with scarcely an exception, are parables also. Some deep spiritual truth shines through the supernatural history, and in the benevolence of their character they answer well to the grace which forms the distinguishing glory of the Gospel.¹

XII.—What is prophecy ?

Prophecy is that gift of God, by which He employs and empowers a creature to speak in His name and for Him ; so that although coming through the lips or writings of a man, the communication is

¹ "The Bible and Modern Thought." See also "Christianity and Miracles at the Present Day," by the Rev. Principal Cairns, D.D., in "Present Day Tracts," vol. i.; "Are Miracles Credible?" by the Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A.; "Can we Believe in Miracles?" by George Warrington. "The evidential function of a miracle is based upon the common argument of design, as proved by coincidence. The greatest marvel or interruption of the order of nature occurring by itself, as the very consequence of being connected with nothing, proves nothing; but if it take place in connection with the word or act of a person, that coincidence proves design in the marvel, and makes it a miracle; and if that person professes to report a message from heaven, the coincidence again of the miracle with the professed message from God, proves design on the part of God to warrant or authorise the message. The mode in which a miracle acts as evidence, is thus exactly the same in which any extraordinary coincidence acts, it exists upon the general argument of design, though the particular design is special and appropriate to the miracle."—Mozley's "Bampton Lectures," p. 24.

in very deed the word of God.¹ But the prophetic gift has so frequently been employed by the Divine will in revealing a knowledge of future events, that the term has become generally associated with such revelations. And in this view it may be thus defined: "Prophecy is a miracle of knowledge; a declaration, or description, or representation of something future, beyond the power of human sagacity to discover or to calculate."²

XIII.—In what respect does prophecy compare with miraculous works, as an evidence of inspiration?

The latter are miracles of power, the former is a miracle of knowledge; they thus belong to the same category, as deviations from the established laws and course of nature. Of the two classes of miracles, too, the end or purpose is the same. They are not designed for the gratification of an idle wonder or a vain curiosity; but for the manifestation and establishment of the mind of God to His intelligent creatures, on points of essential consequence, at once to His own glory and to their happiness. (See John xiii. 19, and John xx. 30, 31.) There is, however, one very manifest difference between miracles of power and miracles of knowledge. The former usually produce the greatest impression upon those who actually witness their occurrence; while prophecy, in the nature of things, makes its strongest appeal to posterity. The evidence of miracles is as full at first as ever it will be; that of prophecy goes on increasing from age to age.

XIV.—How does the gift of prophecy verify a man's claims as an inspired instructor?

In this way: "When the events are distant many years or ages from the uttering of the prediction itself, depending on causes not so much as existing when the prophecy was spoken or recorded, and likewise upon various circumstances and a long arbitrary series of things, and the fluctuating uncertainties of human volitions; and especially when they depend not at all upon any external circumstances, nor upon any created being, but arise merely from the counsels and appointment of God Himself; such events can be foreknown only by that Being, one of whose attributes is

¹ Dr. G. Smith's "Book of Prophecy."

Rev. T. H. Horne's "Introduction." "Prophecy (1) signifies the method of the Divine announcement by special inspired agents; (2) the prediction by these agents of the coming accomplishment of the Divine purpose."—*Pope*. The modern objection to prophecy by Kuenen (in his "Prophets and Prophecy in Israel") and his school is thus stated by Professor Stanley Leathes:—"Old Testament prophecy is a purely natural and psychological phenomenon, unique and historical indeed, but simply natural as the accidental form in which the 'principal religions' of the world developed and expressed itself. It has no claim to be regarded as a direct or supernatural message from God. All its manifestations can be explained on psychological principles, and must historically be so explained; so we have, according to Professor Kuenen, no longer any ground to look upon prophecy, and if not prophecy the Old Testament itself, as in any special sense the Word of God. Leathes' "Old Testament Prophecy," p. 82, etc. This vol. is an able refutation of the above views. See also "Prophecy a Preparation for Christ," by Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D.

omniscience, and can be foretold by Him only to whom the 'Father of lights' shall reveal them; so that whoever is manifestly endued with that predictive power must, in that instance, speak and act by Divine inspiration, and what He pronounced of that kind must be received as the word of God."¹

being XV.—What things are necessary to the validity of the argument from prophecy?

1. That we have satisfactory evidence of the predictions having been delivered before the events, and not having been contrived and palmed upon the world after them.

2. That the events predicted should be such as, from their own nature, or their distance in time; from their complexity, or from other circumstances, could furnish no ground either of previous assurance, or even of high probability, to those who looked forward into futurity.

3. That the prophecy should be very full, very explicit, so that there could be no possibility of accidental coincidence of the event with the prediction.

4. That the event should accurately correspond with the prophecy, and should be sufficiently notorious to admit of public examination.

"If in any writing, said to be prophetic, we meet with the union of these characteristics, we may at once pronounce it to be Divine. In Scripture prophecy they all concur. Take, for example, the dispersion of the Jews, as foretold by Moses (Deut. xxviii.); the destruction of Nineveh, as foretold by Nahum iii.; of Babylon, as foretold by Isaiah xlii., and Ezekiel xxxi.; the succession of the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman Empires, as foretold by Daniel ii., viii.; and we shall find that in them each of these particulars is distinctly realised. But 'the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' This is the great topic of prophetic Scripture; and the predictions on this subject were stated so distinctly as to maintain, from age to age, a growing expectation of His advent; they were so numerous as to extend almost from the birth of time to within five hundred years of His actual appearance; and, lastly, their fulfilment was to the letter, and in the most public manner."²

XVI.—What are the methods by which unbelievers explain the agreement of the event with the prophecies of Scripture?

There are only three natural explanations, as is acknowledged by the French infidel, Rousseau. Either the agreement is purely accidental: but prophecy is so full and precise, giving such details as to times, places, persons, circumstances, that this is no more possible than it would be to produce an *Æneid* by throwing

¹ Watson's "Catechism on the Evidences."

² Treffry's "Lectures on the Evidences." See also "The Evidence of Prophecy," by Alexander Keith, D.D.; Rev. J. R. Gregory's "Illustrations of Fulfilled Prophecy."

printed characters at hazard. It is a *philosophical* absurdity. Or the event has been made for the prophecy: but this is no more possible than that the history of Napoleon was arranged or made at pleasure. It is an *historical* absurdity. Or, lastly, the prophecy has been made for the event: but this supposition overturns all the laws of criticism. It is a *literary* absurdity. Turn which way we will, we can find no other issue.¹

XVII.—How can we reply to the objection so often urged against the Scripture prophecies, namely, that they are clothed in terms of indeterminate obscurity?

Why is not the language of prophecy as lucid as that of history? In some instances it is, there being no ambiguity and no symbol. This is the case, "First, when those to whom the prediction was known were not themselves to be the instruments of its fulfilment, and those who were to be the instruments of its fulfilment were in ignorance of the prediction, *e.g.*, the prophecy of the destruction of ancient Babylon: this was known to the Israelites, who were not to be the agents in affecting it; while to the Medes and Persians, who were to be the instruments of its verification, it was unknown. Secondly, when the predictions are of such a nature as that they cannot be effected otherwise than by the combined agency of those to whom they are known, *e.g.*, the prophecy of the universal diffusion of the Gospel."² But it is admitted that, in general, the language of Scripture prophecies is figurative and symbolical, and, therefore, invested with a certain haze and obscurity. For this various reasons have been given: "This partial obscurity harmonises with the whole of God's providential plan; for, in the first place, God lays no restraint on the freedom of man; and He would be constrained to do so with respect to certain prophecies if they were couched in literal and historical terms, otherwise the enemies of the faith would conspire to prevent their accomplishment, while the friends of truth would combine to insure their fulfilment. In general, God would have His creatures fulfil the prophecy, without being aware of it themselves. In the second place, God does not force man's conviction. He does not render truth so self-evident that there remains nothing for man to do. On the contrary, He everywhere obliges him to seek and to pursue it, inasmuch as religion consists rather in the feelings of the heart than in the opinions of the mind. This remark is not applicable to revealed religion only; it is the same with natural religion. The existence of God, and the immortality of the soul, are they at once and to all as clear as the day?"³ "Nothing can be clearer than that the terms in which predictions are couched should be such as neither, by their too intelligible plainness, to awaken the suspicion of collusion for their accomplishment, nor, by their too impenetrable obscurity, to leave the correspondence

¹ Adolphe Monod's "Lucilla."

² Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

³ Rev. A. Monod's "Lucilla."

between the prediction and the event undiscernible when the fulfilment actually arrived."¹

XVIII.—How can we reply to the objection that there have been pretenders to the gift of prophecy, and predictions which the events proved to be false; and that, therefore, our reliance upon what are said to be prophecies must be very feeble?

"We admit the fact; but we cannot allow that because there have been some false prophecies there are none true and worthy of implicit confidence; on the contrary, we maintain that the existence of fictitious predictions is a strong presumption that some predictions are Divine. If there were no current money, there would be no counterfeit coin; and if there had never been a true prophet, we cannot easily conceive that there would have been any pretenders to that character."² Let any one look through the vast range of literature of ancient or modern times, and produce any predictions that bear the same marks of genuineness as those of Holy Scripture. Let him examine all the oracles and divinations of paganism, and see if they can be brought to the standard that has been mentioned above. We repeat the challenge, and know that it cannot be met.

XIX.—Are we then to conclude that a genuine prophecy is in the power of God only, and can be uttered by none except under His direct inspiration?

Yes; the most full and explicit assertions on this subject are found in the Book of God. "Sagacious men and fallen spirits may form very clever conjectures as to the result of causes in actual operation, and may, therefore, suggest, with some approach to accuracy, events which are likely to occur at no distant date. But nothing save the infinite prescience of the eternal God can foretell the actual occurrence of future contingent events."³ How plainly is this stated in Isa. xlv. 9, 10. And the sacred writers were instructed to challenge the production of any equal or analogous displays of prescience from the followers of the numerous idol deities or false gods, whose worship abounded in their country and times (Isa. xli. 21-23). When, therefore, an individual can satisfactorily prove that he is endowed with the power of prophetic utterance, he may be considered as having substantiated his claims to the character of an inspired instructor.

XX.—What are the leading internal proofs that the writers of the Old and New Testament were inspired?

We have already referred to the *honour paid by our Lord to the Holy Scriptures*, how He affirmed the principle of their supreme authority, and uniformly acted upon it. See Quest. iii., p. 55. And it is of great importance that this should be borne in mind, especially in the present aspects of religious controversy. But other internal proofs of inspiration shall be adduced.

¹ Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."
Evidences."

² Treffry's "Lectures on the
Dr. G. Smith's "Book of Prophecy."

1. *The wonderful unity that is apparent in the Sacred Books.*

This is patent to the most casual observation. There is not a book which does not contribute something to our stock of information relative to the ways of God with man; not one the absence of which would not produce a gap in the continuity of our knowledge. The complete Scriptures contain an entire (though brief) history of man in his relation towards God. They take up the wondrous story in the eternity before time, carry it on consecutively over the whole course of time, and only cease with the eternity after time. Throughout the whole of these ages one harmonious plan of redemption marches on towards its accomplishment. We are presented with its first beginnings, in the promise of a Redeemer, in Eden; are invited to watch the calling, growth, and history of the family and nation selected to furnish its human instruments; we view its actual execution in the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus; and we find in the Apocalypse a sketch of its fortunes in the world up to the coming of our Lord. Throughout this connected line no one book could be omitted without omitting a link, and leaving some essential point of the history unexplained. And if the books thus composed at very different periods, and by men of widely different character, position, and circumstances, are yet found to constitute one whole and single work, united throughout by a unity of thought and purpose; if collusion or mutual agreement among the separate writers was clearly impossible, then this unity can only have been impressed on the work by Divine intelligence, and constitutes the stamp of Divine inspiration.¹

2. *The grandeur and sublimity of their contents.* Many of them lie beyond the possible scope of any human knowledge. This is true of many of the historical facts, of the interposition of God in human affairs, of the purposes contemplated in them, and of the incomprehensible mysteries connected with the being and nature of God. The history, the doctrines, and the morality of the Bible lie equally beyond the sphere of human reason. And many of the truths that it reveals are so profound in themselves that, when revealed, the loftiest human intellect is lost in their heights and depths. Hence the book is believed to be a Divine book. The sublimity of its subject-matter attests its higher than human authorship.²

3. *The absolute veracity of their teachings.* None will deny that errors have taken place in transcription, that dates have been inaccurately copied, that glosses have been interpolated. We leave the determination of these questions to the ordinary resources of criticism. We take the text as identified with the original autographs, and we affirm that it contains truth, and nothing but truth.

¹ "God's Word Written," by Rev. E. Garbett, M.A. This subject is treated with great clearness and force by Lord Chancellor Hatherley, in his work on "The Continuity of Scripture."

² *Ibid.* See "The Superhuman Origin of the Bible inferred from itself," by Henry Rogers, 4th ed. See also p. 43.

On no one point has criticism discovered a single contradiction to known facts, while it has brought to light an astonishing accordance with them. Exactly in proportion as our knowledge of the countries, circumstances, and nations alluded to in Scripture has become more precise and minute, have all the statements of Scripture been more and more verified. Where ground has apparently existed for impugning its accuracy, further information has proved the objections to be only the product of human ignorance; and it is natural to conclude that what further information has done for some difficulties, it would do, should it be vouchsafed to us, for all.¹ "Thy word is truth." Hence follows the inference, that the God of Truth Himself directed the human instruments. They wrote as they were moved by Him. Nothing but the full inspiration of His Spirit could give to their words the attribute of perfect and unmingled truth.²

4. We must also refer to what by some writers is classed amongst the internal evidences of Divine inspiration, viz., the moral influence which the Scriptures exert wherever they are cordially and sincerely believed. Other writings have been revered as sacred and Divine, but they have left their adherents degraded in intellect, polluted in morals, palpably and grossly estranged from all that constitutes dignity and happiness. We refer for proof to the Shastras of the Brahmin, the Koran of the Mussulman, and to the works of the most celebrated legislators of antiquity—as Minos, Zoroaster, Lycurgus, Solon, Pythagoras, etc.³ But when we turn to the Bible, all is changed. Wherever its principles are understood, and its precepts carried into practice, you will find all that constitutes the grace, the strength, the purity, the perfection of social and spiritual life. What is it that has laid so deeply the foundations of our national freedom; that has covered the land with seminaries of education, with asylums for the sick and the destitute; that has impelled the human intellect onwards in the path of discovery; that has mitigated the horrors of war, and is gradually extinguishing the war spirit; that has broken the fetters of the slave; that has elevated woman to that rank in society to which she is justly entitled; and which has secured to the toiling multitudes the inestimable boon of one day's rest in seven? For all these national and social blessings we are indebted to the influence of the Bible.⁴ Nor must we omit the higher, because the saving, influence which the Bible exercises on the inner, spiritual life of man. It is the medium through which the Divine Spirit acts in purifying the soul

¹ Attempts have been made again and again, to show that Scripture and science are at variance; all that has been proved is, that scientific theories are often in conflict with Scripture, and with some alleged theological opinions. See Dawson's (Dr. J. W.) "Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science;" "Science and Religion," by Alexander Winchell, LL.D.; "Scientific Sophisms," by S. Wainwright, D.D.; "The Relations between Religion and Science," by Bishop Temple, etc. ² "God's Word Written," by Rev. E. Garbett, M.A.

³ See also chap. ii., pp. 24, 25.

⁴ See also chap. ii., pp. 49—51. See "Gesta Christi, or a History of Humane Progress under Christianity," by Charles Loring Brace; "The Divine Origin of Christianity indicated by its Historical Effects," by Richard S. Storrs, D.D., LL.D.

of man—in bringing it under the influence of new motives, new desires, new principles; and when the affections of men are once brought under its influence they are “new creatures,” notwithstanding their former circumstances, prejudices, and habits. To exhaust this subject would require a volume. And who sees not that we have here another convincing proof that the Bible is from God? “An evil tree bringeth not forth good fruit.” If, therefore, this revelation were not of God, it could do nothing.”¹

XXI.—Does the inspired authorship extend equally to all the contents of the canonical Scriptures?

Some have contended that the sacred writers were inspired in all matters lying beyond the range of human discovery, such as doctrinal teaching relative to the nature of God, and the mode of man's salvation; but that on all matters falling within the natural range of human knowledge, such as historical and biographical details, they were left to the unassisted use of their own faculties. To this notion we strongly object. The historical facts constitute one of the principal means of verifying the entire revelation.² We have no possible means of putting to any practical test its doctrines; but we have means of testing the accuracy of historical facts. And in these facts, therefore, God has supplied the means of ascertaining the truth of that Book, whose highest object is to reveal doctrines altogether belonging to another sphere. The simple fact, that in this way alone could a verification be afforded, is enough to prove that the historical portions of Scripture are inseparably identified with the doctrinal, and form component parts of one and the same revelation, invested with one and the same authority. Moreover, the wonderful accuracy of Scripture, in its minute historical details, can only be explained by the exercise of a Divine omniscience. This accuracy is not confined to a single book, or to a single writer, or to a single section of the scriptural writings; it is the quality of the Scriptures in general. It has been traced in particulars which are more or less incidental to the main object of the narrative; particulars which a human writer, diffident of the extent of his own knowledge, might have omitted altogether, or where a bold and careless writer might have added details at haphazard; and in particulars, many of which could not possibly fall within the personal knowledge of the writer, and for which no effort of memory, no extent of information can account. Now, we maintain, that this minute veracity is not the result of anything personal to the individual man, but of some general influence which they partake in common. Divine inspiration extends equally to historical and biographical details, and to its sublimest doctrines. It follows, therefore, that an equal authority pervades the whole body of the Scriptures. They are *the* Word of God.³

¹ See on this subject Horne's "Introduction," vol. i., chap. v., sec. 4; Watson's "Institutes," etc.

² See Note, p. 38.

³ "God's Written Word," by Rev. E. Garbett, M.A.

end.

XXII.—Are we, then, to suppose that the same force of inspiration, so to speak, was exerted upon each of the sacred writers, or upon the same writer throughout his writings, whatever might be its subject?

"There is no necessity that we should so state the case in order to maintain what is essential to our faith—the plenary inspiration of each of the sacred writers. Traditional history and written chronicles, facts of known occurrence, and opinions which were received by all, are often inserted or referred to by the sacred writers. There needed no miraculous operation upon the memory to recall what the memory was furnished with, or to reveal a fact which the writers previously and perfectly knew. But their plenary inspiration consisted in this—that they were kept from all lapses of memory, or inadequate conceptions, even on these subjects; and on all others the degree of communication and influence, both as to doctrine, facts, and the terms in which they were to be recorded for the edification of the Church, was proportioned to the necessity of the case, but so that the whole was authenticated or dictated by the Holy Spirit with so full an influence that it became truth without mixture of error, expressed in such terms as He Himself ruled or suggested. This, then, seems to be the true notion of plenary inspiration,—that for the suggestion, insertion, and adequate enunciation of truth, it was full and complete."¹

XXIII.—What is meant by verbal inspiration?

By verbal inspiration is meant that "the inspired servants of God, while they retained the proper use of the powers and faculties with which the God of Providence had endued them, were always guided or assisted to use such language as would convey 'the mind of the Spirit' in its full and unimpaired integrity."² "It does not imply, then, (1) that a supernatural influence made the words or communicated the knowledge of them for the first time to the writers. Nor does it involve (2) that the peculiar habits and familiar mode of language of the writer did not mould the sentences and the place of the individual words, perhaps their very form. Nor (3) does it exclude the possibility that the fact affirmed by the use of some particular

¹ Watson's "Conversations for the Young."

² Dr. Hannah. The controversy among orthodox divines respecting what is called *verbal inspiration* appears to arise in a great measure from the different senses affixed to the phrase. Dr. Henderson, who is among the most candid and able writers opposed to the doctrine of *verbal inspiration*, seems to understand the doctrine as denoting the *immediate communication* to the writers of *every word and syllable and letter* of what they wrote, independently of their intelligent agency, and without any regard to their peculiar mental faculties and habits; while those who most earnestly and successfully contend for the higher views of inspiration, particularly Calamy, Haldane, and Gaussen, consider the doctrine they maintain as entirely consistent with the greatest diversity of mental endowments, culture, and taste of the writers, and with the most perfect exercise of their intelligent agency,—consistent with their using their own memory, their own reason, their own manner of thinking, and their own language;—consistent, too, with their making what they were to write the subject of diligent and laborious study, only insisting that it was *all under the unerring guidance of the Divine Spirit*.—Kitto's "Biblical Cyclopædia," 3rd ed., art. *Inspiration*.

word, as, for instance, that the sons of Esarhaddon found refuge in Armenia, might have been known to the writer, where such knowledge was possible, by the ordinary channels of human information. In short, it does not involve any denial that the man wrote it to whose authorship the particular book is imputed. Verbal inspiration admits all this, but goes on to assert that there was a concurrence of the act of God with the act of man. (1) He endowed the man with those particular gifts, and chose him to be His instrument. (2) He guided his mind in the selection of what he should say, and of the revelation of the material of his writing, where such revelation was made necessary through the defect of human knowledge. (3) He acted in and on the intellect and heart of the writer in the act of committing the words to writing, not only bestowing a more than human elevation, but securing the truthfulness of the thing written. and moulding the language into the form accordant to his own will. To sum up the whole, verbal inspiration simply amounts to this—that while the words of Scripture are truly and characteristically the words of men, they are at the same time fully and concurrently the words of God.”¹

XXIV.—Is verbal inspiration asserted by the immediate and direct testimonies of the inspired writers?

A considerable portion of the entire Scriptures consists in direct messages from God. These are found in the latter portion of the Book of Exodus, the entire Book of Leviticus, many chapters in Deuteronomy and Numbers, the greater part of the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micah, Zechariah, and the whole of the prophecies of Zephaniah and Habakkuk. In all these cases we find the direct communications ascribed immediately to God, being introduced with “Thus saith the Lord,” or analogous terms. No assertion of the existence of inspired words—that is, of words which carry with them the Divine authority—can be stronger than this. The positive expressions, “My God saith,” “The Spirit of God said,” etc., must imply a verbal message if it implies anything. To the same class belongs the personal teaching of our Lord. Surely His words were inspired.

But let us look at the question in relation to both the Old and New Testament. In the case of the Old Testament, the writers of the New, including our Lord Himself, testify to its verbal inspiration, since they quote it in a manner inexplicable on any other principle. In a majority of instances they quote, not its sense merely, but its words, and rest the authority of great doctrines on single phrases, and even on single words, taken from different parts of the Old Testament, and so separated from their context as to show that the words themselves are considered to be authoritative.² And, besides this, while David, Moses, etc., are distinctly recognised as the writers of the books bearing their names, the Holy Spirit is plainly declared to speak through them: “The Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David,

¹ Garbett's “God's Word Written.”

² *Ibid.*

spake" (Acts i. 16); "Well *spake* the Holy Ghost, by *Esaiah*" (Acts xxviii. 25). That these specified portions contain the very words of God is expressly asserted in the word "*spake*," and no consistent believer in the authority of Scripture can call it into question.

We find, indeed, that our Lord promised such a plenary assistance to His Apostles in their time of special difficulty, that it would "not be ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (Matt. x. 20.) The idea evidently intended is, "The instructions which ye in general give are derived not so much from yourselves as from the Holy Spirit. Hence, when ye are called on to defend your doctrines, ye need feel no anxiety, but may confidently rely on the Holy Spirit to vindicate His own doctrines, by suggesting to you the very words of your defence."¹ St. Paul positively asserts this verbal inspiration (1 Cor. ii. 13).

XXV.—Are we to believe that verbal inspiration belongs to every part of the Sacred Writings?

If by this is meant that every word of Scripture is dictated by the Holy Spirit—that, in fact, the writers are the "pens" of the inspirer,—it is evident that such a theory cannot be maintained. God used the human instrument, not as a dead mechanism, but as the living, being he was; and so permitted His words, style, and manner to be coloured by the personal peculiarities of the instrument. So it was with the Prophets. The same God spake through Moses and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the words were His. The style impressed on them by the Prophet was much the same as the difference of accent and emphasis, of tone and manner, with which four different speakers might deliver one and the same message.² At the same time, "it by no means follows that both words and manners were not greatly altered, as well as superintended by this Divine inspiration, although they still retained a general similarity to the uninfluenced style and manner of each, and still presented a characteristic variety. Certain it is, that a vast difference may be remarked between the writings of the Apostles and that of the most eminent Fathers of the times nearest to them, and *that*, not only as to precision and strength of thought, but also as to language. This

¹ Storr and Flatt.

² This view of plenary inspiration is fitted to relieve the difficulties and objections which have arisen in the minds of men from the variety of talent and taste which the writers exhibited, and the variety of style which they used. See, it is said, how each writer expresses himself naturally, in his own way, just as he was accustomed to do when not inspired. And see, too, we might say in reply, how each Apostle, Peter, Paul, or John, when speaking before rulers, with the promised aid of the Holy Spirit, spoke naturally, with his own voice, and in his own way, as he had been accustomed to do on other occasions when not inspired. There is no more objection to plenary inspiration in the one case than in the other. The mental faculties and habits of the Apostles, their style, their voice, their mode of speech, all remained as they were. What, then, had the Divine Spirit to do? What was the work which appertained to Him? We reply, His work was so to direct the Apostles in the use of their own talents and habits, their style, their voice, and all their peculiar endowments, that they should speak or write each in his own way, just what God would have them speak or write for the good of the Church in all ages.—Kitto's "Biblical Cyclopædia," 3rd ed., art. *Inspiration*.

circumstance is at least strongly presumptive, that although the style of inspired men was not stripped of the characteristic peculiarity of the writers, it was greatly exalted and controlled."¹

XXVI.—Are not the many minor details which are found in Scripture history inconsistent with plenary inspiration?

In other words, would it not be unworthy of the majesty and omniscience of God to suppose His Spirit to have inspired the details of genealogy, or the particulars of ordinary earthly events? We reply—(1) The detailed facts of Scripture constitute essential links in the historical unity of the entire revelation. As in human language, if all words of conjunction, and of grammatical dependence, were omitted, the intelligent sentences of human language would become mere strings of isolated words without a meaning; so, were all the human details of the scriptural narratives taken away, the unity of the plan now pervading the entire revelation would be absolutely lost, and the scheme of the Divine plan would be interrupted in the same degree. Hence, it would be as unreasonable to allege these details to be unworthy of the majesty of a Divine Author as it would be to allege the absurdity of ascribing to the genius of Milton the little words which connect the sublime diction of the "Paradise Lost." (2) Minute detail is inseparable from all human action. It is, therefore, inseparable also from doctrines touching human life and action; and if the doctrine be consistent with the majesty, wisdom, and goodness of God, the facts and record of the facts must be consistent with them likewise. (3) The only possible means afforded to man of verifying the truth of Scripture, and of distinguishing it from the false impostures of man, is supplied by these details on points of topography, genealogy, history, etc. If, therefore, we suppose it to be the will of God to afford to mankind some means of verifying the accuracy of His inspired Word, the addition of these little details is only what an adequate conception of His purposes would lead us to expect.²

XXVII.—How can the doctrine of plenary inspiration coincide with the alleged discrepancies which distinguish the citations from the Old Testament in the New?

1. It must be remembered that, in many instances, the writers of the New Testament do not profess to quote the *words*; they merely refer to the *sense* of the more ancient writers, *e.g.*, Matt. ii. 23; John vi. 45, vii. 38, viii. 17; Acts x. 43; Rom. i. 2, vii. 1, ix. 4, x. 11, xiii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. ix. 9, etc. Forgetfulness of this has been one, among others, of the prolific causes of misapprehension relative to the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament Scriptures.

2. In other instances, passages from the Old Testament are adduced in the New, not for the purpose of explaining the language

¹ Watson's "Conversations for the Young."

² Garbett's "God's Word Written."

employed, or of giving its literal sense, but *in accommodation* to particular circumstances of which the writer is treating. In the narratives of the Evangelists, the phrase, "That the Scriptures might be fulfilled," is often to be understood in this way. "And surely, if a human author may quote himself freely, changing the expression, and giving a new turn to his thought, in order to adapt it the more perspicuously to his present purpose, the Holy Spirit may take the same liberty with His own. The same Spirit that rendered the Old Testament writers infallible in writing only pure truth in the very form that suited His purpose then, has rendered the New Testament writers infallible in so using the old materials, that while they elicit a new sense, they teach only the truth, the very truth, moreover, contemplated in the mind of God from the beginning, and they teach it with Divine authority."¹

3. And may we not, in these citations, assume the operation of a Divine intention, which overruled a seemingly independent writer, to provide for the interpretation of the passages adduced by employing one word rather than another? "The inspired writers of the New Testament were God's interpreters, commissioned to reveal the predetermined counsels of His will." As such, their function was not so much to quote the teachings of the Prophets, as to explain. And, being guided to *interpret* by the same Holy Ghost by whom the ancient writers were guided to *write*, they could pass infallibly through the words to the sense, and give to the Church the authoritative record of what "the Spirit which was in them (the Prophets) did signify." Who shall interpret the words, but He who first inspired them?

These remarks apply to the various classes of Old Testament texts that are given in the New Testament with verbal alterations. *But in the majority of instances, as we have already seen, quotations are given with verbal accuracy, and elaborate arguments are founded on single phrases, and even on single words.* Several instances of this character occur in the personal teaching of our Lord. (See Matt. iii. 3, iv. 4, xix. 5, xxi. 13, 16; Luke iv. 21.) In the narrative of His trial and crucifixion, there are also many notable cases of similar verbal reference on the part of the Evangelist (Matt. xxvii. 9, 10, 35.) In the Acts of the Apostles, the same method of verbal quotation is continued (Acts ii. 27, 34, iv. 25, xiii. 47). But in the argumentative portions of the Epistles, we find these illustrations most abundantly.² The inspired writers of the New Testament rest positive doctrines, and frame elaborate arguments, on the authority of single sentences and single words of the Old Testament Scriptures; "If any one will take the trouble of examining these evidences, he will find them marked by two peculiarities: (1) Although the quotation of the whole sentence be verbally inaccurate, the quotation of the particular phrase, or particular word, on which the stress of

¹ "Outlines of Theology," by A. A. Hodge.

² See "God's Word Written," by Rev. E. Garbett, M.A., pp. 258-61, where a great number of illustrations of this are cited.

authority is laid, is invariably accurate, and the context is added, generally, in order to identify the passage, but for no further reason. The exclusive attention thus fixed on particular words can only have arisen from the belief that these single words are God's words, selected by His intention, and, therefore, clothed with His authority. (2) It will be observed that passages, from different writers, are grouped together as the harmonious evidence of some common truth; *e.g.*, the Divine nature and glory of the Son of God are proved in Heb. i., by parts of sentences, selected for the sake of their emphatic words from three different Psalms and from the First Book of Samuel. Similar instances occur in Rom. iv. 3, 6, 7, 8; ix. 7, 16, 17, 20, 25; where single expressions and single words are sharply separated from the context, and used in a sense which the sentiment of the context would not of itself have suggested. If there be verbal inspiration, this mode of quotation is as consistent and reasonable, as it is utterly inexplicable without it; for, if the words were selected under the guidance of the perfect wisdom of the Omniscient Being, then they are full of God, and must have a depth and reach of meaning, a faultless and unerring appropriateness, investing each single word with the full authority of the Deity."

XXVIII.—How can the doctrine of plenary inspiration be reconciled with certain inaccuracies that are alleged to exist on scientific subjects?

The inaccuracies which have been prominently adduced in the most recent attacks, relate to the Bible-astronomy and the History of Creation; and in Chap. V. we have shown that the Bible, in its allusions to these subjects, if it does not teach exactly what the discoveries of modern science have asserted and proved, it contains nothing which, when fairly interpreted, is opposed to the ascertained facts of science; therefore, the objections founded upon the alleged contradiction of these discoveries to the inspiration of the Scriptures are futile and worthless. Referring the reader to that chapter, and to the many able works that have issued from the press on the subject, we will only remark in this place, that the cases of apparent conflict between revelation and science generally arise either out of a mistaken interpretation of a text of Scripture, or out of a mistaken interpretation of some phenomenon of nature—as, for instance, the production of light before the creation of the sun. In the first case, the contradiction disappears when the Scripture is fairly interpreted; in the second, it disappears when an erroneous physical hypothesis is abandoned.

XXIX.—How can the doctrine of plenary inspiration be reconciled with the apparent discordance between different statements in the histories of the Bible?

It is freely admitted that every word of God is pure. It is im-

¹ Garbett's "God's Word Written."

possible that in the respective representations of different inspired writers there should be any real discrepancy; we do not say any material or essential discrepancy, but any real discrepancy whatever. On the other hand, the Bible is not strictly and absolutely free from all error in the shape in which it actually reaches the great majority of its readers. Slight errors of transmission and translation may intrude, and have intruded, which it remains for the scholar to detect, and, as far as possible, to expunge. But as to the apparent contradictions and historical discrepancies which have seemed so formidable to some, we regard them as nothing but phantoms which disappear before a rigid and exact inquiry. It must be remembered that historical truth does not require that no facts should be omitted, since such a condition would be impracticable; nor does it require that in several narratives of the same events the facts recorded should be absolutely identical.¹ One part may be given and another omitted, or there may be variety in the order of arrangement; or the fact given may be viewed from different points, corresponding either to the objects or to the personal character of the narrator. Such variations furnish a strong evidence of the veracity of the writers, since they show their independence of each other. These variations only become contradictions when the different statements are so palpably opposed to each other that one and all cannot be equally true. Now, when these things are borne in mind, the great proportion of those difficulties in Scripture history which seem serious give way and vanish. Although, on the first aspect, there appears incongruity such as we are at a loss to reconcile, upon more close and attentive examination light breaks in upon the obscurity. We discover links of harmony; the appearance of contradiction gives way in proportion as investigation advances; and at length the two accounts are seen to be in perfect concord. And there could not well be a more satisfactory evidence of truth than this. And if there should be a few discrepancies still existing (and they are comparatively very few) which bear any signs of involving a real contradiction, it is only fair and reasonable to conclude that this arises either from some corruption of the copies, or from the necessarily desultory style of the narratives, and from the frequent want thence arising of connecting links. We cannot here enter in detail into the various cases of inaccuracy that have been exhibited by Christian critics or by sceptical adversaries. They are dwelt upon at length in Horne's "Introduction," Paley's "Evidences," "The Bible and Modern Thought," by Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A., "God's Word Written," and many other works on the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures referred to in this and the preceding chapter. By perusing such works the reader will see that the usual result of a close and candid examination is to bring to light some historic fact, some connecting link, some

¹ See note, p. 45.

undesigned coincidence, or some delicate harmony of truth which escapes the careless reader, and only reveals itself to a patient, humble, and reverent study of these oracles of God.

In conclusion, it must ever be borne in mind, when discussing the subject of Divine Revelation, that there are two elements to be recognised—the one human, the other Divine—which are ever distinct, but never separate; and we must keep them so, neither confusing them together, nor allowing either one to absorb the other. The whole of Scripture is Divine, and the whole of Scripture is human; none the less Divine because it is human; none the less human because it is Divine. "Holy men of old wrote"—here is the human side; "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"—here is the Divine. Yet both meet in the same word, as the two clauses are but the constituents of one sentence: "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

in a trinity of Persons three
persons without confusion
in a unity of essence
anon Smith.

Comprehension is not a fact
Comprehension is in no way essential to fact.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY.

SECTION I.

I. THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

I.—What do the Scriptures teach respecting the nature and attributes of the Divine Being?

No language can adequately express or describe the nature and perfections or attributes of the Divine Being. Having proved the existence of God,¹ and the fact that He has revealed Himself to man,² we must turn to that Revelation to ascertain what He has declared concerning Himself.

"There is but one living and true God." This *unity* of the Divine Being is distinctly taught in Scripture. See Deut. iv. 35, 39, vi. 4; 2 Sam. vii. 22; 1 Kings viii. 60; 2 Kings xix. 19; 1 Chron. xvii. 20; Psalm lxxxvi. 10; Isa. xliii. 10, 11, xlv. 22; Mark xii. 29, 32; John xvii. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 4; Eph. iv. 6.³

II.—What do we understand by the term attributes, as applied to God?

The attributes of God are the qualities or perfections of His nature, which belong to, or are justly conceived of as existing in Him. "The Divine attributes belong to God, not as though they made up His nature, as though His whole being consisted only of the combination of the same, but because they are the forms and outward expressions in which His Being is revealed and becomes manifest."⁴

The Divine attributes are usually divided into *natural* and *moral*. The natural are those which belong to His existence as an infinite and rational spirit, viz., Self-existence (or eternity), Freedom, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Wisdom. The moral attributes are Holiness, Righteousness or Justice, Goodness, Love, Grace or Mercy, and Truth.⁵

¹ See chap. i., pp. 9—22.

² See chaps. ii., iii., pp. 23—87.

³ Probably the best definition of the Divine Being is that in the "Westminster Confession of Faith," which see.

⁴ Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," p. 253, etc.

⁵ Pope defines the Divine attributes as absolute and related. See "Catechism of Higher Theology," pp. 76—85.

III.—What are the proofs from Scripture of the Divine attributes?

1. The uniform teaching of Scripture is, that God is a *Spirit* (John iv. 24). He is "the invisible God" (Col. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 17), "whom no man hath seen, nor can see" (1 Tim. vi. 16).

2. God is an *eternal Spirit*, self-existent (Gen. xxi. 33). "I Am" (Exod. iii. 14; Deut. xxxiii. 27; Psalm xc. 2; Isa. xl. 28; Rom. xvi. 26; Rev. iv. 8-11). Created intelligences are endowed with immortality: God alone possesses eternity.

3. God is *infinite*, filling all space (Jer. xxiii. 24); the soul of the universe, but not as a part of it. Infinite in the perfection of all His attributes (2 Chron. vi. 18; Job xi. 7-9; Psalm cxlvii. 5; Isa. xl. 28; Rom. xi. 33-35).

4. God is *omnipotent, i.e.*, infinite in power (Gen. xvii. 1, xviii. 14; Job xlii. 2; Jer. xxxii. 17; Matt. xix. 26; Rev. xix. 6).

(1) God's omnipotence is shown in *creation*, which is described as His act, done by the exercise of His volition (Gen. i. 1; Exod. xx. 11; 2 Kings xix. 15; Neh. ix. 6; Psalm xxxiii. 6, 9; Isa. xxxvii. 16; Jer. x. 12, xxxii. 17; Amos iv. 13; Acts xiv. 15, xvii. 24; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16; Rev. iv. 11).

(2) God's omnipotence is shown *in the universality, variety, and multitude of His works* (Gen. ii. 1-4; Job ix. 5-10, xxvi. 7-14; Psalm xix. 1, civ. 2-7, cxxxvi. 5-9; Isa. xl. 26, xlii. 5; Jer. x. 12; Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 16). Also by the descriptions of His power (Job xxviii. 9-11; Psalm xviii. 9-15, civ. 28-32; Nahum i. 3-6; Hab. iii. 3-12).

(3) God's omnipotence *is exercised over animate as well as over inanimate creation*; but its exercise is limited by His moral perfections. As a good man cannot do a bad act, though he may have the opportunity, and the mental and physical power to do it, much less can God, though He is infinite in power, exercise it in doing what is wrong. His almightiness is moral as well as natural, and is always controlled by infinite Holiness, Justice, and Love.

5. God is *omnipresent* (1 Kings viii. 27; Job xxviii. 24; Psalm xxxiii. 13, 14, cxxxix. 7-12; Jer. xxiii. 23, 24; Amos ix. 2, 3; Acts xvii. 27, 28). If God be the Creator, Upholder, and Governor of all things, the idea of ubiquity is necessarily implied. His knowledge is His essence knowing, His actions are His essence acting; but as His knowledge and power are infinite, they, therefore, reach all duration and space, and embrace all actions and events.

6. God is *omniscient*. The texts which prove the omnipresence, for the most part prove also the omniscience of God; see also 1 Kings viii. 39; Job xxxi. 4, xxxiv. 21, 22; Psalm xi. 4, xciv. 9-11, cxxxix. 3; Prov. xv. 3; Isa. xl. 28; Jer. xxxii. 19; Dan. ii. 20-22; Heb. iv. 13. (1) God's *intelligence is independent, i.e.*, it in no way depends upon His creatures or their actions, but upon His own infinite intuition of all things possible or actual, past, present, or future (1 Sam. xiii. 11, 12; Isa. xlvi. 9, 10; Acts i. 24, xv. 18).

(2) God's *intelligence is perfect and absolute, i.e.*, He knows all

things directly in their essences, which are often hidden from us, while we know them only in their properties, and as they stand related to our senses.

(3) The *foreknowledge of God* is proved by the predictions which He inspired the prophets to utter; and it follows also from the perfections of His nature.

How the foreknowledge of God is to be reconciled with man's free agency and moral accountability, is one of the most awful and dark problems of theology; indeed, it may be pronounced to be insoluble by human reason. But both these doctrines are clearly stated in Scripture, and are established by abundant evidence. We must, therefore, accept them "as of faith," though we may not be able to reconcile them.

In order to meet this difficulty, (a) man's moral freedom has been denied by some; (b) others have maintained that God, being infinitely free, abstains voluntarily from knowing what His creatures endowed with free agency will do; (c) others, again, contend for a middle knowledge ("*scientia media*"), i.e., foreknowledge as to what free agents will voluntarily do under given circumstances.

None of these views are satisfactory. The *first* is opposed to Scripture, reason, and experience. The *second* is based upon a misconception, as though the omniscience of God were like His omnipotence; whereas, in fact, the former is a necessity of His nature; whereas the latter is His power in operation, and implies that it may or may not be exercised as His will and wisdom may determine. The *third* is true, but defective; since this "middle knowledge" is necessarily implied in omniscience, as the less is comprised in the greater.

(4) The prescience or foreknowledge of God does not impose any course of conduct upon an intelligent free agent; it in no degree affects his liberty of action. Man neither sins, nor follows holiness, as the result of God's foreknowledge; so that arguments used to prove that God's foreknowledge of man's fall and its consequences is inconsistent with, and opposed to, His goodness and justice are without foundation.¹

7. God is *infinitely wise*. God must know what is best; and must, therefore, be conceived of as always adopting the means which will best accomplish His purposes; and that constitutes wisdom.

(1) God's wisdom is manifested in the *adaptation of means to the end*, as seen in creation (Job xxvi. 1-14, xxxvii. 5-22; Psalm civ. 24; Prov. iii. 19, 20; Isa. xl. 12-15; Jer. x. 12, 13); in Providence (Job v. 9-16, xxxvii. 12-14; Psalm xxxiii. 8-19, cxlii. 5-9; Isa. xlv. 24-28; Dan. ii. 20-22). God's wisdom is exhibited in the variety, beauty, order, and wondrous arrangements of nature; in the adaptation of man to the world and the world to man; of light to the eye, and the eye to light, etc.²

(2) God's wisdom is pre-eminently demonstrated in the *plan of human salvation*, by which the problem is solved as to how God

¹ See Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. iv.

² See chap. i., pp. 12-15.

can be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus (1 Cor. i. 24; Eph. i. 7-9, iii. 9-11).

8. The *perfect goodness* of God is a glorious characteristic of His nature, and is one of His moral attributes. It is shown in the benevolence which embraces all mankind, and provides for their welfare. It is exhibited in the *mercy* which the Divine Being shows towards His fallen creatures, and in the provision He has made for their relief and restoration to Himself. It is manifested in the *grace* which He gives to His creatures, which enables them to avail themselves of His merciful provision for their salvation, and to live so as to please Him (Exod. xxxiv. 6; Numb. xiv. 18; Psalm xxv. 7, 8, c. 5, cxix. 68; Nah. i. 7; Matt. xix. 17).

How the *existence of moral evil* can be consistent with the *infinite goodness of God* is a difficulty of the most awful character, the complete solution of which is impossible to man. But sin does exist; and if God be the infinitely perfect Being which He is represented to be, and which even natural theology requires He should be, it must follow that the permission of sin, and all its terrible consequences, is consistent with His holiness and goodness.¹

9. God is infinitely *Holy* in His nature and in His relations to man (Psalm lxxi. 22, cxi. 9; Isa. vi. 3; Hab. i. 13; 1 Peter i. 16; Rev. iv. 8, xv. 4).

10. *Justice or righteousness* is a Divine perfection. It is holiness exhibited in government, and has been defined as Legislative, Rectoral, and Judicial or Administrative² (Exod. xxxiv. 7; Numb. xiv. 18; Deut. xxxii. 4; Psalm xi. 7, lxxxix. 14, xcvi. 2; Jer. xxxii. 19; Zeph. iii. 5; 1 Peter i. 17).

11. The *Truth or Faithfulness* of God is akin to His holiness and justice. His truth implies that all He says and does is true. It includes His veracity, "He cannot lie." The unchangeableness of His laws, promises, and threatenings, result from His truth. His faithfulness to all His promises manifests His truth. Nor does the apparent failure of some promises or threatenings argue against this; for these are not always absolute, but more frequently conditional, either expressed or implied (Jonah iii. 4, 10).

Language is sometimes used which *seems* to show that God changes His mind and actions. This, however, so far from being any evidence of vacillation or changeableness, is, in fact, illustrative of His truth and unchangeableness. It is the alteration in *man's* conduct and feelings towards God which causes the change in His feelings and action towards men. To be insensible to repentance and confession of wrong-doing, when united with a change of conduct on man's part, would be to represent God as a tyrant and monster. Nor is it possible to represent God's mercy and compassion in such cases other than in language such as is used in Scripture, although that language is necessarily defective. Gen. vi. 6; Exod. xxxii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 35; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Psalm cvi. 45; Joel ii. 13; Jonah iv. 2.

¹ See p. 84.

² See Pope's "Compendium of Theology."

IV.—What do the Scriptures teach as to the mode of the Divine existence?

Scripture assumes the existence of God, and never attempts to prove it; but in *revealing* Him it distinctly declares His *Unity*.¹

It is impossible to define the Unity of God; the word unity in human language gives but a faint idea of it, barely serving to defend the doctrine against the opposite error.² "Of all other objects of thought we can imagine fellows or reproductions. But in God there is absolute soleness, '*soleitas*;' though what lies in this essential oneness, we know but partially."³

"We speak of God as one and indivisible, but also as unique and incomparable" (Exod. viii. 10; Deut. iii. 24; 2 Sam. vii. 22; 1 Kings viii. 23; 1 Chron. xvii. 20; Psalm lxxxix. 6, 8; Isa. xlv. 5, 9).

"Belief in the unity of God finds its support partly in the idea of absolute perfection itself; partly in the harmony of the laws, forces, and phenomena of nature, and notably in the unity of the moral law; partly in the last place, in history, which clearly shows that humanity, as it continues to develop itself, ever ascends from Polytheism to Monotheism, never the reverse. No wonder that the latter may be called the common basis of the Law, the Gospel, and of Islamism."⁴

The *Unity* of the Divine existence is made the basis of worship, and the ground of obedience (Exod. xxxiv. 14; Deut. vi. 4, 5, 13, x. 20; 2 Kings xvii. 36; Matt. iv. 10).

It is the standing protest against Polytheism and Dualism (Exod. xx. 3; 1 Sam. vii. 3; Isa. xlii. 8, xlv. 6, 8; 1 Cor. viii. 4). And equally is the Divine Unity opposed to Pantheism (Psalm xciv. 7-11).

V.—But do not the Scriptures reveal a plurality of persons in the Unity of the Godhead?

They do. Dimly, as in Gen. i. 26, and in the name Elohim, often applied to God.⁵ More directly in the benediction and doxology used by the Jewish priests (Numb. vi. 24-27; Isa. vi., compared with John xii. 41; Acts xxviii. 25-27. Also in Isa. xlviii. 16).

The plurality of persons is shown to be triune in the baptismal formula, and in the apostolical benediction.⁶

SECTION II.

THE TRIUNE JEHOVAH.

I.—What is the meaning of the word Trinity?

The word, in its Latin form, *Trinitas*, is derived from the adjective *Trinus*, "three-fold," or "three in one;" it is nowhere employed in Holy Scripture, but was a term invented and used as early as the

¹ See pp. 82, 83.

² Oosterzee, 250.

³ Pope.

⁴ See p. 10.

⁵ Pope.

⁶ Oosterzee, 250.

⁷ See p. 91.

second century,¹ to express the doctrine by a single word, for the sake of brevity and convenience.

II.—What is the substance of Scripture teaching with regard to this doctrine?

The doctrine, as delivered in the Bible, is very short, and amounts to this: "That in the entire and undivided unity of the Divine nature there is a Trinity of personal subsistences, con-substantial, co-equal, and co-eternal."² "In other words, that the one Divine nature exists under the personal distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This we conceive to be the extent of the information conveyed to us respecting this doctrine in the inspired volume; and it is wise to keep ourselves within the limits of the record. When the adversaries of Trinitarianism insist on explanations of what is admitted to be inexplicable, and on definitions of what the Bible has not defined, let us follow the counsel of Hezekiah: "Answer them not." We never can venture to explain on such subjects, further than the testimony of the Bible warrants, without the risk and certainty of darkening counsel by words without knowledge.⁴

III.—What idea do we attach to the word "person" in connection with this doctrine?

It is clearly defined by Dr. Waterland to be "an intelligent agent, having the distinct characters, I, Thou, He." By Locke thus: A person "is a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection." By Dr. Isaac Barrow thus: "By a person, we are to understand a singular, subsistent, intellectual being; or, as Boethius defines it, an individual substance of a rational nature."³ It has been said that the term is not used in Scripture; and some who believe the doctrine it expresses have objected to its use. But if that which is clearly stated in Scripture be compendiously expressed by this term, and cannot so well be expressed except by an inconvenient periphrasis, it ought to be retained. Our translators, however, believed that there is Scripture warrant for the term, when, in Heb. i. 3, they translated the word *hypostasis*, "person."⁵ The Greek Fathers understood the word in this sense, though not in this sense exclusively. And the Apostle's argument obliges us to give the word this signification here. For the Son being called "the express image" of the Father, a distinction between the Son and the Father is unquestionably expressed; but if there be but one God, and the Son be Divine, the distinction cannot be one of essence, and must, therefore, be a personal one. This seems sufficient to authorise the use of the word "person" in discussing the doctrine of the Trinity.⁷

¹ By Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, in Syria (A.D. 168—183); but it does not appear to have been generally used in theological writings until a much later period.

² Dr. Hannah.

³ Watson's "Institutes."

⁴ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

⁵ Works, vol. ii., p. 493.

⁶ The Revised Version has "substance" instead of "person."

⁷ Watson's "Institutes."

IV.—How does the doctrine now stated differ from Tritheism, Sabellianism, and Arianism?

Tritheism, said to have been first advocated by John Ascusnaga, a Syrian philosopher of the sixth century, denies the unity of persons in the ever-blessed Trinity, and teaches that the Godhead is constituted of three beings, distinct in essence as well as in person. In other words, that there are three Gods. From the absurdity and grossness of this system none are more free than Trinitarians, who earnestly plead for the infinite and indivisible unity of the Divine nature.

Sabellianism, so called from Sabellius, an African bishop or presbyter of the third century, may be considered as the opposite extreme to this. It teaches that there is no distinction of persons in the Divine nature, and that the terms, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, represent the Divine Being to us under different aspects or relations only; as a man may be called a father, a son, and a brother in different respects or relations, continuing the same single individual man. Because their scheme, by denying a real Sonship, obliged them to acknowledge that it was the Father who suffered for the sins of men, the Sabellians were often, in the early ages, called "Patri-passians."¹

Arianism, which derives its name from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria in the fourth century, teaches that the Godhead consists of one eternal person, who, in the beginning, created, in His own image, a superangelic being, His only begotten Son, by whom He made the worlds; and that the Holy Ghost was the first and greatest creature whom the Son created. This system, therefore, while it professedly allows a kind of inferior deity to the Son and the Spirit, denies all proper consubstantiality and co-eternity with the Father, and consequently all that constitutes peculiar and supreme Divinity.²

In direct opposition to all these heresies of the early Church, "we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there

¹ This heresy has been revived in modern times by Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swedish baron, who flourished in the early part of the last century. He was a learned but eccentric man, and declared that for twenty-seven years he had enjoyed uninterrupted intercourse with the world of departed spirits, and during that time was instructed in the internal sense of the Sacred Scriptures, hitherto undiscovered. His views with regard to the Divine nature were that Jesus Christ is Jehovah manifested in the flesh—that His humanity is Divine—and that in His person dwells the whole Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Father constituting the soul of the above humanity, whilst the humanity itself is the Son, and the Divine virtue or operation proceeding from it is the Holy Spirit; forming altogether one God, just as the soul, the body, and operation of man, form one man. See Watson's "Dictionary," art. *Swedenborgians*.

² Rev. A. A. Hodge. Dr. Hannah. Socinians (from Socinus, a Polish divine, 1604) differ somewhat from Arians; but for the most part both Arians and Socinians are known in the present century by the name of Unitarians; who, while rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, hold views widely apart from each other—from the extreme Socinianism of Priestley, to the Arianism, almost amounting to Trinitarianism, of Channing. The name Unitarian is misleading; for believers in the Trinity are firm believers in the Unity of the Deity. See p. 86.

is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal."¹

V.—Is not the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity contrary to all reason, and, therefore, perfectly incredible?

Were we to affirm that the persons in the Godhead are three in one in the same sense, or in the same respects, we should evidently affirm what is contrary to reason; such a proposition involving, in the very terms of it, a palpable and irreconcilable contradiction. But it is no contradiction to say, that in different respects the three may be one; that is, that in respect of persons they shall be three, and in respect of Godhead, essence, or nature, they shall be one. The *manner* of the thing is a perfectly distinct question. It is a mystery concerning which the Bible says nothing. We are required to believe the plain fact that God is Three in One. In the *manner* lies the mystery; we have no concern with it; it is no object of our faith. We believe just as much as God has revealed, and no more. "This" (says Mr. Wesley) "is a point much to be observed. 'There are many things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.' Part of these God hath revealed to us by His Spirit; 'revealed,' that is—unveiled, uncovered; that part He requires us to believe. Part of them He has not revealed; that we need not, and indeed cannot, believe; it is far above, out of our sight. Now, where is the wisdom of rejecting what is revealed, because we do not understand what is not revealed?—of denying the *fact*, which God has unveiled, because we cannot see the *manner*, which is veiled still?"²

VI.—Is there not evidence of this doctrine supplied by the names of God as given in the Old Testament?

This is very obvious to a person conversant with the Hebrew language. This language is peculiarly expressive, and its names of objects are not *arbitrary* signs, but significant of their nature and properties, or of some remarkable circumstance connected with their history (see Gen. xvii. 5, xxxii. 28; Matt. i. 21). In conformity with this feature of the language, the *names* of God are expressive of Himself, and were chosen by Him for this purpose. Now, the two principal names which are applied to Deity in the Old Testament are Jehovah, and God (in Hebrew *Elohim*). The former is God's proper name, and clearly applies to the Divine essence. This name is always singular, and may be rendered "He who exists." The other name, *Aleim* or *Elohim*, is plural. And the question occurs—Why is the name Jehovah, which refers to His essence, always singular? Plainly to express the unity of the

¹ Creed of St. Athanasius.

² "Sermon on the Trinity." Also Jones's "Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity."

Divine essence. Why is the other, *Elohim*, plural? As clearly to denote a plurality of persons in the Godhead.

In a multitude of passages these two names of God are united together to express His Divine nature—"the Lord God," *Jehovah Elohim*¹ (Exod. xx. 2, 5; Deut. vi. 3, 4, 5; Isa. xlii. 5). This double name is the one which God has ordinarily assumed in addressing mankind. Now, as there must be fitness and propriety in the language of God, there must be a sense in which He is both singular and plural—plural in persons, for His name is *Elohim*; singular in essence, for His name is *Jehovah*. If the Trinity were false, the names would be contradictory; if the Trinity be true, the genius of the language is consistent, and the names appropriate.

VII.—Is not this argument strengthened by the ordinary grammatical construction of these names in a sentence, and by some peculiar exceptions in a few remarkable passages?

Every one knows that verbs and pronouns should agree in number with the leading noun. Yet *Elohim*, though plural, is almost invariably constructed with verbs and pronouns in the singular, as in Gen. i. 1, "*Elohim* created;" the agent is plural, the verb singular. And this strange form of expression is used by Moses above five hundred times. It is not as if the grammar had been unformed, and necessitated such an idiom; it was that the writer, actuated by an inspiring influence, selected a mode of speech denoting an undoubted plurality in the agents, while there was perfect unity in the action.

In a few remarkable instances, where the personalities of the Godhead are designed to be made prominent, the regular construction is adopted, and *Elohim* is combined with plural verbs and pronouns. See Gen. i. 26: "*Elohim* said, Let *us* make man in *our* image." If the language is proper, there must be a plurality of persons in the Godhead, and each person must be related to us as our Creator. In harmony with this, the Son and the Holy Spirit are set forth in other parts of the sacred volume as united in the act of creation (Job xxxiii. 4; John i. 3).

And it must also be observed, that on some occasions the singular name, *Jehovah*, is united with plural verbs and pronouns. See Gen. xi. 6, 7, which obviously contains the solemn intercourse of Divine persons: "*Jehovah* said . . . let *us* go down," etc.; and Isa. vi. 3, 8, where both the singular and plural pronouns, "*whom* shall *I* send?" and "*who* will go for *us*?" refer to the one true and only God, "*Jehovah* of hosts." Thus, by the very names in which God is revealed to man, and by the construction of those names with various verbs and pronouns, we are taught the great mystery of godliness—the fact of a plurality of persons in the essential unity of the Godhead.²

¹ The reader will remember that in every instance where the name *Lord* is printed in capital letters, it is *Jehovah* in the original Hebrew.

² See Dr. W. Cooke's "Christian Theology." A remarkable and very able essay will be found in the sixth edition of this valuable work.

See also an article in the *Inquirer*, August 4th, 1877, by the Rev. Professor Upton.

VIII.—What other passages in the Old Testament clearly mark a distinction of persons in the Godhead?

1. The threefold ascription of praise, uttered by the winged seraphim in the heavenly temple (Isa. vi. 3), especially when taken in connection with other texts which show that the Being whose glory filled that temple, and drew forth those praises, was not the Father only, but the Son (John xii. 41), and the Holy Ghost (Acts xxviii. 25).

2. The threefold benediction of the high priest in the temple below (Numb. vi. 24-26); that threefold blessing mysteriously coalescing in *one* covenant name: for it is added, "They shall put My name upon them, and I will bless them" (ver. 27).

3. The Messiah's commission (Isa. xlviii. 16): "The Lord Jehovah and His Spirit" send forth, and the eternal "I AM" is the sent one.

4. The many passages which speak as distinctly of the Son and the Spirit as they do of the Father:—of the Son, Psalm ii. 7, 12; Prov. xxx. 4; of the Spirit, Gen. i. 2, vi. 3; Psalm cxliii. 10; Joel ii. 28; Zech. iv. 6.

IX.—What passages in the New Testament confirm and sanction the Doctrine of the Trinity?

The Doctrine of the Divine Tri-unity presents itself—

1. At the Saviour's baptism (Matt. iii. 13-17), where we have the voice of the Father, the human presence of Jesus, and the visible descent of the Spirit.

2. In the form of Christian baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19), that solemn ordinance being duly administered only when "in *the name*"—the one undivided name—of the Three Divine Persons.

3. In the apostolic formula of blessing (2 Cor. xiii. 14), where the glorious Three are addressed in prayer, as the united fountain of grace and love.

4. In the prayers of the saints (Eph. ii. 18; Rev. i. 4, 5).¹

5. In the worship of heaven (Rev. iv. 8), this threefold ascription being in perfect harmony with Isaiah's vision (Isa. vi.), and with all that we learn from other scriptures of the threefold personality of the Divine nature.

entitled "The Unitarian and Orthodox Theology Compared," in which he says, "I do not, of course, accept the doctrine of the Trinity; but I do think that that doctrine has been a marvellously useful vehicle in transmitting to man the most central and vital truth of Christian theology and philosophy, I mean the inseparable co-presence of God and man in human nature. To my feeling, there is no expression more indicative of theological and philosophical shallowness than the expression not unfrequently among us, 'I, for my part, regard Jesus as a mere man.'" "The Gospel of the Nineteenth Century," 4th ed., pp. 393-99.

¹ The style of the book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called the seven spirits; but no created spirit or company of created spirits are ever spoken of under that appellation; and the place assigned to "the seven spirits" between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates with certainty that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent, in both dispensations, is intended.—Watson's "Institutes."

X.—What is the value of 1 John v. 7, in its bearing on this controversy?

The genuineness or otherwise of this passage has long been the subject of discussion; it is omitted in the Revised Version, and the majority of biblical critics have abandoned the clause as spurious. But its absence does not invalidate the irresistible evidence which other undisputed passages of Holy Writ afford to the doctrine of the Trinity.¹

Many very able works have appeared in defence of this great doctrine. Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy" are very powerful and convincing, and the appendix embodies much Scripture criticism. Faber's "Apostolicity of Trinitarianism," in two volumes, 8vo, is one of the most important works that modern times have produced on the subject. His object is to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity has been the recognised doctrine of the Christian Church from the apostolic times; it is a standard work on this great subject. David Simpson's "Apology for the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity" is an historical, as well as a theological work; it is in one volume, 8vo, and displays vast reading and research. Randolph's "Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity" is the production of a very accomplished scholar, against "The Apology" of Mr. Lindsey, a clergyman of the Church of England, who had imbibed the Socinian principles. In the early part of the last century, Mr. Abraham Taylor, a Nonconformist minister, published an octavo volume on "The True Scripture Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity, in Opposition to the Arian Scheme." It is a work of real merit—learned, orthodox, zealous. At this time the Lady Moyer Lecture was founded. It consisted of eight sermons preached annually at St. Paul's Cathedral in defence of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Dr. Waterland led the way; and was ably followed by Dr. Berriman, Bishop, Trapp, Knight, Bedford, Wheatly, Seed, Dawson, Browne, Felton, and others, each of whom published his sermons in an octavo volume. They form a valuable body of Scripture and historical evidence on the subject. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, Bishop Bull wrote a "Defence of the Nicene Faith;" a work of great importance. Mr. John Howe also wrote with piety and moderation, confining himself, however, principally to the question of the possibility of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. Dr. Wallis, at the same period, published three sermons and several letters concerning the Trinity. Their clearness and logical accuracy have perhaps never been surpassed. Bishop Stillingfleet, who was one of the most voluminous and powerful writers of that age, published also a small treatise on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which deserves a place in every theological

¹ See on this disputed clause Horne's "Introduction," vol. iv., pp. 448-71, ninth edit.; Dean Alford's "Greek Testament;" Angus's "Bible Handbook," p. 47; Dr. Clarke's "Commentary," end of 1 John v.; and other commentaries.

library. And Mr. Charles Leslie wrote against the Socinianism of that period. He was a high and intolerant clergyman, but one of the most profound reasoners of either that or any other age. His principal work on the subject was, "The Socinian Controversy Discussed." In reference to the subject of the Holy Trinity, Milbourne's "Mysteries in Religion Vindicated," published 1692, is well worthy of diligent study; and particularly two works of Bishop Browne, entitled, "The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of the Human Understanding," and "Divine Analogy." They are well adapted to check the intellectual pride which has given birth to every form of error respecting the Divine nature, and to teach men to rest in the simple testimony of Holy Scripture.¹

SECTION III.

THE SUPREME DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

I.—Do the Scriptures reveal the proper Deity of Christ?

We have seen that while God is truly one in essence, He is truly and really distinguished by a threefold personality. To render the argument complete, we have yet to demonstrate from the Holy Scriptures that each personal distinction in the Godhead is described as possessing true and proper Divinity. The Deity of the Father is admitted by all. That the Deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit is also explicitly revealed we shall proceed to prove. We begin with the true and proper Deity of Christ.

II.—With what heresies are we principally brought into contact in examining this subject?

Those of *Arius* and *Socinus*. Arius maintained that the Son of God is a creature, but the first and noblest of all created beings; that by Him, as a subordinate agent, God formed the universe, and that the Holy Ghost was created by His power.² This scheme obtained for a time imperial patronage in the primitive Church, and for some years to a great extent triumphed over Scriptural Christianity. The Nicene Council was held in order to its suppression, and the Nicene Creed was drawn up and adopted as a testimony against it. In England this scheme is generally abandoned, and those who depart from orthodox Christianity almost invariably espouse the tenets of Socinus, under the plausible name of Unitarianism.

There were two men of the name of Socinus, who lived about the time of the Reformation. The elder was Lelius Socinus; the younger, Faustus Socinus, a nephew of Lelius. Their theory had been advanced in substance by Paul of Samosata, in the third

¹ Rev. T. Jackson's MS. Lectures.

² See p. 88.

century. It is easier to say what they did not believe, than what they did. They denied the Divinity of Christ, with the sacrifice of His death; and regarded Him as a mere man and a martyr. The personality and Godhead of the Spirit they denied, and spoke of Him as an exertion of Divine power. This theory reduces the revelation of God to a level with Deism and the system of Mohammed.¹

III.—Is there any evidence that Christ had an existence previous to His incarnation?

This Socinians and Unitarians deny; they even say that the doctrine is not to be met with in the Bible. First, take the testimony of Christ Himself (John iii. 13; vi. 32, 33, 38, 50, 51, 58, 62; xvi. 28). Secondly, take the testimony of inspired men:—Of John the Baptist (John iii. 31); of the Apostle John (John i. 1-3, 14); of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 47; Eph. iv. 9; Heb. ii. 14-16). All these scriptures are perfectly plain if we regard Christ as having had an existence before He appeared among men. His birth was not His beginning. It was His arrival from another sphere.

IV.—How far back did His pre-existence extend?

The Scriptures carry the mind backward, and yet farther backward, until the thoughts are lost in the inscrutable depths of a pre-eternity. (1) He existed before John the Baptist (John i. 15, 27), though certainly not in His human conception, birth, or personal ministry. (2) He existed before Abraham (John viii. 58). The question, to which this text was an answer, related to pre-existence, and in this sense the text was understood by the Jews. (3) He existed before the flood (1 Peter iii. 18-20), for "He preached" to the sinners of the old world; if, this were done by the ministry of a prophet (2 Peter ii. 5); yet to do anything by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates His existence as if He did it of Himself without any intervening instrument. (4) He existed before the creation (John i. 1, xvii. 5, 24; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 2). (5) He existed from all eternity (Micah v. 2, margin); from "the days of eternity" were the "goings forth" of this glorious Being, travelling in the greatness of His strength through the silences of immensity.² Now, the pre-existence of Christ, simply considered, does not evince His Godhead, and is not, therefore, a proof against the Arian hypothesis—that He was the first and greatest of creatures; but it destroys the Socinian hypothesis, that He was a man only. When, however, we are carried back by the Scriptures to the ages of eternity, and are told that "in the beginning" He was with God, yea, and "was God," then the doctrine of His pre-existence is a

¹ Rev. T. Jackson's MS. Lectures.

² Read on this subject Pearson, "On the Creed," art. 2, under the head of "His Only Son;" Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. x.; Wardlaw, "On the Socinian Controversy," dis. iii.; also "How is the Divinity of Jesus depicted in the Gospels and Epistles?" by the Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, D.D., part I. This is a very admirable work, and well worthy of careful study.

powerful argument in proof of His Divine nature. He must be God in all the mystery and all the majesty of that nature, if He could be spoken of in words like these.

V.—Were there any appearances of Christ as a Divine Person before the advent?

Of this we have no positive statement in Scripture; but the fact can be clearly proved by a comparison of many texts.

1. *It is clear that a Divine Person did appear, though often in the form of an angel,¹ both to the patriarchs and to their successors:—To Abraham at Mamre* (Gen. xviii.). Here He comes as one of "three men," but He announces Himself as "Jehovah," who can so overrule the processes of nature as to give the aged woman a son (ver. 14); and as they look towards Sodom, He stands forth as Deity confessed; six times He is called "Jehovah" (vers. 17, 19, 20, 22, 26, 33); once "the Judge of all the earth" (ver. 25); such is His power, that He threatens to destroy the Cities of the Plain (vers. 20, 21); He receives the adoring worship of His servant (ver. 23); "then Jehovah went on His way" (ver. 33).—*To Abraham at Moriah* (Gen. xxii.). God came to try the faith of the patriarch. In ver. 11, we find that the "God" who tempted him (ver. 1) was "the Angel of the Lord." It was to Him that the sacrifice would have been offered, and He declares that the readiness to offer the son of his affection to Him (the Angel) was proof that Abraham feared God (ver. 12). He then calls to him again, delivers the message of the eternal God, and by using the phrase, "By Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord" (ver. 16), He shows that there are distinctions of persons in the Godhead, and that He Himself, though Divine, was the medium of communication between heaven and earth.—*To Jacob at Bethel* (Gen. xxviii. 13-17). Here was a very glorious appearance to Jacob of "Jehovah God of Abraham;" and in Gen. xxxi. 11-13, we find that it was "the Angel of the Lord" who as Jehovah thus appeared.—*To Jacob at Peniel* (Gen. xxxii.). The patriarch was subjected to a strange mysterious conflict with "a man" (ver. 24); but when the day came, "the Man" gave Him a new name, and Jacob gave the place a new name (vers. 28, 30); and in both cases the statement was made that the Being with whom he wrestled was none other than "God" Himself, whom Hosea designates "the Angel"—"the Lord God of Hosts" (Hosea xii. 4, 5).—*To Moses at Horeb* (Exod. iii.). A burning

¹ The term "Angel of the Lord," which so often occurs in the English Bible, is so ill conformed to the original that, it is to be feared, it has led many into the error of conceiving of "the Lord" as one person, and of "the Angel" as another. The word of the Hebrew, ill rendered "the Lord," is not, like the English word, an appellative, expressing rank or condition, but it is the proper name Jehovah. And this proper name Jehovah is not, in the Hebrew, a genitive after the noun substantive "Angel," as the English represents it; but the words "Jehovah" and "Angel" are two substantive nouns in apposition, both speaking of the same person, the one by the appropriate name of *essence*, the other by the title of *office*. *Jehovah angel* would be a better rendering. Bishop Horsley, quoted in Dwight's "Theology," ser. xxxv.

bush startles the man of God, and a voice speaks; but the Speaker, "Angel" as He was (ver. 2), is called "Jehovah," "God" (ver. 4), "the God of Abraham," etc. (ver. 6), and the great "I AM" (ver. 14). He claims the tribes of Israel as *His* people (ver. 7), and promises that *Himself* should bring them out of Egypt to the Promised Land (ver. 17); which promise He afterwards fulfilled, when, as "Jehovah" (Exod. xiii. 21), "the Angel" (xiv. 19), He went before them in the cloudy and fiery pillar. And there are many other appearances of the same august Being. In Exod. xix. 20, 21, He comes down on Mount Sinai, and is called "Jehovah;" in Acts vii. 38, He who thus came down is called "the Angel." In Exod. xxxiii. 20, 21, He is promised as the Guide and Leader of the people to the Promised Land; and that He was the same Divine Angel is evident from the fact that He claims their obedience, that it is His prerogative to pardon or punish sin, and that God's own peculiar name, "Jehovah I AM," is in Him. With this uncreated Angel,—this presence of the Lord,—the people were satisfied (Exod. xxxiii. 14, 15); whereas the thought of being left to the guidance of "an angel"—a mere ministering spirit—filled them with mourning and sadness (Exod. xxxiii. 2). In Joshua v. 13-15, He is called "a Man," because He assumed a human form; He is also Captain of the "Lord's host," and, therefore, distinct from Jehovah, whose host He led; still, He is called "Jehovah" (vi. 2), whose presence made the ground holy (v. 15).

2. *It is clear that the Divine Person thus revealed was not God the Father.* "For of God the Father it has been ever true, that no man hath at any time seen His shape, nor has He ever limited Himself to any definite personal appearance."¹ He has always maintained the character of "the invisible God," "whom no man hath seen nor can see" (1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16; John v. 37). Moreover, in no part of Scripture is He spoken of as being *sent*. On this subject there is a perfect uniformity in the language of the sacred writers. According to them, the Father sends the Son, and the Father and the Son send the Holy Spirit; but neither the Son, nor the Spirit, nor both united, ever send the Father.

3. *It is also clear that this Divine Person was the promised and future Christ;* for, *first*, Christ is announced under the very same titles that the Angel bore. Malachi speaks of Him as "the Messenger" or "Angel of the covenant" (Mal. iii. 1); "but the same person who is the Messenger is the Lord Jehovah Himself; not the same person with the sender, but bearing the same name, because united in that mysterious nature and undivided substance which the name imports. The same person, therefore, is servant and Lord, and by uniting these characters in the same person, what does the prophet but describe that great mystery of the Gospel, the union of the Divine and human nature in the person of the Christ?" Observe, also, as a messenger or angel is the servant of Him who sends him, so Christ, in evident reference to this, is called *God's*

¹ Dr. A. Clarke.^{*} Bishop Horsley, Sermon on Mal. iii. 12.

servant (Isa. lii. 13, liii. 11, xlix. 6). A message is a service; it implies a person sending and a person sent; and as this name is given to the Lord Jesus, it seems that whenever God has had a commission to execute, that commission has been confined to His Son, who, from the beginning, has been the Mediator between God and man. "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but took upon Him the form of a servant." The identity of titles, both Divine and subordinate—titles of nature and of office, which were given to the Angel Jehovah and to the Lord Jesus, are, to our mind, conclusive evidence that they are one. *Secondly*, various things, said to be done by the Angel Jehovah in the Old Testament, are attributed to Christ in the New.

(1) We have seen how the Angel Jehovah spake to Moses on Mount Sinai. In Heb. xii. 24-26, we are told that it was "Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, whose voice then shook the earth." (2) The Angel Jehovah, when He "spake to Moses in Mount Sinai," gave the law, and made the covenant, usually called the Mosaic, with the children of Israel. Jeremiah tells us that the new covenant with Israel was to be made by the same person who made the old (Jer. xxxi. 31-34); and from St. Paul we learn that this new covenant, predicted by Jeremiah, is the Christian dispensation, and Christ is its Author (Heb. viii. 6-10). The Christ of the New Testament and the Angel Jehovah of the Old are, therefore, the same Person. (3) We have seen how the Angel Jehovah was the leader and guide of the Israelites to the Promised Land, and the New Testament frequently identifies the Lord Jesus with the events of their journey. The reproach which Moses endured, when he left the Egyptian court, and united himself with the tribes of Israel, is called "*the reproach of Christ*" (Heb. xi. 26). But how can this be true, excepting as the people were the people of Christ, and so the reproach was His? They are charged with tempting the Lord their God in Massah (Deut. vi. 16), which they did by murmuring and repining at what He, as their Divine leader, allotted them to bear. But St. Paul tells us that it was *Christ* whom they tempted when they murmured against God in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 9). But how can this be true, excepting as Christ was then with them as "the Lord their God," leading them to the land of promise? They were supplied with manna from heaven and water from the rock, type of those spiritual supplies which the believers among them received as oft as they resorted to their Divine conductor. But again, the Apostle tells us that the "spiritual rock" which supplied the life-giving stream was Christ, who "followed them" (margin, "went with them") wherever they journeyed (1 Cor. x. 4). But how can this be true, excepting as Christ was with them, their unfailing companion, the Author of all their temporal blessings and of all the spiritual good which they enjoyed?¹

Thus, from the New Testament, we gather that the Son of God,

¹ The evidence on this subject is arranged with consummate ability and clearness in Professor Hill's "*Lectures on Divinity*," book iii.

the Saviour, was the Angel Jehovah of the Old Testament, who appeared and spake to the fathers. And what rich and copious proof have we here of our Lord's Deity! "No name is given to the Angel Jehovah which is not given to Jehovah Jesus; no attribute is ascribed to the one which is not ascribed to the other; the worship which was paid to the one by patriarchs and prophets, was paid to the other by evangelists and apostles, and the Scriptures declare them to be the same august Person; the image of the Invisible, whom no man can see and live; the redeeming Angel, the redeeming Kinsman, and the redeeming God."¹

VI.—Are Divine names or titles ever given to Christ?

1. *He is called God.* There can be no dispute that the name "god" is often used in the Bible when it cannot for a moment be supposed that it is used in its high and incommunicable sense. It is applied to Moses (Exod. vii. 1), and to princes, magistrates, and judges (Exod. xxii. 28; Psalm lxxxii. 1, 6), because of some imperfect resemblance which they bear to God in some one particular. But it is in no secondary or figurative sense that Christ is called God. Consider these texts: Matt. i. 23; John i. 1, xx. 28; Acts xx. 28;² 1 Tim. iii. 16;³ Heb. i. 8; 2 Peter i. 1.⁴ But, as if for ever to shut out the secondary or subordinate sense, He is called "the mighty God" (Isa. ix. 6); "God over all" (Rom. ix. 5); "the true God" (1 John v. 20); "the great God" (Titus ii. 13).⁵

2. *He is called Jehovah,*⁶ which is acknowledged to be the incommunicable name of the Most High, signifying His eternal, independent, and immutable existence. "I am Jehovah; that is My name: and My glory will I not give to another." If this name, therefore, is directly given in the Scripture to Jesus of Nazareth,

¹ Read on this subject Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xi.; Doddridge's "Lectures," lecture clvii.; Hare's "Preservative against Socinianism," chap. viii.; Fletcher's Works, vol. vi.; Dwight's "Theology."

² Griesbach and J. P. Smith agree that the preponderance of evidence is for the reading "the Church of the Lord." Bloomfield considers that "the Church of God" is the true reading, and observes that it is a usual expression of St. Paul, occurring eleven times in the epistles. The Revised Version has the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities read the Lord."

³ Some have wished to read "which" or "who," instead of "God," in this verse. The difference in the original would be made by a very trifling variation in the characters used. The Revised Version reads, "He who was manifested in the flesh," with the following marginal note, "The word *God*, in the place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*." Those who desire to see the arguments on this text will find them in the various commentaries, in Horne's "Introduction," and Henderson's "Great Mystery of Godliness Incontrovertible."

⁴ This text is rendered in the margin of the larger English Bibles, "Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and, according to the established principles of Greek construction, this appears decidedly to be their just translation.—*Dr. Wardlaw*. This rendering is adopted in the Revised Version, with marginal note "or, our God and the Saviour."

⁵ To avoid all ambiguity and to express the precise sense of the original, the words ought to be rendered "the glorious appearance of our Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ."—*Dr. Wardlaw*. The Revised Version has this rendering with the authorised text in the margin.

⁶ The reader will remember, that in every instance where the name "Lord" is printed in capital letters it is Jehovah in the original Hebrew.

the question of His supreme Divinity ought to be decided; and that it is so, we have abundant proof (see Isa. vi. 5, compared with John xii. 41; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Joel ii. 32, compared with Rom. x. 13; Isa. xl. 3, compared with Matt. iii. 3; Isa. viii. 13, 14, xxviii. 16; compared with 1 Peter ii. 6-8; Zech. xii. 10, compared with John xix. 37); and "we are bold to say that there is no lofty name by which the Father is ever described, which is not given, in some place or other, to the Son; so that if you have any process of argument by which to disprove the Divinity of Christ, you may apply the same process to disprove the Divinity of the Father, and thus demonstrate that there is no God at all."

VII.—Are Divine attributes or perfections ever ascribed to Christ?

Yes.

1. *Eternal existence.* Isa. ix. 6; Micah v. 2; John i. 2; Isa. xlv. compared with Rev. i. 11, ii. 8, xxii. 13.
2. *Omnipresence.* Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20; John iii. 13.
3. *Omniscience.* John ii. 24, 25, xxi. 17; Col. ii. 3; Rev. ii. 23, compared with 1 Kings viii. 39.
4. *Omnipotence.* Isa. ix. 6; Phil. iii. 21; Rev. i. 8.
5. *Immutability.* Heb. i. 10-12, xiii. 8.
6. *Every attribute of the Father.* John xvi. 15; Col. ii. 9.

VIII.—Are Divine works ever ascribed to Christ?

1. *The creation of the Universe.* "If there be a maxim that is written clearly, with all the light of its own evidence upon the human soul, it is this: 'He that made all things is God.'" And in how many texts is creation ascribed to the Son of God? (John i. 3, 10; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2, 10.)¹
2. *Providential government.* Matt. xxviii. 18; Luke x. 22; John iii. 35, xvii. 2; Acts x. 36; Rom. xiv. 9; Eph. i. 22; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3; Rev. xvii. 14.
3. *The forgiveness of sins.* Matt. ix. 2-7; Mark ii. 7-10; Col. iii. 13.
4. *The final dissolution and renewal of all things.* Heb. i. 10-12; Phil. iii. 21; Rev. xxi. 5.
5. *The resurrection of the dead, and universal judgment.* John

¹ "By thus ascribing the work of creation to the Son, the apostles do no exclude the agency of the Father and the Holy Spirit. They do not break in upon the unity of the Godhead, and separate the essence of Deity, in distinguishing the persons. Creation was the work of the Triune God; but the Son was the immediate and prominent agent in wielding the three-fold energy of the whole Divine nature."—Watson's Sermon on Col. i. 16.

"Should it be objected that Christ created *officially*, or by *delegation*, I answer, this is impossible; for as creation requires absolute and unlimited power or omnipotence, there can be but *one* Creator, because it is impossible that there can be *two* or *more* Omnipotents, Infinites, or Eternals. It is, therefore, evident that creation cannot be effected *officially* or by *delegation*, for this would imply a being *conferring the office*, and delegating such powers; and that the being to whom it was delegated was a *dependent being*; consequently not unoriginate and eternal; but this the nature of creation proves to be absurd."—See Dr. A. Clarke's admirable and sublime note on Col. i. 12-17.

v. 22, 25-30; Phil. iii. 20, 21; Matt. xxv. 31, 32; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31; Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 1.

IX.—Is Divine worship paid to Christ?

1. The worship of Christ is distinctly recognised as the distinguishing peculiarity of New Testament saints. Acts ii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 12, 13.¹

2. We have numerous instances of religious worship as rendered to Christ by the inspired apostles and early saints. Luke xxiv. 51, 52; Acts i. 24, vii. 59, 60; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9; 1 Thess. iii. 11-13; 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17.²

3. He is worshipped by angels. Heb. i. 6; Rev. v. 11, 12.

4. He is to be worshipped by every creature in the universe. Rom. xiv. 11; Phil. ii. 9-11; Rev. v. 13, 14.

After reading such passages as these, can we doubt whether the Being who is thus represented as occupying the same throne with the eternal Father, and receiving the very same expressions of adoration and praise,—of *unqualified* adoration, of *everlasting* praise,—be Himself God in the same sense, and in as high a sense, as the Father Himself is so styled?

X.—Is not the Divinity of Christ proved from His own most solemn declaration?

See especially Luke xxii. 70; * John v. 18, 25, x. 30, xiv. 9, xvi. 15. If this be His testimony concerning Himself, we are reduced to the fearful alternative, either to recognise Him as truly God, or to turn away from Him as destitute of the human excellences of sincerity, humility, and truth; unless, indeed, we have recourse to a supposition, upon which the most desperate of His modern opponents have not yet ventured, and say with His jealous kinsmen that He was

¹ The testimony from *epikaleomai*, translated "call upon," is most convincing when compared with the Septuagint usage of the word; for it is the ordinary term for the sacred invocation of God, as see Psalm lxxxvi. 5; 1 Peter i. 27. It describes such spiritual worship, that, whether offered to the Father or to the Son, is indissolubly connected with salvation (Acts ii. 21); and yet this is, without the shadow of a doubt, applied in the above texts to the invocation of the Lord Jesus.

² The Unitarian objection to the Divinity of Christ, as arising from this argument, is, that the worship rendered to Christ was only such reverent salutation as was by custom offered to those in authority. We are aware that the word translated worship, *proskuneō*, is often used in classical writers for humble and prostrate salutation. But what is its New Testament usage? The word occurs sixty times, and the noun formed from it, *proskunētes*, once. There are twenty-two instances in which it is used of worship offered to God the Father, or absolutely to God; and five of Divine worship used intransitively; fifteen instances of worship to Jesus Christ; seventeen of idolatrous worship condemned, and two of human salutation. Of these two, moreover, in one (Matt. xviii. 29), the king to whom the worship is paid is evidently in his royalty a type of God. We are, therefore, virtually reduced to one solitary instance.—Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, M. A., "Rock of Ages."

* Revised Version—in margin, "Or, ye say it because I am."

beside Himself.¹ Of a truth, the alternative is terrible. But can devout and earnest thought falter for a moment in suspense?

XI.—Is not the Divinity of Christ proved by the frequent conjunction of His name with that of the Father?

We have examples of this in the promises He made (John xiv. 21, 23); in the embassy of the apostolic writers (Titus i. 4; Gal. i. 1); in the designation of the Churches addressed (1 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 1, 2; Phil. i. 1, 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2); in the benediction besought by the apostles (1 Tim. i. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 14); and in the worship of heaven (Rev. v. 13, vii. 10). Now, the union of the Name of the Most High with one subordinately employed in the evident capacity of a servant, is of easy explanation, though even this is rare in Scripture; but the conjunction of the infinite God with one co-ordinately engaged in manifest equality of rank, is utterly inexplicable on the Unitarian hypothesis, and no explanation can be given except on the assumption that the Lord Jesus is one with the Father in the honours of supreme Divinity. To associate the Creator with a creature, in offices and prayers and giving of thanks, in the way set forth in these texts, would for ever confound and destroy the infinite distinction between the eternal God and mortal man.

XII.—Is not the Divinity of Christ proved from the view given in the Scriptures of the love of God as displayed in the mission or gift of Jesus Christ?

This love is always spoken of in terms which intimate its astonishing and unparalleled greatness (John iii. 16; Rom. v. 8, viii. 31, 32; 1 John iv. 8-10). If Jesus Christ is to be viewed only as a teacher sent from God, if His life was only an example, and His death a confirmation of His testimony, where shall we discover that unparalleled peculiarity of love, and whence derive that incomparably superior obligation, which these passages so strongly express? Peter and Paul were commissioned to teach mankind the will of God, and they also proved their sincerity, and sealed their testimony with their blood. But when do we find any language like that which is used respecting Him applied to them? Why is the love displayed in the gift of Jesus Christ the pledge and assurance of every other blessing? Why is it exhibited as without parallel or comparison, even in the whole conduct of God Himself? Indeed, the supposition of Jesus Christ being a mere human prophet so reduces and neutralises the meaning of the expressions, so totally annihilates their spirit and beauty and propriety, that we say, with all the emphasis of conviction, it cannot be true.²

XIII.—Is not the Divinity of Christ proved by His high claims to the love and obedience of His followers?

¹ This argument is elaborated in a train of lofty and impassioned eloquence by Liddon, in the "Bampton Lectures for 1866."

² Wardlaw: "Socinian Controversy," dis. ii.

What mere human prophet ever addressed the people to whom he was sent in such terms as the following passages contain? Matt. x. 27-38; Luke xiv. 26; John xii. 25, 26. If the speaker were indeed what we affirm Him to have been, the language is suitable to the person; we are sensible of no incongruity between them. But if He were on a level in nature with the disciples and the multitude to whom He spoke, every feeling of fitness and propriety is outraged; it is the language of unexampled presumption. Yet these high claims were felt and owned by His followers to be just. Love to Christ was the distinguishing feature of their character (Eph. vi. 24); the grand moving spring of their activity (2 Cor. v. 14, 15); the want of which incurred a heavy curse (1 Cor. xvi. 22). And view Jesus Christ as Emmanuel—God with us—the atoning Redeemer of a lost world—then all is as it ought to be. The strongest terms that can be selected are not then too strong to express His claims on our attachment; His title to the entire surrender of our hearts and powers to His service.¹

XIV.—Is not the resurrection of Christ the crowning proof of the Divinity of His person and mission?

It undoubtedly is, and is so stated by St. Paul (1. Cor. xv.). The clear teaching of Scripture is, that "The Christ who died for our sins, and was buried, returned bodily to life on the third day, and was seen alive by His disciples. If ever this confession, on which the whole Christian Church is built, must be abandoned as absolutely untenable, all will at the same time be for ever over, alike with the highest glory of the Redeemer, as with the highest consolation of the redeemed."²

XV.—How may the evidences of the resurrection be stated?

Our limits preclude our doing more than present a very brief summary.

1. It will be admitted that such a person as Jesus Christ lived; that He collected around Him a body of followers who believed Him to be the Messiah; and that He was crucified by the authority of the Roman Government.

2. It is certain that before the end of the first century the religion which bore the name of Jesus Christ, and of which He was the recognised Founder, had spread very widely, and Christian Churches were founded in—almost, if not—all the great cities of the Roman Empire.³

3. The first three Gospels were published in their present form

¹ Wardlaw's "Socinian Controversy," dis. ii.

² See Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 563, etc; Row's "Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ."

³ See Tacitus' "Annals," Book. xx., c. 44; and Pliny's "Letter to Trajan," A.D. 97.

not later than A.D. 110. Even Rénan acknowledges that there is sufficient evidence that Matthew was written about A.D. 66; Mark about 100; Luke about A.D. 90; and John at the beginning of the second century.¹

4. The four most important Epistles of St. Paul—viz., Romans, 1st and 2nd Corinthians, and Galatians—the latest of these was written not later than twenty-eight years after the crucifixion.²

5. These are the authorities upon which the proof of the resurrection depends.

Now here we have historical recollections beginning twenty-eight years after the principal events recorded, and we may readily test the value of such evidence. A writer in 1874 thus puts this matter: "The repeal of the corn laws took place exactly this interval of time from the present year. Those who are forty-five years old must have a clear recollection of the events by which it was brought about; and while they continue alive, it will be impossible to encircle the chief agents in it with a mass of fable, so as to hide the character of the events. Two years later occurred the revolution in France, which expelled Louis Philippe. Our recollections of that event are so fresh as to render it impossible that we could become the prey of a number of legendary stories respecting it. Such stories can only grow up after the lapse of considerable intervals of time, when the recollection of the events has lost its freshness, and the generation which witnessed them has died out. Observe, then, that St. Paul was separated from the crucifixion when he wrote these letters by the same interval of time which lies between us and the two events in question."

XVI. What do Paul and the Evangelists testify as to the resurrection of Jesus Christ?

1. That Jesus Christ was crucified by the Romans, having been declared by the Jews to be guilty of blasphemy—because that He, being Man, made Himself God. After the body had hung upon the cross the usual time, it was found that He had died sooner than was usual, so that "they brake not His legs;" but to be sure that it was not a case of suspended animation a soldier—in mere wantonness, as it seemed—pierced His side, and forthwith there came out water and blood. His body was not cast into the common receptacle for criminals, but was given over to a friend, and was laid in a tomb in which no other body had been placed. But Jesus had declared that if they killed Him He would rise from the dead the third day. His enemies, to prevent the possibility of a spurious resurrection, asked that the tomb might be guarded. A military guard was detailed to

¹ Rénan's "Life of Jesus" quoted in Wace's "Authenticity of the Four Gospels."

² Tischendorf's "When were the Gospels written?" Sanday's "Gospels of the Second Century," etc.

this work, and lest they should be tampered with, the stone at the mouth of the sepulchre was sealed.

2. But it is agreed on both sides that the body was missing from the grave. What explanation was offered of this? The soldiers said, that while they kept watch there was a great commotion, and an angel rolled away the stone—that they were terror-stricken and became as dead men. They told the chief priests and elders what had happened, and they were bribed to say, "His disciples came by night and stole Him away while we slept;" and though such conduct—sleeping on guard—would subject them to punishment, they were secured from it by the influence of the Jewish authorities. This, then, is the only explanation ever given by the parties concerned to account for the body of Jesus being missed from the tomb, and you will observe it was published at the time.

3. How do the disciples account for the body being missing from the tomb? They say, that when the death of their Master took place all their expectations of His being the Messiah died out; at His betrayal they forsook Him and fled, and before they were assured of His resurrection they went to their own home. But His declaration that He would rise again the third day, gave them some vague hope, though they did not understand what the rising from the dead should mean. Early in the morning of the third day, some women of their company went to the grave, taking with them sweet spices to embalm the body. They were surprised and distressed at finding the sepulchre empty, but were informed by angelic messengers, "He is not here, for He is risen." Mary Magdalene did not clearly understand what was meant by this, and, bitterly weeping, she exclaimed—"They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." Turning from the grave in the twilight of early dawn, and blinded by her tears, she saw some one whom she took to be the gardener, and in great agony demands—"If thou hast borne Him hence tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him hence." Calling her by name,— "Mary,"—she recognises Him to be her Master, and she is directed to tell His disciples that He has risen. They are somewhat incredulous; some of them go to the sepulchre and find it empty.¹ Two of them go to the village of Emmaus, and in the evening are joined by Jesus; conversation ensues respecting the wonderful events of the day, but as they break bread together Jesus is made known to them. Meanwhile those of the disciples who remain in Jerusalem have met in the evening, and as they are speaking of the astonishing event of their

¹ We are aware that attempts have been made to show that the reports of the women and disciples who went to the sepulchre are contradictory. It is only necessary to point out that each simply testified to what they saw, and do not pretend to give evidence as to all the facts which occurred. If in a court of justice each witness gave evidence in precisely the same manner, in nearly the same words, while it was evident that all were not witnesses of every particular circumstance in the case, the judge would at once say the evidence was untrustworthy and had been concocted.

Master's alleged resurrection. He, Himself, appears among them, and shows them His hands and His side. They are joined by the disciples from Emmaus: but one of their number—Thomas—is absent, and he refuses to believe that Jesus has risen and appeared to them. On the eighth day—or one week after the first appearance among them—He comes again, no doubt by appointment—for they are all present—Thomas being among them: Jesus rebukes his incredulity, so that convinced, he exclaims, "My Lord and my God." On various occasions, for forty days Jesus is with His disciples. On one occasion He was seen of five hundred brethren, the greater part of whom were alive when Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians. By His words and actions He gave them most indubitable evidence that He was their once crucified but now risen Master; and when He had given them His final directions and instructions, He ascends out of their sight.

4. Such, without going into minute detail, are the statements made in the Gospels, as those of eyewitnesses, and are confirmed by Paul. But they receive additional confirmation in the facts—

(a) That the disbanded company of Christians—for they went to their own homes—was reformed, as the result of Christ's resurrection.

(b) That they continued to meet together for worship on the first day of the week—the Lord's Day—transferring the Sabbath to that day, in consequence and in commemoration of the resurrection; and this custom has continued in the Christian Church without intermission from the day of the resurrection; a standing monument, in fact, of this great Christian miracle.

(c) That the Apostles proclaimed the fact of Christ's resurrection immediately after the event, in the very city, and among the people who were conversant with the facts of the case, and where it could have been disproved instantly, had it not been true.

(d) That the Apostles and first Christians had no interest in proclaiming the resurrection, had it not been a fact, but that all their interests lay in the opposite direction.

(e) That in the various prosecutions of the Apostles by the Jewish authorities no accusation was ever made that they were proclaiming what had not occurred. If they were willing not to speak in the name of Jesus, they might have gone where they pleased, and done what they liked; but they declared they "could not but speak the things which they had heard and seen," let the consequences to them be what they might. They willingly suffered the loss of all things, and endured martyrdom as witnesses of the resurrection of Christ.¹

5. Upon the whole case, then, we may confidently say with St. Paul, "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-

¹ See Row's "Historical Evidence of the Resurrection;" Sherlock's "Trial of the Witnesses of Christ's Resurrection;" Cooper's "The Verity of Christ's Resurrection."

fruits of them that slept." Jesus Christ was therefore demonstrated, or "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."¹

XVII. Have not sceptics raised various objections against the resurrection of Christ?

From the earliest times they have done so. During the life of the apostles there were some in the Corinthian Church who denied the resurrection of Christ by denying the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Celsus, Porphyry the Emperor Julian, and others were followed at a later period by Spinoza, and during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by the English Deists and the German naturalists and rationalists. In recent years objections have been urged by the materialistic school of scientific men, who may be designated the modern Sadducees.²

The objections are of two classes—

1. Those which *a priori* deny the possibility of a miracle.³ This objection is sufficiently answered in pp. 62-66.

2. That the disciples and followers of Jesus were impostors, or that they were enthusiasts—*i.e.*, they were either deceivers, or were the victims of delusion. As to delusion two alternatives are put forth: (a) That they were so "credulous and enthusiastic that one or more of them fancied they saw Jesus alive after His death, and that they succeeded in persuading the others that it was a fact."⁴ Or (b) That Jesus did not really die, but merely swooned, and was afterwards removed from the sepulchre by His friends, and died soon after.⁵ It certainly requires a greater amount of credulity to accept either of these theories than to believe that Jesus Christ rose from the dead.⁶ This is sufficiently replied to under Questions XV. and XVI. (pp. 102, 103).

¹ Dr. Arnold, in one of his sermons to the boys at Rugby, says:—"The evidence of our Lord's life and death and resurrection may be, and often has been, shown to be satisfactory; it is good according to the common rules for distinguishing good evidence from bad. Thousands and tens of thousands have gone through it piece by piece as carefully as ever judge summed up on a most important cause. I have myself done it many times over, not to persuade others, but to satisfy myself. I have been used for many years to study the history of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them, and I know of no one fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better and fuller evidence of the sort, to the understanding of a fair inquirer, than the great sign which God has given us that Christ died and rose again from the dead."

² See "The Unseen Universe," by Tait and Stewart, in reply to the scientific objection, 2nd edit., pp. 165-189.

³ See Acts xxvi. 8.

⁴ Rénan supposes that Mary Magdalene took the gardener for Jesus—thought He had risen from the dead—and communicated her enthusiasm to the others, who accepted her report. He says: "Divine might of love! moments for ever sacred, when the passion of an hysterical woman gave to the world a risen God."

⁵ "The idea of suspended animation, not real death, is involved in inscrutable difficulty."—Dr. Samuel Davidson.

⁶ Strauss, even, is obliged to confess: "Taken historically,—*i.e.*, comparing the effect of this belief with its absolute baselessness,—the story of the resurrection of Jesus can only be called a world-wide deception." Truly it is a miracle greater than that of the resurrection itself, that such a belief should have originated and been perpetuated if the event itself were a myth.

That the disciples were impostors has never been seriously argued, or if so has been long abandoned. Their whole life, conduct, sufferings, and sacrifices show that they were sincere in the belief of the truth which they proclaimed—that Christ was risen from the dead; and, as we have seen, they had abundant, suitable, and frequent evidence of this. Such a belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ as has prevailed from the beginning to the present it is impossible to account for on any hypothesis other than that it actually occurred. For a full discussion of this subject see Christlieb's "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," pp. 448-503; Abbot's "Commentary," Matt. xxxiii., close of chapter; Oosterzee's "Christian Dogmatics," p. 563, etc.

XVIII.—What are the principal objections that Socinians and Unitarians allege against our Saviour's true and proper Divinity?

They may be arranged in two classes:—

1. *Those drawn from His proper humanity and His humble mission as a servant.* It is exceedingly unfair to adduce this as an objection; for Socinians and Unitarians cannot but know that Trinitarians admit as freely as themselves that our Lord is man, and that, as the Mediator between God and man, He received a commission from the Father. The question, however, is, are we not continually taught, by an astonishing mass of Scripture evidence, that while He is truly and properly man, He is also the Supreme and Eternal God? And are not the very texts which most strongly declare the humanity of Jesus sufficient to refute those who from them would deny His Deity? How could a mere man, without absurd presumption, solemnly announce that God the Father was greater than he? How could he be "made flesh"? How could it be a proof of his humility that he "was made in the likeness of men"? He was "perfect God and perfect man;" and, keeping this in remembrance, we have a clear and satisfactory explanation of those passages which might otherwise appear incongruous and contradictory.

2. *Those drawn from particular texts of Scripture.*

(1) It is supposed that our Lord's reply to the rich young man proves that He Himself disclaimed Divinity (Matt. xix. 16, 17). It is most unfortunate for the Unitarian theory to press this passage into its service; for if it disproves the Saviour's Deity, it also disproves His goodness. But was He not good? Not good? and yet the great teacher of men, and the example of the most perfect holiness, obedience, and benevolence! Not good? and yet 'the whole testimony of Scripture asserts His immaculate holiness and disinterested love! Not good? and yet the Father, once and again, proclaims from heaven that He was His beloved Son, in Whom He was well pleased; and inspired apostles declare that He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners! The title "good Master,"

however, was not rejected by our Lord because it was improperly *applicable* to Him, but because it was improperly *applied* by one who regarded Him only as a mere man, not as the Divine Messiah.¹ He did not restrain one from calling Him good, who came professing his persuasion that He was a Divine person, or one who entreated Him to do an act which supposed Divine power, and so might be considered as implying such a persuasion; but one who addressed Him as a teacher, "good Teacher," *didaskalos agathos*, and proposed a question which all eminent teachers amongst the Jews professed to answer. Our Lord repelled the title when given as an unmeaning compliment, but announced to the young man the true ground on which alone the term was applicable to Him. "If I am good, then am I Divine; for there is none good but one, that is, God." This was doubtless the conclusion to which Christ was desirous to lead the young man. He had come to inquire of Jesus merely as a master, or teacher; the Saviour would convince him that He was not only his instructor, but his God.²

(2) It is supposed that in Mark xiii. 32 we have a denial of our Lord's omniscience, and, therefore, of His Divinity; but whatever may be the meaning of these words, they cannot be understood in a sense that contradicts the many passages which explicitly declare that Christ knows all things. Moreover, it is very clear, from the whole drift of the discourse, that our Lord *did* know the time of the impending calamities; for, in the same breath, He foretells them with the most circumstantial exactness, and declares that the present generation should not pass away until the event should be accomplished. And hence we must seek the explication of the text in that idiomatic use of the word *to know*, which the Hebrew so often furnishes, and which the Evangelist would naturally follow, although he wrote in Greek. To *know*, in this place, appears to bear the sense of the Hebrew conjugation called *Hiphil*, and to signify, therefore, "to make to know"—that is, "to declare or reveal." St. Paul uses the same word in the same sense in 1 Cor. ii. 2. The meaning will then be, that by none of the three means of communication by which God has been pleased to reveal His purposes, neither by inspired men, nor angels, nor even the Son Himself, was the exact time of that visitation *made known or revealed*; but the Father Himself would reveal it by its sudden and unlooked-for appearance, "which *in His own times* He shall show." A comparison of this text with Acts i. 6, 7, seems to confirm this view; for there again the Saviour intimates, not that He was Himself unable to satisfy their curiosity, had He pleased to do so, but that it was not within the range of His commission, as the Sent of God, to disclose to them that part of the Divine arrangements.³

¹ The Revised Version reads in v. 17, "Why askest thou concerning that which is good?"

² Dr. Cooke's "Christian Theology," Watson's "Exposition," *in loco*.

³ Watson's "Exposition," *in loco*; Dr. W. Cooke's "Christian Theology"; Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. iii. p. 685; Dr. Urwick's "Second Advent," p. 34.

(3) Two passages are often adduced against the eternity of Christ, and in proof that He is a created being—Rev. iii. 14, and Col. i. 15. In the first of these, the word rendered "beginning" is *archē*, which is applied to the Father as well as the Son (see Rev. xxi. 6); so that, if the word must mean that Christ had a beginning, and, therefore, is not eternal, it teaches the same with regard to God the Father. The meaning of the word *archē* "beginning," is the same here as *archōn*, *chief*, *ruler*, *governor*, *supreme*; the abstract term being put for the concrete, of which there are many examples. This is evidently its meaning when applied to the Father, and so it is when applied to the Son.¹ Hence, Dr. A. Clarke's note: "The beginning of," etc.; "that is, the Head and Governor of all creatures, the King of the creation." And Benson's: "The Author, Head, and Ruler of the creation of God." And thus, instead of disproving His eternity, it establishes His supremacy and Divinity. In Col. i. 15, Christ is designated "the first-born of every creature," or more literally, "the first-born of the whole creation." The word *prōtotokos*, *first-born*, like *archē*, *beginning*, signifies the Chief, the Supreme, the Lord, the Governor; the phraseology is Jewish. As he who was first born in a Hebrew family had the pre-eminence and lordship over his brethren, so the word was used to denote pre-eminence or dominion in general. It is applied to kings (Psalm lxxxix. 27); to death (Job xviii. 13); and, by the Jewish people, to God Himself, for they call Jehovah "the first-born of all the world, or of all the creation," to signify His having created or produced all things. The word is thus applied to Christ by St. Paul, and is designed to exalt Him above all creatures, and to crown Him Divine Head and Lord and Sovereign of all. It proclaims one of His many royal titles, and invests Him with the insignia of universal empire.²

(4) 1 Cor. viii. 6 is also adduced as a denial of our Lord's Divinity; but, as Dr. Pye Smith observes, "The Deity of Christ can no more be denied because the Father is here called the 'one God,' than the dominion of the Father can be denied because the Son is called the 'one Lord.'"³ "The connection of this passage with the preceding, and the scope of the argument, are well expressed by Billroth, as follows: 'As respects the eating of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols, we know that there is no idol-god in the world, and that there is no God but one, viz., Jehovah. Although, then, there be what are called gods, whether they be in heaven or on earth, as, indeed, there are gods many and lords many (to the heathen, according to the ideas of the heathen), yet is there to us but one God (*i.e.*, there is only one Being whom we acknowledge as Divine) and one Lord, from whom, as Creator and First Great Cause, all things have their origin, and we [exist] for Him (*i.e.*, for

¹ Dr. W. Cooke's "Theology."

² Dr. W. Cooke's "Christian Theology;" Dr. A. Clarke's "Commentary," *in loco*; Dr. Guthrie's "Inheritance of the Saints," p. 197.

³ Smith's "Scripture Testimony," vol. ii., p. 394.

His service and glory, see Col. i. 16, 17); and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom (*i.e.*, as the immediate and efficient cause) are all things, and we *by* Him; '*i.e.*, are what we are'—language in perfect accordance with the great Scripture principle: "Of the Father, through the Son, and by the Spirit, all things are." Here, then, there is nothing to exclude from the honours of supreme Divinity either the Word, who was in the beginning with God, and was God, or the Holy Ghost, who bears the same Divine title. Indeed, the passage can only be explained in itself, or made to agree with the uniform testimony of Scripture, on the principle that the Father and the Son are one God and one Lord, in the unity of the Godhead.

Among the most valuable works on the subject of this section are the following: Dr. Pye Smith's "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," in two volumes, 8vo, beyond comparison the most elaborate and convincing book on the Divinity of Christ that ever appeared in the English language. Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy." Holden's "Scripture Testimony to the Divinity of Christ," which is more adapted to popular use, and to the use of young students, than either of the works just mentioned. It is in one volume, 8vo. Moses Stuart's "Letters to Dr. Channing, in Defence of the Divinity of Christ." They are written in a truly Christian spirit, and contain much valuable criticism combined with sound argument. Hare's "Preservative against the Errors of Socinianism." It is acute and powerful in argument, and contains a just view of the important subjects of which it treats. Wilson's "Illustration of the Method of Explaining the New Testament by the Early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ." A very able defence of the Godhead of Christ, showing that the early Christians and the Jews, who were contemporary with our Lord, understood those terms which are now applied to the Divinity of our Lord just as they are now understood by orthodox believers. Dr. Burton's "Testimonies of the Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ," and his "Testimonies to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost and the Doctrine of the Trinity," are both works of the highest value, as exhibiting the views of the Christian writers during the first three centuries concerning these subjects. Horsley's "Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley," published in one volume. They are deficient in Christian temper, but are among the ablest controversial publications that ever appeared. Dr. Waterland, at an early part of last century, wrote largely in defence of the Divinity of Christ and of other subjects connected with it; and all his publications bearing on these points are entitled to a careful study. Dr. Calamy, Dr. Guyse, and Mr. Hurrion, three Dissenting ministers, lived at the same time, and distinguished themselves in defence of the truth. Calamy published a volume on the doctrine of the Trinity; Guyse on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; and Hurrion another on the same subject. They are all worth a careful reading.

¹ Dr. Bloomfield, *in loco*.

Bishop Bull's "Opinion of the Catholic Church, for the first three centuries, on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God," is equally valuable to the theological student and the student of ecclesiastical history. I especially recommend a work, published A.D. 1765, by Dr. Abaddie, entitled "The Great and Stupendous Mystery of Man's Salvation by Jesus Christ, asserted and defended." Mr. Wesley was deeply impressed with the value of this treatise. The author maintains that if Jesus Christ be not God, the Gospel is less credible than the system of Mohammed. His argument may be evaded, but cannot be refuted.¹

SECTION IV.

THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

I.—In what various applications do we find the term "Son of God" in Scripture?

This was a title which, before our Lord's time, had been received with various shades of meaning. It had been used of all who, in their several degrees, stand in filial relationship to their Father in heaven—(1) Of the spirits who sang for joy when the foundations of the earth were laid (Job xxxviii. 7). (2) Of the judges and rulers who, because the word of the Lord came to them, were all the children of the Most Highest, and to whom, as such, even one of the very names of God—*Elohim*—was applied without impiety (Psalm lxxxii. 6; Judges v. 8). (3) Of those, whosoever they may have been, who saw the daughters of men that they were fair (Gen. vi. 4). (4) Of Israel, as the dear son of Jehovah (Hosea xi. 1). (5) Of all who should one day be called the children of the living God (Hosea i. 10); viz., believers in Christ, because of their gracious adoption into God's family (John i. 12).²

II.—When the term is applied to the Lord Jesus, is it a title of office or of nature? In other words, does it apply to Christ as a Divine person, or must it be restricted to His humanity?

1. There are passages which seem³ to restrain its significance to the mere humanity of the Saviour; and to rest its application—(1) Upon His miraculous conception (Luke i. 35).⁴ (2) Upon His official designation (John x. 34-36). (3) Upon His resurrection from the dead (Acts xiii. 33).

¹ Rev. T. Jackson's MS. Lectures. See also pp. 119, 120.

² Plumptre's "Christ and Christianity;" Boyle Lecture for 1866, p. 145.

³ I say "seem to restrain," etc., because I am well aware that some of our most learned and judicious divines explain these passages as confirming, rather than as opposing, the doctrine of the Divine Sonship of our Lord, as we shall afterwards have occasion to show.

⁴ Revised Version, "That which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God," with marginal reading almost like the A. V.

2. The general teaching of Scripture is, however, that as He is called "Son of man" in reference to His proper humanity, so is He called "Son of God" in reference to His Divine nature, and as expressive of His peculiar and eternal relation to God the Father.

We admit that there are instances in which the title "Son of man" is connected with the loftier attributes of Deity (see Matt. ix. 6, xii. 8, xxiv. 30, 31; John iii. 13, vi. 62); and that the title "Son of God" is occasionally applied where the reference is to the attributes of pure humanity, as *e.g.*, Rom. v. 10; Gal. ii. 20. This, of course, arises from the personal union of the two natures in Christ. But this interchange of appellations will no more prove the title "Son of God" to be a human designation, than it will prove "Son of man" to be a Divine one.

III.—Can we gather from the evangelical narrative in what sense the disciples, and the Jews in general, regarded this title?

A few references will show that they all regarded it as the designation of a Divine person. (1) *Take the confession of Nathanael* (John i. 45-51). He was first led to Jesus through an invitation from Philip, who described our Redeemer as "the son of Joseph." But when Jesus announced to him that He saw him "under the fig tree," probably in allusion to a recent act of secret devotion, Nathanael, certain that no merely human being had seen him, at once recognised in Christ that prerogative of God, which consists in searching the hearts of men, and seeing them in their most secret retirements, and under this idea exclaimed, "Thou art the Son of God," etc. The natural conclusion is, that, as the confession was drawn forth by this proof of omniscience, it was intended to indicate His proper Deity. (2) *Take the confession of the disciples*, occasioned by a most impressive display of our Lord's power over the elements (Matt. xiv. 22-33). They had seen Him walk upon the sea, which is the prerogative of God (Job ix. 8); they had seen Him uphold the disciple on the face of the great deep, and, by a single act of His will, hush the tempest, and bring the endangered vessel to land. They felt that the Lord of nature was there, and they "worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God." Can we resist the conviction that under these circumstances the acknowledgment and homage was that of pure Deity? (3) *Take the confession of Peter* (Matt. xvi. 13-18). It has two great parts: "Thou art the Christ" is the first part,—He whom God has anointed and sent forth to be the King, the Priest, the Prophet of His Church. This, then, was a title of office. "The Son of the living God" is emphatically added to express the *true nature* of Him who was thus acknowledged to be the Christ. That this was the view of Peter is rendered indubitable by our Lord's reply, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven," meaning, that the truth thus expressed had not been ascertained by human testimony, but by the Divine revelation alone. Now, the title "Son of God" describes the miraculous conception, it is a

matter of plain historical testimony; if it expresses nothing more than the Messiahship of Jesus, *that* was stated to Peter by his own brother Andrew (John i. 40, 41); and was no subject of Divine communication. But the doctrine of the Saviour's Deity, and of His eternal relation to the Father, is truly inscrutable, and in order to its apprehension requires the revelation of God; for "no one knoweth who the Son is but the Father." This interpretation, therefore, is the only one with which the passage harmonises. (4) *Take the avowed conviction of the Jewish people.* In the narrative recorded (John v. 17, 18), the calling of God His own Father was understood by the Jews, and their opinion is sanctioned by the evangelist, as the most direct and precise claim of Divinity, and, according to their interpretation, as a crime worthy of death. In John x. 24, 25, we find our Lord avowing Himself to be the Christ; but this produced no observable effect upon His hearers. When, however, He claimed God as His Father, they proceeded to outrage as before, and assigned as the reason, that, being a man, He made Himself God (vers. 29-38). It is obvious, therefore, that the conception they had of the term was that it implied the possession of perfections and prerogatives such as belonged to no creature, but to God only (see also Mark xiv. 61-64).

IV.—Did the Saviour ever affirm His Sonship in the same sense in which it was understood by the Jews?

Had they misapprehended the term, we cannot doubt that He would instantly have corrected their mistake, and set them right. He was bound not to suffer His own character to be stained in their view with the crime of blasphemy. But He uttered no word of correction. On the contrary, He re-asserts His Sonship, and that in the most explicit terms, as involving a Divine character and claim. For (1) He declares His equality with the Father, both in operation and in honour (John v. 19-29). (2) He refers to the testimony of John in confirmation of His claim (John v. 33, compared with John i. 34). (3) He appeals to the testimony of the Father (ver. 37), who, both at the baptism (Matt. iii. 17), and at the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5), proclaimed Him as His "beloved Son," for the purpose of securing the most profound reference for His person and work. (4) He appeals to His miraculous works, they being evidences of His Divine power (John x. 37, 38; xiv. 11).

V.—Is there any confirmation of this view arising out of the history of our Lord's death and resurrection?

The Jews had all along asserted that the assumption of the title "Son of God" by one whom they regarded as a mere man, was for Him to be guilty of the capital crime of blasphemy (see John x. 33). And before the bar of the Sanhedrim, the high priest adjured Jesus, that is, put Him upon oath, to tell Him whether He was Christ, the Son of God (Matt. xxvi. 63). The people also urged the same question (Luke xxii. 70). And He at once avowed that He was

so in the very sense in which they put the question (Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 70); and for this they adjudged Him worthy of death, and led Him to the cross (Matt. xxvi. 65, 66; Mark xiv. 61-64; John xix. 7). "The mere claim of being *the Christ* would not have been regarded as blasphemy by those who had questioned with themselves whether John was the Christ or no, and were deceived again and again by the appearance of false Christs. It was because they saw in the words what seemed to them to imply a claim to the incommunicable name, a participation in the absolute unity, that they condemned Him on the ground that He spoke of Himself as the Son of the Blessed."¹ It now became a question of the utmost moment, was He, as the Son of God, equal to the Father, or was He a blaspheming impostor? It was a question to be decided by infinite power alone; and, for its decision, the Father interposed; and by the most stupendous of all miracles—His resurrection from the dead—Christ was "declared," definitely marked out, "the Son of God with power" (Rom. i. 4). The resurrection was, therefore, the evidence of the Divine filiation of the Redeemer. His claim to be the Son of God, which the Jewish council adjudged to be blasphemy, was by this glorious miracle effectually vindicated.

VI.—Do the writings of St. John afford any special evidence of the Divine Sonship of our Lord?

The avowed purpose, both of the Gospel and Epistles, was to excite and confirm our faith in the great truth that Jesus is the Son of God (John xx. 31; 1 John v. 13). And how is the matter proved? By giving evidence that He was miraculously born? By supporting His claims to Messiahship? No; but by repeated and irrefragable arguments that He was Divine. The title "Son of God" must, therefore, express the sovereign Divinity of Christ. And we shall see how this idea runs through the writings of this Apostle. As the Son, He has perfect oneness and equality with the Father (John x. 30, v. 18, xvi. 15); oneness and equality of nature, with mutual in-being (John i. 18, viii. 19, 20, x. 28, 30, xiv. 7-11, xvii. 20-23); oneness and equality of title (1 John v. 20, compared with John xvii. 3); oneness and equality of glory (John xvii. 1, 5-9, 10); oneness and equality in counsel and operation (John v. 17-19, 30, xiv. 10, 11, xvii. 21; 1 John ii. 24; 2 John 9); oneness and equality of life-giving power (John v. 21-27, xi. 25-27, 40, x. 17, 18); oneness and equality of honour (John v. 23, xiv. 13, xv. 23, 24). Can these passages be reviewed without producing in us the conviction that "Son of God," as applied by the Apostle, is a title of absolute Divinity?

VII.—Does not the Epistle to the Hebrews clearly sustain the doctrine of the Divine Sonship of Jesus?

It must be remembered that many of the persons addressed in

¹ Plumptre's "Boyle Lecture for 1866," p. 148.

that epistle had been contemporaries of our Lord, and had witnessed that unrighteous controversy upon the doctrine of His Divine Sonship which issued in His crucifixion. The lofty sense in which He employed the title "Son of God," and in which it was interpreted by His judges, must to them have been perfectly familiar. They were incapable of affixing to the appellation any idea but that of sovereign Divinity. And yet with these circumstances before him, the Apostle, in treating of the dignity of our Lord's person, styles Him throughout "The Son of God."

(1) As the Son of God, He is the radiation of the Divine splendour, and the accurate and most exact resemblance of the Father's substance (Heb. i. 3).

(2) As the Son of God, to Him are ascribed the creation of the world and the attributes of eternity and immutability (Heb. i. 2, 10-12).

(3) As the Son of God, He is superior to angels, He having this title by inheritance, that is, by natural and inalienable right (Heb. i. 4-6)—right resulting not from mere gratuity, or from the meritoriousness of toil or sufferings, but from nature.

(4) As the Son of God, He is addressed by the Father as "God," the everlasting King (Heb. i. 8), whereas angels in their highest estate are but messengers and ministers (ver. 7).

(5) As the Son of God, even in His condition of lowest debasement, He is entitled to the homage of angels (Heb. i. 6).

(6) As the Son of God, He sits upon the throne of God, far above all principality and power, while angels are occupied in the services of love (Heb. i. 13, 14).

The same ideas of absolute Divinity connect themselves with the title throughout the epistle. The conclusion is inevitable; not only that "Son of God" is a Divine title, but that of all the appellations by which the Divinity of Christ is described, it is the most choice, peculiar, intelligible, and emphatic.

VIII.—Does not the language of the angel to the mother of our Lord affirm that He should be called the "Son of God," on account of His miraculous conception?—Luke i. 35.

So it has been thought by Dr. A. Clarke and some others; and they have regarded this text as decisive evidence against the Sonship of our Lord's Divine nature. But if their view of the passage is correct, then, in the same respect in which our Lord is the Son, the Holy Ghost is the Father—a title which is never appropriated to Him. Moreover, throughout His personal history there is not a single instance in which the use of this title is connected with an allusion to the Divine production of His human nature. Even St. John, who wrote for the one specific purpose—"that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God"—says not a word about the miraculous production of His humanity. That view of the passage which makes the miraculous conception the reason why our Lord should be invested with this title, arises from the notion that

"the power of the Highest," in the second clause, means the same as "the Holy Ghost" in the first, which it evidently does not. There is abundant evidence that the term "power" was, by the Jews, used to signify a Divine person; in 1 Cor. i. 24 Christ is called "the power of God;" and the early writers of the Church commonly apply the word "power" to the Divine nature of our Lord; and, in accordance with this view, we must affix a personal sense to the term "the power of the Highest" in this text. There were two acts to be performed in the "preparation of the body" of our Lord—one, the miraculous production of a human being; and the other, the joining of the Divine nature with it in personal union, so that Christ might be Emmanuel, God with us; and it is reasonable to conclude that both should be referred to in the explanation of the case to Mary. First, then, we have the act of the Holy Ghost producing the human nature of our Lord in the womb of the Virgin; and then we have "the power of the Highest"—i.e., the Second Person in the Trinity, the Eternal Logos, descending upon the virgin mother, and uniting Himself to that which was so formed. From these two acts all that the angel mentions followed. It follows that that should be a "holy thing" which should be born of Mary, as being produced immediately by the Holy Ghost; and it followed that this "holy thing" should be called the Son of God. And, accordingly, this became the appellation of the one undivided Christ, but wholly by virtue of the hypostatical union. The mode of expression by which the concluding clause is introduced confirms the view thus given: "therefore *also*," etc. It shall not merely be called *holy*, which would follow from its immediate production by the Holy Ghost; but it shall be called the Son of God because of another circumstance—the union of the two natures; for since human nature was united to the Son of God, it was to bear the same name, as being in indissoluble union with Him.¹

IX.—Does not the language of St. Paul, in Acts xiii. 33, oblige us to rest the Sonship of our Lord upon His resurrection from the dead?

By some this view has been entertained. But a palpable reason for its rejection is, that it supposes Christ to have become the Son of God at the resurrection, which is not the fact. Every expression in the New Testament which gives emphasis to the Sonship of Christ, refers to a period before the resurrection. There are two other expositions of the passage; and in both it is referred to the *Divine* filiation. Watson supposes that the resurrection is here announced as the evidence or declaration that Christ was truly, and in a proper sense, the Son of God. In this case, according to an allowable Hebraism, the passage will signify, "Thou art My Son; this day (of the resurrection) have I declared, and by indubitable evidence demonstrated, Thy proper and Divine generation."

Watson's "Exposition," *in loco*; Treffry's "Eternal Sonship," pp. 127-37 148-50. See also Revised Version, Luke i. 35.

Hence it is a passage of exactly similar import to that in Rom. i. 4, "declared to be the Son of God . . . by the resurrection," etc.¹ Treffry doubts whether there is in this text any reference to the resurrection. He says the word *again*, in ver. 33, is inserted by our translators without any sufficient warrant,² while the participle *anastēsas*, *raised up*, does by no means necessarily suggest the doctrine supposed. In fact, when the verb has this sense, it is usually connected with some determining phrase, such as *ek nekron, from the dead*; otherwise its meaning simply is to *raise up*, or, passively to *be raised up*. See Acts ii. 30, iii. 6-17, 22, 26, 34, where, the reference is not to the resurrection, but to the natural production and the official elevation of Christ. And throughout St. Paul's discourse at Antioch, recorded in Acts xiii., he maintains a clear distinction between the raising up of Christ by official appointment, and the resurrection from the dead. (Compare verses 23 and 30. The same distinction is to be observed in verses 33 and 34; resurrection being spoken of only in verse 34.) Thus the passage will signify, "God hath fulfilled His promise, in that He hath raised up Jesus, by sending Him in the flesh, and by appointing Him to the various functions required of Him." And then, to show that Jesus, who was thus raised up, is such a Saviour as God had promised unto the fathers, he announces the eternal relation of the Messiah to the Father,—the great truth which displays the beneficence of Him who gave, and the condensation of Him who was given, "as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day" (there being no succession, no yesterday, no to-morrow, in eternity) "have I begotten Thee."³ Whichever of these interpretations we prefer, the main result of our inquiry is unaffected, the Saviour still stands before us as the eternal Son of God; the Son, in that high and ineffable sense which can be predicted of no created, no finite being; the Son, as having from eternity derived the Divine essence from the Father, but so derived it, incomprehensible though it be, that we can affirm of the two Persons that they are co-equal, co-eternal, and of the same substance.

X.—What is the reply to the metaphysical objection, that Sonship implies posteriority of time and inferiority of nature?

Properly speaking, it implies neither. "On the contrary, filiation necessarily implies not only equality, but identity of nature. This is so evident that in the Scriptures, 'Son of man' is a common Hebrew periphrasis for a proper human being; and by parity of reasoning, He who is strictly 'Son of God' is a proper Divine being. Hence, far from being an evidence of natural inferiority, the filiation of our Lord is the most plain and unequivocal argument for His Deity." "Nor is it correct to say that a father, as such, exists before his son. He who has no child is not a father; and no one can be a father until he has offspring; and supposing paternity and filiation to be essen-

¹ Watson's Works, vol. iii., pp. 38, 39. ² It is omitted in the Revised Version.

³ Treffry's "Eternal Sonship," p. 299, etc.

tial relations of the first and second Persons in the Trinity, it is plain that from eternity (incomprehensible as it may be to us) the one must have been a Father, and the other a Son."¹

XI.—Can anything be predicated as to the manner of the Son's generation?

On this subject, the Holy Scriptures are silent; and all analogies derived from created nature must for ever fail to convey adequate ideas of the mode of Divine existence. It is sufficient for us to rest in the fact as revealed by God Himself; waiting till our arrival in the world of spirits for those further discoveries which the Almighty, in the plenitude of His wisdom and love, may see good to make.

XII.—Is there any importance attached to the inquiry into the doctrine of the Divine Sonship?

Some have gone so far as to represent it as a subject of mere strife of words, while others regard it as affecting not merely the general character of the Gospel, but the very subsistence of experimental religion. A few considerations may tend to a due appreciation of the subject.

1. "The denial of the Divine Sonship destroys all relation among the Persons of the Godhead; for no other relations among the hypostases are mentioned in Scripture save those which are expressed by paternity, filiation, and procession; every other relation is merely economical; and these natural relations being removed, we must then conceive of the Persons in the Godhead as perfectly independent of each other; a view which has a strong tendency to endanger the unity of the essence;" for, to unity of nature natural relation is essential; and if the relation be given up, the unity must follow.

2. "If Son of God be in strictness a human designation (and so it must be if it relate not to His Divinity), then we may say that our Saviour, as God, has no distinctive name at all in the whole Scriptures. The title 'God' does not distinguish Him from the other Persons of the Trinity; and 'Word' stands in precisely the same predicament as 'Son'; for the same kind of criticism may reduce it to merely an official appellation. The other names of Christ are all official; and hence the denial of the title 'Son' as a designation of Divinity leads to the remarkable conclusion, that we have not in Scripture a single appellation which, in strictness and truth of speech, can be used to express the Divine Person of Him who was made flesh and dwelt among us."

3. A denial of the Divine Sonship of our Lord is calculated to weaken the impression of the greatness of God's love in the redemption of the world. That love is eminently evinced in the fact that He gave "His only begotten Son" (John iii. 16, 17; John iv. 9, 10);

¹ Rev. R. Treffry's "Eternal Sonship," p. 27, 40-44.

Him who from eternity was "in the bosom of the Father," the sharer of the depth of the Father's counsels, the object of His ineffable delight. And He that spared not *His own*, His proper Son—His in a sense altogether exclusive and peculiar, His in infinite and ineffable tenderness—how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Such is the leading doctrine of the glorious Gospel. But withdraw the Divine Sonship, and the subject is instantly thrown into obscurity. We cannot conceive in what sense the first Person in the Trinity could possess a property in, or an authority over, the second, so as to be able to give or send Him. All that we are capable of imagining in this case is, that on the part of the one there was a concurrence in the beneficent design of the other. This, however, is no evidence of the Father's love; and all that Scripture teaches on the subject becomes actually unintelligible. On the other hand, let the doctrine of the Divine filiation be admitted, and we perceive the fitness, the harmony, and the glory of the mediatorial designation. Thus is our love to God enkindled by the manifestations of His love to us; our faith is strengthened by the recollection that it was "His own Son" who died for our sins; and we assure ourselves of the prevalence of the mediatorial intercession by the thought, that He who pleads for us is the dear and only begotten Son, who was loved by the Almighty Father with ineffable delight before the foundation of the world.

The most able Treatise on the Divine Sonship of our Lord in the English language is that written by Rev. R. Treffry, Jun. The reader should also peruse the chapter on this subject in Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xii.; and an Essay of great value by the same author, "Works," vol. vii. Fletcher also has written upon the subject with great force and beauty (see "Works," vol. vi., pp. 169-93); and Pearson "On the Creed" has a chapter full of convincing argument. Art., *His only Son*.

Recent controversies have arisen respecting the person and nature of Christ. Strauss, in 1835, in his "Leben Jesu," maintained that Jesus was not a true character. He acknowledges Him to have been a great religious genius; but that long after His death various myths or legends which had been circulated respecting Him and His actions were collected, and subsequently honestly accepted as real history. In 1864, he slightly modified some of his conclusions. In his "The Old and the New Faith" (1873) he abandoned Christianity. His views were refuted by Neander, Lange, Tholuck, Ebrard, Ullman, Julius Müller, and other German critics, as well as by rationalists, such as Baur, Schwegler, Keim, and others, and may now be said to be abandoned by all critics of reputation. Rénan, in his "Vie de Jésus," accepts the Gospels as historical, but that Jesus, though the Christ, was not a Divine person. He accepts the early origin of the Gospels, but strives to explain away all that is supernatural in the life, words, and acts of Jesus. "His book has all the

charm of a religious romance ; . . . but as a critical or scientific book it is of no value." He has been replied to by E. de Pressensé, in "Jesus Christ, His Times, Life, and Work," by Van Oosterzee, Henry B. Smith (of America), with various replies direct and incidental from numerous English authors.

The author of "Ecce Homo" undertook "to trace the biography of Christ from point to point, and accept those conclusions about Him which the facts, critically weighed, appeared to warrant." It was not easy to tell what precise views the author held, or intended to teach ; these were to be declared in a subsequent volume. The work is very able, but unsatisfactory. Among the criticisms and replies the most satisfactory, and certainly the ablest, are "Ecce Deus," by Dr. Joseph Parker ; and a series of letters in the *Sunday Magazine* for 1868, from the late Professor Henry Rogers. Without mentioning the various admirable Lives of Christ, which have recently issued from the press, the attention of the reader may be called to "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," by Dr. Chadwick ; "The Person of Christ ; The Perfection of His Humanity viewed as a Proof of His Divinity," by Dr. Schaff ; "The Jesus of the Evangelists," by the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. ; "The Sinless Character of Jesus," by Dr. C. Ullman ; "The Character of Jesus Christ," by Dr. Horace Bushnell, in his "Nature and Supernatural." "Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century," by Dr. John Cairns, particularly pp. 234-81 on Strauss, Rénan, and Mill. "The Person of Christ," by Dr. Pope ; "The Divinity of Christ ; Bampton Lectures," by Dr. Liddon ; "How is the Divinity of Jesus depicted in the Gospels and Epistles?" by Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, D.D

SECTION V.

THE PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.

1.—What is the teaching of the Church respecting the Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost ?

All who believe in the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Divine nature, believe that plurality to be a Trinity, and to consist of Father, Son, and Spirit. None, it is presumed, have believed in more, none in fewer. We now come to consider the personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost, in opposition, first, to Arianism, which teaches that as the Son is the first and greatest creature of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is the first and greatest creature of the Son, "a creature of the creature ;" and secondly, to Socinianism, which teaches that the Holy Spirit is only a Divine attribute, energy, or influence. This latter is the opinion of all modern Socinians, Unitarians, and Rationalists.

Adhering to the definition of a person as an "intelligent agent,"

"one who possesses personal properties," *i.e.*, such as indicate the possession of mind or intelligence,¹ we inquire—

II.—How can the personality of the Holy Ghost be proved from Scripture?

Let it be conceded that the terms "Spirit" and "Holy Spirit" do sometimes denote, not the person, but the operations, the gifts, the influences of the Holy Ghost, as when He is said to be "poured out," etc., the question arises, whether, besides these, there are not very numerous portions of Scripture which *do* positively and unanswerably establish His personality.

1. *The personal pronouns are repeatedly applied to Him*, though the noun translated *Spirit* is, in the original, in the neuter gender (John xiv. 16, 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, 14, 15). We cannot suppose this violation of grammatical propriety to have been merely accidental. It had a manifest design.

2. *Personal qualities are ascribed to Him*. Such as active intelligence (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11); volition (1 Cor. xii. 11; Acts xv. 28); personal capability of being resisted (Acts vii. 51), grieved (Isa. lxiii. 10; Eph. iv. 30), blasphemed against (Matt. xii. 31, 32), lied against (Acts v. 3, 4), and tempted (Acts v. 9).

3. *Personal acts are ascribed to Him*. He strives (Gen. vi. 3); He speaks (John xvi. 13; Acts x. 19, viii. 29); He guides (John xvi. 13); He intercedes (Rom. viii. 26); He works miracles (Rom. xv. 19); He sanctifies (1 Cor. vi. 11); He calls and sends forth messengers (Acts xiii. 2, 4); He distributes gifts (1 Cor. xii. 11); He seals (Eph. i. 13, iv. 30).

III.—How can the proper Deity of the Holy Ghost be proved from Scripture?

1. *Divine names are given Him*. (1) God (Acts v. 3, 4; 2 Tim. iii. 16, compared with 2 Peter i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 16). (2) Jehovah (Isa. vi. 5, 9, compared with Acts xxviii. 25; Exod. xvii. 7, compared with Heb. iii. 7-9; Jer. xxxi. 31-34, compared with Heb. x. 15-17).

2. *Divine perfections are ascribed to Him*: Omnipresence (Psalm cxxxix. 7-10; Rom. viii. 26, 27). Omniscience (Isa. xl. 13, 14, compared with Rom. xi. 34; 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11). Omnipotence (1 Cor. xii. 11; Rom. xv. 19). Eternity (Heb. ix. 14).

3. *Divine works are performed by Him*: Creation (Gen. i. 2; Job. xxvi. 13, xxxiii. 4). Providential renovation (Psalm civ. 30). Regeneration (John iii. 5, 6; Titus iii. 5). The resurrection of the dead (1 Peter iii. 18; Rom. viii. 11).

4. *Divine worship is paid to Him* (Isa. vi. 3-9, compared with Acts xxviii. 25; Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Matt. xxviii. 19).

IV.—How do we express the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son?

By the word "procession." The teaching of Scripture is, that

¹ See p. 10.

as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Holy Ghost is God by an eternal procession. The manner of the procession lies beyond the reach of all our ideas; but the fact is both expressly stated and clearly implied. First, it is expressly stated that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father (John xv. 26); and it is clearly implied that He proceedeth from the Father and the Son, in passages where He is called "the Spirit of the Father" and the "Spirit of Christ" (Matt. x. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 9).¹

V.—What, then, is the sum of Scripture teaching with regard to this momentous subject, the Trinity in Unity?

(1) The Divine Being is essentially One; but, in a manner by us altogether incomprehensible, existing in three Persons. (2) This personal distinction belongs, eternally and necessarily, to the one Godhead—to the very essence of Deity; the personality being as essential as the unity. (3) This distinction being proved from the Scriptures to exist in the Divine unity, all the texts in which the unity is affirmed must be interpreted in consistency with this doctrine; as meaning that God is One indeed, but that He is one according to the peculiar modification of unity which belongs to Deity; a unity differing from that which can be predicated of any of His creatures.² (4) While this distinction has, by a necessity of nature, subsisted in the unity of the Divine essence from eternity, there is an eternal and necessary relation of the three Divine persons to each other, the second Person of the Godhead being "the Son" of the Father by a Divine and eternal filiation; and the third Person related to the Father and the Son by the Divine and eternal procession. "These relations, we say, are proper and Divine. The Father, as God, begets; the Son, as God, is begotten; the Holy Ghost, as God, proceeds. And, as natural and Divine, so are these distinctions and relations eternal. The Father is an eternal Father; the Son an eternal Son; the Holy Spirit an eternal Spirit." The maintenance of personal and Divine distinctions is our protection from Sabellianism; that of proper and eternal relation preserves us from Tritheism; while the assertion of consubstantiality, joined with *relative order*, is our defence against Arianism."³

¹ Pearson "On the Creed," art. viii.; Osborn's "Fernley Lecture."

² Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

³ Treffry's "Eternal Sonship."

CHAPTER V.

CREATION OF THE WORLD.

I.—What is the relation to each other of the first two chapters of Genesis?

It is important that this question should be duly considered; because, in "Essays and Reviews," and in some other writers, there is an attempt to throw discredit on these chapters, by representing them as two different and contradictory accounts of creation, taken by the author from two different sources. We conceive that there is no ground whatever for the allegation. The aim of the first connected narrative is to exhibit God as the Creator of the universe, and to mark out the order in which the process of creation was conducted; and the picture is closed with the words, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth," etc. (chap. ii. 4).¹ The author then passes over from the perfected picture of created universe to that which must have been to him, as to all writers of history, the most worthy of note,—the history of man. The differences that exist are to be explained by the different objects the author had in view. In the first, his object was to give an outline of the history of the universe; in the second, to relate the origin and primitive history of man, so far as it was necessary, as a preparation for the history of the fall. In the former, therefore, all the steps of creation are treated in chronological order. In the latter, only so much is alluded to as is necessary for the author's purpose, and in the order which that purpose required.²

II.—What are the teachings of revelation and science as to the antiquity of the earth?

The discoveries of geology prove the globe to have existed at an indefinitely remote period before the creation of man; that is, long before the six days' work so definitely described in the Mosaic account. "If any point, not capable of mathematical demonstration in physical science, is proved, surely this truth is established."³ In

¹ Or rather the "picture is closed with" the 3rd verse, announcing the sabbatic rest, and the words of the 4th verse are the commencement of a new section.

² See "Aids to Faith," pp. 197, 198. See also the "Critical Commentary," note on Gen. ii. 1-3; Eliott's "Comm. Introd. to Gen.," pp. 4, 5.

³ Professor Hitchcock's "Religion of Geology." Pearson "On Infidelity," p. 227.

ignorance, however, of this fact, it was at one time supposed by some that the first verse of Genesis contained a summary account of the six days' work which followed in detail—that "the beginning" was the commencement of the first day, and of course only about six thousand years ago.¹ But no phrase could be more indefinite as to time than the phrase "in the beginning." It means "in former duration," "of old." Whenever it is used in the Bible, it merely designates the commencement of the series of events or the periods of time that are described. And all that it states in Gen. i. 1, is that the act of creation occurred at a certain point of time in past eternity, which is not chronologically fixed. It leaves an undefined interval between the creation of matter and the six days' work "during which it may have passed from chaos to order, and from order to chaos again, and each time it may have continued as long in its transition state. And after each reduction to order, it may have been occupied by as many descriptions of creatures as any speculator may be pleased to suppose."² With these agree the views of Dr. Chalmers: "The detailed history of creation in the first chapter of Genesis begins at the middle of the second verse; and what precedes may be understood as an introductory sentence, by which we are most appositely told, both that God created all things at the first, and that afterwards, by what interval of time it is not specified, the earth lapsed into a chaos, from the darkness and disorder of which the present system or economy of things was made to arise. Between the initial act and the details of Genesis, the world, for aught we know, might have been the theatre of many revolutions, the traces of which geology may still investigate."³

III.—What is the meaning, and what the Biblical usage of the word "to create"?

The Hebrew, *barā*, and Greek words thus rendered, are often applied to the formation of one substance out of another pre-existing, and not merely to signify the bringing of things out of nothing.

¹ Hebrew Bible Chronology, 589i; Septuagint (Hales'), 7298 (A.D. 1837).

² Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

³ Or rather the history of Creation is confined simply to the first two verses; the remainder of the chapter describes: 1. The change of the material of our globe from chaos; 2. The distribution of light upon and over our planet, or perhaps the solar system; 3. The formation of the earth as an abode for sentient life; 4. The creation of living creatures; 5. The creation of man. The apparent conflict of this chapter with geology has arisen from the mistake of supposing it to be a narrative of Creation, when all but the first two verses is an account of the adaptation of the created material of the earth as an abode for man. The attempt at the reconciliation of geology with this first chapter of Genesis, is an attempt to reconcile two things which were never at conflict.

Dr. Payne Smith says,—“The creative document is a grand and glorious introduction to the rest of Holy Scripture, but it was never intended to teach geology or astronomy; rightly understood it does not contradict those sciences, but its real object was to set forth two main truths—the first that all the laws and workings of Nature are the workings of God; the second, that of all this working, man is the final cause.”

Professor Asa Gray says:—“The fundamental note is, the declaration of one God Maker of all things visible and invisible—a declaration which if science is unable to establish it is equally unable to overthrow.”

But we believe that these three propositions could easily and thoroughly be established on good evidence, viz.:—(1) "The proper and primary sense of the word is that of the Divine act of absolute creation out of nothing, and only its secondary and transitive meaning is that of fashioning or re-modelling from elements already in existence,—this peculiarity distinguishing the word from others, whose just and proper meaning is, to model or make, and with which it is sometimes associated or apparently interchanged."¹

(2) Apart from any consideration derived from the primary meaning of the word itself, the true and proper exegesis of the opening statement of Genesis requires them to be understood in the sense of absolute creation; for, in the words of John Howe, as the work there described was wrought *in the beginning, i.e.*, when things took their beginning, had their first rise, it must suppose that "heaven and earth" were not only then brought into order, but *that* of which they were made was made of itself to exist, not having existed before. Otherwise, how was that the "beginning" of things? (3) The same doctrine is to be undoubtedly drawn from a right interpretation of other passages of Scripture. In Rom. iv. 17, God is said to have "called those things which be not as though they were." Now, as "to be called" in Scripture is *to be* (1 John iii. 1); so "to call" is *to make or cause to be* (Jer. xxxii. 23; in the original "thou hast called this evil;") He, therefore, "callesth those things which be not as if they were," who maketh those things which were not to be, and produceth that which hath a being out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing.² In Heb. xi. 3, we read, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God." It cannot be justly questioned that the Divine declaration, by faith in which we attain to this conviction, is that contained in Gen. i. 1; here, therefore, we have the Apostolic exposition of that declaration—"The worlds were framed by the word of God"—by the commanding word (Psalm xxxiii. 6; cxlviii. 5.) And still further to evolve and expound the idea of absolute origination, it is added, "So that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear;" or, which amounts to the same. "Things visible were made from things not visible;" *i.e.*, not from anything pre-existing;³ they were strictly originated by the creative fiat. Had the Apostle meant merely that the visible creation was formed from a pre-existing, invisible matter, he surely would not have made it a doctrine of faith; this is rather a doctrine of sense in antagonism to faith, and as such it has been always acceptable to a sensuous philosophy.⁴ We, therefore, conclude, with much certainty, that the material

¹ *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, vol. v., art. "Baden Powell's Essays."

² Pearson, "On the Creed," art i.

³ The learned John Howe puts the matter thus: "Things which are seen, *i.e.*, which are, were not made of things which do appear, *i.e.*, things before existing; for there is nothing at all that can be supposed to exist, but doth appear to some faculty or other, Divine or created. But they were things simply not appearing at all, and therefore not existing at all, out of which these worlds were made."

⁴ Harris's "Pre-Adamite Earth."

universe was created out of nothing; and that God intended, in Gen. i. 1, to declare the great truth that there was a time in past eternity when it came into existence at His irresistible fiat; a truth eminently proper to stand at the head of a Divine revelation.

IV.—What errors have been propagated in the world in direct opposition to this view of creation?

Epicurus, Plato, Aristotle, and nearly all the philosophers of antiquity taught that matter was self-existent and eternal. The grand argument by which this opinion was sustained is the well-known *ex nihilo nihil fit*—nothing produces nothing. While, therefore, they recognised God as the Author of the harmonious system that now exists, they believed that the matter was from eternity. In modern times, the deniers of the doctrine of absolute creation out of nothing have been either Pantheists or Atheists. *The Pantheists* (see p. 4) teach that God and the universe are one—that all visible objects are but fleeting modifications of a self-existent, unconscious, impersonal essence, which they call God, or Nature, or the All. There is no personal God; and, therefore, creation, miracle—any disturbance of the laws and methods of nature—is impossible and absurd. *The Atheists* have differed among themselves (see pp. 6, 7). (1) Some maintain that the present system of the universe has continued just as it now is, in unbroken succession, from eternity. (2) Some resort to the atomic theory of the ancients; viz., that the only self-existent principle of all things was an infinite number of atoms, which from eternity moved together in obedience to certain necessary forces, and, in their fortuitous concurrence, constitute everything that exists around and within us. (3) Others hold to an endless development of all things. According to this development theory—or, as it is sometimes called, “this law of continuity”—species was not created, it is developed. “Those distinctions which we call by the name of ‘species’ are not immutable forms stamped upon the subjects so distinguished at the first, and reproducing themselves from age to age. They are all the results of gradual change, of progressive advancement throughout incalculable ages of past duration, from the merest rudimental germ or germs up to the beautiful and noble forms which we now behold. And even this is but a lower stage from which everything is now advancing to yet higher and nobler forms of existence throughout interminable ages of future duration.”¹ But this doctrine of development has received its most perfect scientific exposition in the “Nebular Hypothesis” of La Place, a celebrated French philosopher. He taught that the earth and the system to which it belongs had arisen from the gradual condensation of a diffused vaporous nebula; “and he supposed that the numerous patches of thin faint light scattered over the heavens might be stars in process of formation. Suppose rotatory motion established in the thin luminous matter,

¹ *Sunday Magazine*, vol. iii., pp. 170, 171; Godwin's “Lectures on Atheism,” p. 267.

gravity meanwhile drawing its ethereal particles together, and a sun of somewhat solid material might at length be formed. As it revolved rapidly, rays of light might be flung off from it at various distances, which might ultimately settle into planets, and these again might fling off similar rings, from which satellites might be evolved."¹ Such was this philosopher's way of explaining how the world might have come into existence without the intervention of Divine power. "But that the universe existed at first in a gaseous, diffused, nebulous state, is only an hypothesis. And the fact that the space-penetrating power of Lord Rosse's telescope has resolved many of the supposed *nebulæ* into starry systems, requires us to keep the hypothesis still at a wide distance from the realities of science."²

It is here that the word of God steps in to rebuke the folly of human speculation, and tells us, in its very first sentence, "that *matter*, elementary or combined, aggregated only or organised, and *dependent*, *sentient*, and *intellectual beings*, have not existed from eternity, either in self-continuity or succession, but had a beginning; that their beginning took place by the all-powerful will of one Being, —the self-existent, independent, and infinite in all perfection; and that the date of that beginning is not made known."

V.—What is the modern theory of evolution?

1. Evolution pure and simple is thus described by Tyndall: "Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalcular and animal life, not alone the nobler forms of the horse and the lion, not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, will, and all their phenomena, were once latent in a fiery cloud. Surely the mere statement of such a notion is more than a refutation. But the hypothesis must go further than this. Many who hold it would probably assent to the position that at this moment all our philosophy, all our science, and all our art—Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, Raphael—are potential in the fires of the sun. . . . I do not think any holder of the evolution hypothesis could say that I overstate it, or overstrain it in any way. I merely strip it of all its vagueness and bring before you unclothed and unvarnished the notions by which it must stand or fall."⁴

This extreme view is, of course, decidedly Atheistic. Haeckel, who holds it, believes in the eternity of matter, denies intelligence and design in nature, holds that life is from spontaneous generation. He is supported by Büchner, who insists that matter and force alone exist. Carl Voght, and a few others, hold these atheistic views. Tyndall goes very far in this direction when he says, "By an intellectual necessity I cross the boundary of the experimental evidence and discern in that matter which we in our ignorance of its

¹ *Sunday Magazine*, vol. iii., p. 380.

² Dr. Harris's "Pre-Adamite Earth," Brewster's "More Worlds than One."

³ Dr. Pye Smith.

⁴ "The Scientific Use of the Imagination," p. 47.

latent powers, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of all terrestrial life."¹ But he has since greatly qualified his "intellectual" faith, has by his experiments discredited "spontaneous generation,"² and disavowed scientific Atheism.

2. Evolution is associated with the name of Darwin—one form of it is often named Darwinism—who, in his "Origin of Species" (1860), and his "Descent of Man" (1872), published views which excited great interest and provoked no little opposition. Darwin's theory³ does not concern the origin of the physical universe—*i.e.*, the creation of matter—so much as the origin of life. He distinctly recognises the creation of matter and of life. "There is," he says, "a grandeur in this view of life with its several powers having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that while this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravitation, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved."⁴

3. It is difficult to define the exact position of Herbert Spencer⁵ (and his able American disciple Fiske), Huxley, Tyndall, and their school. They are not materialists, nor "scientific Atheists" (to use Tyndall's words). Their Agnosticism does not lead them to believe in the eternity of matter—in the sense of self-production or evolution;—they incline to the theory of spontaneous generation, but acknowledge that it is non-proven.

VI.—Can the theory of evolution be maintained as a scientific fact?

Evolution, instead of creation, is absolutely discredited all along the line. Huxley expects that if he could look back sufficiently far into the distant past, "he should witness the evolution of living protoplasm from not living matter."⁶ But he acknowledges that "as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural."⁷ Virchow says of "spontaneous generation . . . we do not possess any actual proof; . . . and whosoever supposes it has occurred is contradicted by the naturalist, and not merely by the theologian." Tyndall acknowledges that "men of science would frankly admit their inability to produce any satisfactory evidential proof that life can be developed save from demonstrable antecedent life."⁸ Darwin declares the production of organic beings from inorganic matter to be "a result absolutely inconceivable."⁹ Huxley imagined

¹ Belfast Address.

² *Nineteenth Century*, January and March 1878.

³ Huxley, in 1869, gave the name of "Evolution" to Darwin's theories.

⁴ Spencer's definition is, "Evolution is an integration of matter, and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." I hope the reader understands this, for I do not.

⁵ Darwin's "Origin of Species."

⁶ "Lay Sermons," p. 226.

⁷ "Critiques and Addresses," p. 239.

⁸ Belfast Address, p. 56.

he had found the physical basis of life—the bridge which was to span the chasm between the living and the not-living—in the slime or ooze dredged up from the floor of the ocean by the *Porcupine* and the *Challenger*; in his joy he baptized it *Bathylbius Hackelia*, but the microscope showed this to be a material which, when dissolved, crystallised as gypsum. Tyndall, by his careful and brilliant experiments, clearly proved, and honestly admitted, that spontaneous generation was not a fact.¹ Darwin admits that geology gives no evidence in favour of evolution, but thinks this may arise from “the extreme imperfection of the geological record.”² He acknowledges that “breaks in the organic chain are incessantly occurring.” “There is scarcely a single point on which facts cannot be adduced opposite to those to which I have arrived.”³ Tyndall confesses, “Those who hold the doctrine of evolution are by no means ignorant of the uncertainty of their data, and they yield no more to it than a provisional assent.” The result to which we are brought, therefore, is, that in the present state of scientific knowledge the doctrine of evolution is absolutely unproven; and its advocates can only claim for it the position of an hypothesis, while materialistic (or atheist) evolution is disproved. “The chasm between the living and the not-living the present state of knowledge cannot bridge.”⁴

VII.—But are there not many who hold that evolution as a mode of Divine action is consistent with Scripture?

There is a large, and undoubtedly increasing school of theologians as well as naturalists, who hold to the Scripture doctrine of both inorganic and organic creation, but who believe that evolution may be, and probably is, a mode of creation. Without denying the facts which have been collected with so much care by Darwin, Wallace, and others, they nevertheless contend that the facts fail to furnish evidence of the transmutation of species, and especially of the evolution of man from any lower animal. Wallace, the co-discoverer of evolution with Darwin, insists that evolution cannot account for man. He also believes in the development of species, from a number of original creations, from which variations have occurred through “natural selection.”⁵ Indeed, Darwin himself never claimed to have done more than furnish a working hypothesis. He says, “It seemed worth while to try how far the principle of evolution would throw light upon some of the more complex problems in the natural history of man.”⁶ “I am aware that much remains doubtful, but I have endeavoured to give a fair view of the whole case.”⁷ Professor Henslow, an evolutionist, says, “I wish to state distinctly that I do not at present see any evidence for believing in a gradual development of Man from the lower animals, by ordinary natural

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, January and March 1878.

² “Descent of Man,”

vol. ii., p. 387.

³ “Origin of Species.”

⁴ Huxley in “Ency. Brit.,” 9th ed., art. “Biology.”

⁵ “On Natural Selection,” p. 303, etc.; see also Mivart’s “Genesis of Species,”

pp. 319-25.

⁶ “Descent of Man,” vol. ii., p. 385.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 396.

laws ; that is, without some special interference, or, if it be preferred, some exceptional conditions which have thereby separated him from all other creatures, decidedly in advance of them all." ¹ Mivart, also an evolutionist, but not a Darwinian, holds that evolution as a mode of Divine action, is consistent with Scripture ; and that it proves man to have been a distinct creation, since evolution is incompetent to account for his origin and existence. ² Dr. Pope makes this remark, "The scriptural account of the secondary creation, or formation of all things, combines creation and providence : there are the creative epochs, in the intervals of which providence works ceaselessly by the development of types. Natural selection, heredity and the survival of the best types are terms which are all but used in the Scriptures ; the middle one is used. Under the seventh secular day of Moses we now live : there is no longer creative intervention ; but the Creator still works in a regular development which pervades the original types (John v. 17)." ³ Fiske says, "The world is inexplicable without the omnipresent existence (ignored by Positivism), whereof the phenomenal world is the multifiform manifestation." ⁴ Dr. Asa Gray thus defines the position of the Theistic evolutionist :—"In the world of law you cannot expect us to adopt your assumption of special creations by miraculous intervention with the cause of nature, not once for all at a beginning, but over and over in time. We will accept intervention only when and where you can convincingly establish it, and where we are unable to explain it away, as in the case of the absolute beginning."

VIII.—Is it not objected that the period at which man is stated by Scripture to have first appeared on earth, is shown by science to be far too brief?

A good deal has been written by scientists in this direction. The most extravagant demands have been made as to the antiquity of man ; but such speculations need not detain us.

Science has shown that "the beginning" of our world is immensely remote ; and with this Scripture agrees (see Gen. xlix. 26 ; Job xxxviii. 4 ; Prov. viii. 22-31 ; Hab. iii. 6 ; John i. 1-3).

Science testifies to the advent of our race being sudden, and up to the present time there is absolutely no evidence that man has been evolved from any other animal, and here Scripture and science are in agreement. Science shows the appearance of man on the earth to be comparatively recent, more recent indeed than other forms of life. Even granting the general soundness of the circumstances under which human remains have been found—although we do this only for argument's sake—yet no facts have been proved which would demand more than from 6,000 to 8,000 years. ⁵ Now

¹ "The Theory of Evolution of Living Things, and the Application of the Principles of Evolution to Religion," p. 107.

² "The Genesis of Species," by St. George Mivart, F.R.S.

³ "A Higher Catechism of Theology," pp. 111, 112.

⁴ "Cosmic Philosophy,"—Preface. Fiske is a Spencernian.

⁵ See Dawson's "Earth and Man," pp. 291-98 ; Thompson's "Man in Genesis and

Scripture, according to the Hebrew chronology of the Bible, makes man's age on earth 5,891, while the Septuagint makes it 7,313.

"Geology as a science is at present in a peculiar and somewhat exceptional state. Under the influence of a few men of commanding genius belonging to the generation now passing away, it has made so gigantic conquests that its armies have broken up into bands of specialists, little better than scientific banditti, liable to be beaten in detail, and prone to commit outrages on common sense and good taste, which bring this otherwise good cause into disrepute.¹ Scripture gives us no definite information concerning the date of man's creation.² Our common chronology gives 4,004 years from man's creation to the birth of Christ; but it must be remembered that the larger chronology of the Septuagint and Josephus makes the period 5,572. Scripture, however, has not any regular chronology until after the time of Abraham. Before that period "the narrative given in the Book of Genesis may be a condensed epitome of foregoing history, not a consecutive line of historical events year by year, and generation by generation; but a condensed epitome of what had occurred in the world from the beginning of time; for if you will scrutinise it carefully, you will see that the names of individuals are put for tribes, dynasties, and nations, and that it is no part of the object of the historian to give the consecutive course of the world at large."³ Sir J. W. Dawson says, one of the first and most important facts with reference to the appearance of man is, that he is a very recent animal, dating no further back in geological time than the Post-glacial period, at the close of the Tertiary and the beginning of the Modern era in geology. Further, inasmuch as the oldest known remains of man occur along with those of animals which still exist, and the majority of which are not of older date, there is but slender probability that any much older human remains will ever be found.⁴

IX.—Is it not contended by many scientists that man was originally a savage, and that therefore the scriptural account of his creation must be a myth?

The evolutionists pure and simple hold this; but as they have failed to prove their position, this theory fails with it.⁵ But science, so far as it is able to speak on this subject, discredits the theory. Geology testifies by its fossil human remains, that man's bodily structure—and especially his brain—was not inferior to the race at

Geology," 85-110; "Age and Origin of Man Geologically considered in Present Day Tracts," vol. iii. See also as to the unsatisfactory state of geological science, Dawson's "Earth and Man," p. 312. See "Studies in Life," Lectures by Dr. H. Sinclair Patterson, M.D., p. 94, etc.

¹ Dawson's "Earth and Man," pp. 312-315.

² Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. i., pp. 70-87.

³ "Man in Genesis and Geology," by Joseph P. Thompson, D.D., LL.D., p. 104; Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. i., pp. 147-58.

⁴ Dawson's "Earth and Man," pp. 356, 376, etc.

⁵ See Dawson's "Earth and Man," pp. 377, 381-383; Henslow's "Theory of Evolution of Living Things," pp. 120-23.

the present day.¹ The cave dwellings, tools and weapons, needles and textile materials, carvings and drawings of animals, such as horses, reindeer, and even a mammoth, executed with great skill upon bones, reindeer horns, and mammoth tusks, show a state of civilisation and development far removing the earlier races from savagism, and give no evidence of "utter barbarians."² Huxley declares the break between man and the lower animals to be "an enormous gulph," "a divergence immeasurable," and "practically infinite." Max Müller says, "Man alone employs language, he alone comprehends himself, he alone has the power of abstraction,—alone possesses general ideas. He alone believes in God."³ The history of the remote past also falsifies the theory of man's savage origin.

The reader is referred for evidence of this to the Duke of Argyll's "Primeval Man;" Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. i., pp. 163-70, and the authorities quoted in that work. Thompson's "Man in Genesis and Geology," pp. 95-110; Dawson's "The Chain of Life in Geologic Time," pp. 233-270; Reynolds' "The Supernatural in Nature," pp. 302-308, and other works on this subject.

X.—What are the teachings of revelation and science as to the state of our globe immediately prior to the Adamic creation?

Revelation declares that "the earth was waste and void," etc. (Gen. i. 2, Rev. Ver.). The meaning is that it was waste and desolate, covered with water, surrounded with darkness, and utterly devoid of inhabitants and life. And "science proves that, before man appeared, the earth must have been waste and desolate; all previous forms of life destroyed and entombed; and though its strata might be completed, its whole surface was covered with mighty inundations, and its atmosphere loaded with the vapour from the seas and oceans, which such a vast volcanic eruption could not fail to send up in immense and enormous volumes, wrapping the whole surface of the planet, perhaps for years or centuries, in thick impenetrable darkness." But how this state of desolation and emptiness arose, whether it became so in consequence of some mighty catastrophe, or simply in obedience to God's omnific word, science cannot tell, nor has Moses declared.

XI.—How are we to understand the word "day" in the creative narrative?

It was long since suggested that the day thus mentioned might mean an indefinite period. And this notion has been eagerly seized by Hugh Miller and others, from a desire to show the accordance of the words of Moses with the main outlines of geological discovery; but such a meaning is regarded by many as forced and unnatural, and "cannot be brought into harmony with the plain and definite terms of

¹ See Professor Owen's reply to Dr. Grant Allen in *Longman's Mag.*, No. 1; also "The Age and Origin of Man," "Present Day Tracts," vol. iii., pp. 34-41; Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. i., pp. 159, 160.

² See Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. i., p. 642.

³ "Chips from a German Workshop," vol. iv., p. 458.

⁴ Birks's "Bible and Modern Thought," p. 317; Dawson's "Earth and Man,

the narrative. 'It was evening and it was morning, the first day,' or, 'evening came and morning came, one day,' are terms which can never be made to comport with the theory of indefinite periods; and especially when there follows God's resting from His works, and hallowing the seventh day as a day of sabbatical commemorative celebration of the work of the other six. Was that, too, an indefinite period?"

Chalmers, Buckland, Sedgwick, Hitchcock, Dr. Kurtz, and Archdeacon Pratt, in his able pamphlet on "Scripture and Science," and many other writers of eminence, adhere to the view, that the days of Genesis are literal days; that the ages of geology are passed over silently in the second verse, and that the passage describes a great work of God at the close of the "Tertiary Period," by which our planet, after long ages, was finally prepared to be the habitation of man. On the supposition that geological discoveries necessitate the admission of a more remote origin and a longer existence to our globe than a few thousands of years, the true explanation lies in the first verses of Genesis, as explained before. (See Quest. II., pp. 123, 124.)

But the first "day" of the series (ver. 5) could not have been a natural or astronomical day is evident, for neither sun nor moon at that time had appeared; either they were not created, or were not appointed for the functions they were to perform for our globe. Nor is the last—the seventh—day astronomical, although the sun had then been appointed for "days." What ground, then, have we for believing that the intermediate days were astronomical? There is a sense in which they may have been God's days—days of indefinite length, just as now the seventh day is. "Generic days which are not measurable by any historical or scientific standard."

The word translated *day* is not confined in Scripture to the period of the earth's revolution round the sun: it is frequently used to designate periods of indefinite time, *e.g.*, Gen. ii. 4, "In the *day* when God made the earth and the heavens;" ver. 17, "In the *day* that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (see also Heb. iii. 15; John viii. 56; Micah iv. 6, v. 10; Isa. xii. 1, etc.; Rev. xviii. 8), in these instances a period, long or short, is meant; Deut. ix. 1, "Thou art to pass over Jordan *this day*," *i.e.*, within a short time; 2 Peter iii. 8, "*One day* is with the Lord as a thousand years," etc. (see also Psalm xc. 4; Job x. 5;) *Day of Mercy*, Luke xix. 42; *Day of Vengeance*, Isa. lxi. 2, lxiii. 4; *Day of Death*, Gen. ii. 17; *Day of Judgment*, Matt. vii. 22, xxiv. 36; *Day of Rest*, Heb. iv. 4-9.¹

¹ Eichhorn, Bauer, and others have contended that the Mosaic account of creation is "a philosophic myth, wherein a cultivated Israelite gives us the fruit of his reflections as to the origin of things, clothed in the form of history." Some of the Fathers, Theophilus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Augustine, Basil, and the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, regarded the account as allegorical, and gave to it various fanciful meanings. Kurtz and others regarded the chapter as a series of visions, or pictures, revealed to Moses. None of these ideas are satisfactory. The historical interpretation is the only defensible one; but since no history of the Creator's acts could be so constructed as to give mankind a scientifically accurate and detailed narrative of the Divine proceedings, so, from the very nature of the case, the narrative must be more or less pictorial.

If it be objected that this interpretation has been forced upon theologians by the discoveries of science, the answer is, that no doubt this is partly true, and is so far a recognition of the aid of science in the true interpretation of Scripture. But the fact is, that before the birth of modern science this doctrine of the creative days was both held and taught by the old Jewish Rabbins, by Irenæus, Theophilus, and Origen. Augustine, in the sixth century, taught that the days of Gen. i. were periods of indefinite length (*per temporum moras*), describing them as alternate births and pauses in the vast unfolding of the world. This interpretation has been advocated by numerous divines from Augustine to the present.¹ In this, as in many other cases, theology has been in advance of science.

But the truth after all is, that the description of the creative work is not intended to be scientific. "Science tells us nothing whatever as to the origin of things."² There is no attempt to give a geologic or palæontologic history of our globe in the long ages past; and there can, therefore, be no conflict between Genesis and geology. Professor Jevons points out that natural phenomena cannot be brought under mathematical laws; that the more "new and unexplained facts are explained, the more there is to explain;" that there is no "less opening for new discoveries than there was three centuries ago." "We have but to open a scientific book, and read a page or two, and we shall in all probability come to some recorded phenomena of which no precise explanation can yet be given."³

XII.—What are the subjects in the history of the six days' work which Infidelity derides and scouts?

1. *It is objected that the production of light on the first day is contradictory to the creation of the sun and moon upon the fourth day.* This has been the subject of sceptical derision from the days of Celsus to the present time; but the discoveries with regard to heat, combustion, electricity, luminous ether, stellar light, etc., show that there may be, and is, light independently of the sun.⁴ The progress of science has, therefore, neutralised the objection that

¹ See *Contemporary Review*, Article by Mivart, January 1872. ² Tyndall. ³ "Principles of Science," vol. ii., pp. 450, 451. Dr. Pope remarks, "A literal history was impossible; what we have is the Divine symbolical teaching of certain great lessons." The teaching is—1, "that all things were created by one God; 2, that they were created according to laws, the evolution of which proceeded from lower to higher; 3, that the whole was ordered in creative epochs ceasing with the creation of man. These epochs are connected with a seven days' reckoning by the will of the Creator; each day representing to us a period of undefined extent. The Sabbath of this rest from creative activity is now running on; and is weekly commemorated. The Divine history is a hymn of creation simply above and beyond scientific criticism. Two things are indubitably true: first, that it teaches an evolution proceeding within the limits of kind even to the seventh age, while creative interventions have ceased; and, secondly, that it represents man as the end of all, which science also does without avoiding it." Pope's "Higher Catechism of Theology," p. 98. ⁴ "Moses speaking of light as existing without the sun, anticipated on a large scale what Professor Tyndall beautifully performs on a small scale—the extraction of light from total darkness."—Reynolds' in regard to Creation, "The Supernatural in Nature," p. 128.

light could not exist before the sun. Indeed, it has done more; it has proved the accuracy of the Mosaic language. Moses does not call the sun "*Or*, light," but "*Maor*, a light-bearer, a place or instrument of light"—a luminary or candlestick—just what modern science has discovered it to be. Now, in the beginning God created light, and diffused a great portion of it through the various substances of the earth. This was done on the first day; but on the fourth day light was concentrated round the sun's body, in order that henceforth the sun might become the means of illuminating and fructifying the worlds revolving around him, and that he, with other heavenly bodies, might be "for signs and for seasons and for days and for years." This is what Moses teaches; and hence, so far is the Mosaic doctrine of light from being inconsistent with science, that if Moses had wished to embody its latest discoveries in popular scientific language he could not have expressed himself more happily.¹

2. *It is objected that the Bible declares the earth to be immovable.* This strange objection to Scripture cosmogony is revived in the volume of "Essays and Reviews," p. 208, the proofs being taken, however, not from Moses, but from such passages as Psalm xciii. 1 and Psalm civ. 5. According to the mode of interpretation on which this objection is based, it might be proved that the Hebrews held that a pious man was an immovable fixture (see Prov. x. 30). But the objection rests on simple ignorance of the Hebrew word translated "moved." This word *not* signifies, as Gesenius says, "to waver, to shake, to totter," and, therefore, it is applied to the feet of one in motion in Psalm xvii. 5 (see margin). Can anyone be so silly as to suppose that David prayed that his feet might be immovably fixed? The petition is that his feet might not "totter," that he might not stumble. So the meaning of the above passages is, that "the world is established, that it cannot totter;" not even in that velocity of motion with which it compasses the sun. A totter, a slip, would be of dreadful consequence to its inhabitants; but the Lord has so arranged and steadied its motions, that no *totter* is possible.²

3. *It is objected that the Mosaic account of the "firmament" represents it to be a permanent solid vault.* This was urged by Voltaire, and in recent times has been triumphantly repeated to show the supposed ignorance and gross conceptions of the Hebrew people. The objection is based on Gen. i. 6, 7; Job xxvi. 11; 2 Sam. xxii. 8; Psalm lxxviii. 23; Gen. vii. 11; and if well founded would be conclusive proof of the opposition between astronomical science and the Mosaic cosmogony. But, happily, it is the weakest of all the objections, and the most easily refuted by Scripture statement. The Hebrew word *Rakia* does not signify *vault*; it is the most general word that language could supply to signify the vast bound-

¹ Professor A. McCaul, in "Aids to Faith," p. 211; Dr. W. Cooke's "Explanation of Scripture Difficulties," p. 16; Garbett's "God's Word Written," p. 198; Cotterill's "Does Science Aid Faith in regard to Creation?" pp. 30, 31.
 Professor McCaul, in "Aids to Faith," p. 219.

lessness of the heavens. It is precisely equivalent to our word "expanse," which it would be rare folly to imagine a solid and crystalline sphere. "But it is said the Hebrews believed that heaven had pillars and foundations, and that there were windows and doors in heaven, on the opening of which the rain descended. With equal reason might these wise interpreters say that the Hebrews believed that there were bottles in heaven (Job xxxviii. 37); or that the waters are bound up in a garment (Prov. xxx. 4); or that the ocean has bars and doors (Job xxxviii. 10); or that the shadow of death and the womb have doors (Job xxxviii. 17, iii. 10). If these are figurative, as common sense would teach, so are the windows and doors of heaven. And there is evidence enough that the Hebrews knew very well that rain did not come from the celestial ocean, through windows and doors, nor yet from bottles in the heavens; but from the clouds (Job xxxvi. 27, 28; Gen. ix. 11-17; Judges v. 4; 1 Kings xviii. 45; Prov. iii. 20.)¹

4. *It is objected that the different races of men could not have had a common origin, and therefore the account of the formation of but one pair of human beings is not credible.* It was said by Voltaire, and often repeated, that "none but blind men can doubt that the whites, negroes, Albinos, Hottentots, Laplanders, Chinese, and Americans are entirely distinct races." At the same time many of our profoundest philosophers, both among the believers and unbelievers in revelation, have strenuously maintained that there is nothing in the varieties of colour, stature, physiognomy, or conformation of men, to prove that they did not descend from the same stock. In a very elaborate article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" on *Complexion*, it is proved, that the different colours in different inhabitants of the globe are caused by those various qualities of things, which, combined with the influence of the sun, contribute to form what we call *climate*. The reader is referred to a lecture of Rev. W. Brock, D.D., in which he argues "the Common Origin of the Human Race" from the affinity between the languages of mankind, the resemblances, in their physical organisation, the equality of their intellectual capacities, the identity of their great traditions, and the sameness in their spiritual condition.² In these various arguments we have a summary of the proof, which has never been successfully met, that all men have descended from the same first parents; or, in the words of Scripture, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth."

XIII.—What principles ought to be borne in mind in comparing the teachings of science with the records of inspiration?

1. That the book of nature and the book of revelation have the same Divine Author; and, when rightly interpreted, both declare

¹ Professor McCaul, in "Aids to Faith," pp. 220-30; Birks's "Bible and Modern Thought," pp. 314-16.

² "Lectures to Young Men, delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association, in Exeter Hall, from Nov., 1848, to Feb., 1849."

the glory of God, and show forth His handiwork. There may be apparent discrepancies between them, but there can be no real contradictions; and in proportion as scientific research is prosecuted in the right spirit, and true principles of interpretation are applied to the scriptural page, will the harmony be manifested.

2. That the sacred writers speak of natural objects according to the popular mode of comprehending them. Their idioms were the idioms of their time and country. "And to infer that Scripture teaches the immobility of the earth because it speaks of sunrise or sunset, or because Joshua said, 'Sun, stand thou still,' is just as fair as to attribute the same error to the compilers of almanacs and astronomical tables, or to scientific men in their common *parlance*. If Copernicus himself had been in a similar position with that of Joshua, he would have used just the same language; and he who would try to substitute a more exact phraseology would be regarded as more of a pedant than a philosopher."

3. That the mere speculations of men, whether in the regions of science or of criticism, however learned and laborious they may be, should be received with great caution. The history of the last hundred years tells of theory after theory, propounded with the utmost confidence—first applauded, then controverted, then utterly rejected. Mere scientific hypothesis is not scientific fact, and has no authority; neither are the transcendental guesses of the human understanding or imagination entitled to be heard in judgment against the teachings of Scripture. We should allow ourselves to be influenced only by those settled results which, after severe testing, have been unanimously accepted by the competent, the sober, and the judicious.

4. That we should for ever stifle all jealousy, and silence all outcry against the steady march of physical and mental science. 'No progress which science can make will ever unsettle one stone in the solid foundation on which we rest our faith in the Divinity of those oracles. Scientific investigation, carried out to the uttermost, can no more succeed in sapping, than the storms and floods of persecution have ever succeeded in shaking, the foundations of the temple of Christian truth. They shall never be moved. All will but contribute to settle and secure them.'" "Let but the investigation be sufficient, and the induction honest; let observation take its farthest flight; let experiment penetrate into all the recesses of nature; let the veil of ages be lifted up from all that has been hitherto unknown, if such a course were possible, religion need not fear; Christianity is secure, and true science will always pay homage to the Divine Creator and Sovereign, 'of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things;' and unto whom be glory for ever."

5. We have previously said, "that the attempt to reconcile geology with the first chapter of Genesis, is an attempt to reconcile two things which were never in conflict." We may make the same

* Dr. Wardlaw.

* Dr. J. Pye Smith.

* See p. 124, note.

remark as to science in general. It is an obvious truth that the Scriptures were never intended to be scientific. They were to be for all ages and for all peoples; and what may be called a scientific history of the origin of things—if it had been possible to be given—could never have been understood by the earlier races of mankind, nor even by the present generation. The marvel is, how Moses was able to give so wonderful and so scientific a conception of the origin of our world; a record which has not only never been proved to be erroneous, but which, as science has advanced, has been shown more and more to be accurate. Even Haeckel, with his extreme materialistic evolution, was so struck with this that he wrote thus:—

"The Mosaic history of Creation has enjoyed, down to the present day, general recognition in the whole Jewish and Christian world of civilisation. Its extraordinary success is explained, not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and it contrasts favourably with the confused mythology of Creation current among most of the other nations. First, God creates the earth as an inorganic body; then He separates light from darkness, then water from dry land. Now the earth has become habitable for organisms, and plants are first created, animals later; among the latter the inhabitants of the water and the air first, afterwards the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally, God creates man, the last of organisms, in His own image, and as the ruler of the earth.

"Two great fundamental ideas, common also to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in this hypothesis of Creation with surprising clearness—the idea of separation or *differentiation*, and the idea of progressive development or *perfecting*. Although Moses looks upon the results of the great laws of organic development . . . as the direct actions of a constructing Creator, yet in his theory there lies hidden the ruling idea of a progressive development and a differentiation of the originally simple matter. We can therefore bestow our just admiration on the Jewish lawgiver's grand insight into nature, and his simple and natural hypothesis of Creation without discovering in it a so-called *Divine revelation*."¹ This is certainly a remarkable testimony to the astonishing scientific knowledge—or at least his "grand insight into matter"—of Moses. But is this an adequate explanation of the fact that he was so many ages in advance of the knowledge of his time? How was it that he alone of all the men of his age—he belonging to a nation only just emerging from slavery—was so surprisingly in advance of such nations as Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria? Is there any other satisfactory answer than that which Judaism and Christianity have consistently given—viz., that Moses wrote by Divine inspiration?

"There is one other remark (only) which we have space to make, *i.e.*, that it is a mistake to suppose that the two books of Divine

¹ Haeckel's "History of Creation," vol. i., p. 38.

revelation—the natural and the *supra*-natural—must always appear to agree. That they do and will agree is certain; but to expect that this will always be obvious to us is an error. Each of these revelations occupies a different plane; each has to be viewed and interpreted from different view-points; each is answerable to its own laws. Mathematics and the laws of physics are applicable to nature, but are *inapplicable* to the *supra*-natural, as would be the attempt to measure the tones of a piano with a two-foot rule. We accept readily and gratefully all the light which science has thrown and can throw upon the origin of the Universe, the existence of life, the nature of man, and the great cosmical laws; but true science itself acknowledges, that of the origin of things it can know nothing. For that knowledge we are dependent upon God alone. This He has given us in His word; “the fundamental note of [which] is, the declaration of one God, Maker of all things visible and invisible—a declaration which, if science is unable to establish, it is equally unable to overthrow.”¹

¹ Professor Asa Gray. A remarkable discussion has taken place between the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone and Professor Huxley, on the subject of the agreement of science with Genesis. As might be expected from such masters of word fence, there has been much brilliant writing; but the question is left just as it was. Mr. Gladstone claimed that a certain order of creation of organic life was demonstrated by modern science, and that it corresponded with the order set forth in Genesis. Mr. Huxley expresses the utmost contempt for the “reconcilers,” and insists that science sanctions no such order as that stated by Mr. Gladstone, but in fact disproves it. Mr. Gladstone explains his words, and withdraws some of his statements, and Mr. Huxley criticises these revised views. He, however, makes the striking admission, that “if any one chooses to say that the creative work took place . . . exactly in the manner which Mr. Gladstone does, and natural science does not, affirm, natural science is not in a position to disprove the accuracy of the statement,” only he cannot claim the support of science for his views. He also remarks, “Now it appears to me that the scientific investigator is wholly incompetent to say anything at all about the first origin of the material universe. The whole power of his organon vanishes when he has to step beyond the chain of natural causes and events.” (See *Nineteenth Century*, November, December, 1885, January, February, 1886.)

CHAPTER VI.

MAN, HIS ORIGINAL STATE AND FALL.

I.—What was the image of God in which man was created?

"God is a Spirit," and therefore it could not have been in bodily lineaments that there existed a resemblance between the creature and the Creator. Nor does it refer to the dominion which was granted to him over this lower world. In this respect he was the vicegerent, and if the vicegerent, then, in some sense, the image of God. But it is evident that this cannot be brought into account, when we would determine in what the alleged image consisted. The image was that in which man was created, and cannot, therefore, be explained by rank or authority subsequently given.¹ The New Testament settles the question about the import of the image of God in those passages which contain allusions to man's first creation, when, in regeneration, the lost image is restored (see Col. iii. 9, 10, and Eph. iv. 24).² Here the properties of the image are specified: "knowledge," "righteousness," and "true holiness;" or, in the words of Dr. Hannah: "Light in the understanding, rectitude in the will, sanctity in the purposes and affections." In this state his Maker pronounced him good; "very good," a declaration which implies the absence of all evil, and the possession of every excellence, physical, intellectual, and moral, which his nature as a man, and his condition as a free agent, could admit.³

II.—Was man in his state of original probation placed simply under a law, or also under a covenant?

The difference between the two is sufficiently plain. A law is

¹ This is the opinion of A. Clarke, Watson, Wardlaw, Hannah, and many others. But Wesley speaks about a "political image" (sermon xlv.); and Benson, Jackson, with not a few divines of learning and ability, have maintained that the dominion over the inferior creatures was an integral part of that image and likeness of God in which man was created. This view they think is supported by 1 Cor. xi. 7. Bishop Harold Browne, in the "Speaker's Commentary," says the image and likeness consisted in that man was created "intelligent, immortal, personal, with power of forethought and full choice, and at the same time pure, holy, and undefiled."

² That this, the image of God, applies to the whole race, see Gen. ix. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 7; Acts xvii. 29; James iii. 9.

³ Read Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xviii.; Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., chap. v.

the will of the sovereign, sanctioned by threatened punishment. A covenant is a stipulation or agreement, which, although it may have the nature and sanctions of a law, promises a reward upon certain conditions to be fulfilled by the creature, and an alternative penalty to be inflicted in case the condition fails. Now "the law under which our first parents were placed is styled in the Scriptures 'the first or old covenant,' and is commonly called by divines the covenant of works, in distinction from the new or second covenant, of which Christ is the Mediator, and which is called the covenant of grace."¹ The conditions of that covenant may be summed up in one word—obedience; "full obedience in every point, and this to be performed without any intermission, from the moment man became a living soul till the time of his trial should be ended."² By his faithful adherence to these conditions, he was to be continued in the possession of all his blessings, love and joy, life and immortality (this is manifestly implied in Gen. ii. 9, 17, iii. 22; Gal. iii. 12); while disobedience was to be followed by the loss of all, and by the infliction of all the evils comprised in the dreadful word "death." This was the covenant—the agreement into which the Creator entered with His sinless creature; and that man did enter willingly into this covenant will appear from the fact that the human will was in perfect unison with the Divine. He cordially obeyed the law, accepted the promises, and determined to avoid the threatened evil.

III.—How can the test to which man's subjection was put be vindicated from the scorn of Infidelity?

The account of this matter we have in Gen. ii. 8, 9, 15-17.³ It must not be supposed that this was the only rule under which man was placed. "All rational creatures are under a law which requires supreme love to God, and entire obedience to His commands." The command to abstain from eating of this tree was only made a special and decisive test of that general obedience. And we can conceive nothing more fitting.

1. The restraint reminded him that he was under a law to his Maker; that though lord of the creation, he was in subjection to the authority of God; and the continued abstinence from the prohibited fruit would be regarded as an open proclamation, in

¹ Dr. Dwight's "Theology." Mr. Wesley very beautifully exhibits the difference between the first and the second covenant—the covenant of works and the covenant of grace—in sermon vi. Dr. Pope seems to object somewhat to this view. He says: "The word covenant means generally a Divine disposition or order, or arrangement; and in this sense Adam was, as a creature, placed under a covenant which included his posterity in him. But (2) the word covenant is throughout Scripture connected with sacrifice and a Mediator; in this sense Adam was not placed under a covenant." ² Wesley, sermon v.

³ Two explanations have been given of the designation of the tree as "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." The first, that the eating of it added the knowledge of "evil" to man's previous knowledge, which was only "good." The second, that the tree was to be the test "of good or evil;" the test by which God was to try man, and by which it would be known whether he would be good or evil.

view of heaven and earth and hell, of unquestioning obedience to the will of God. What more just than this?

2. "From the comparatively trivial character of the action prohibited, it taught the important lesson that the real guilt of sin lay in its principle, the principle of rebellion against God's will; not in the extent of the mischief done, or of the consequences arising out of it."¹ What more important than this?

3. It concentrated man's obedience into a single point, brought the duty which he was required to perform up to his view in the most distinct manner possible, and rendered it too intelligible to be mistaken. No room was left for doubt or debate—a matter of special importance to him, so lately brought into existence, so unversed in argumentation, acquainted only with plain facts, and under the guidance of nothing but common sense.² What more kind than this? Thus, there is no ground for the unbeliever's scorn. The prohibition has only to be examined to show forth the justice, the wisdom, and the benevolence of him who imposed it.

IV.—By what principles can we estimate the turpitude of Adam's sin?

This subject has often been made the subject of the unhallowed burlesque of ungodly men. "How could it be," they ask, "that God should condemn man for the mere eating of an apple?" as if the sin was to be measured by the mere value of the fruit that was taken. But there cannot be a more false measure of moral turpitude.

1. The sin consisted in disobeying his Maker, revolting from His authority, and rebelling against His government. Whatever was the mode, whatever was the instrument of the rebellion, the sin was substantially the same; the same authority was denied, the same obligation broken, and of course the same guilt was thus far incurred.³

2. The sin involved the breach of the whole moral law—the law of love under which our first parents were placed. There was *unbelief*—a principle which makes God a liar—a transfer of his confidence from God to a malignant and an apostate spirit. There was *ingratitude* and discontent with the rich provision God had made for his happiness; there was *pride*, a desire for elevation by unlawful means; there was *self-will* and insubordination to God; and there was *alienation of heart*, engendered by receiving the calumnies which the tempter cast upon God.

3. The sin was intensely aggravated by the *smallness* of the *temptation*; for although, in one view, some perverse spirits, who are determined to cavil, may consider this as rendering the offence proportionately diminutive and trifling, yet in another and far juster

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., p. 82.

² Dr. Dwight, sermon xxvi.

³ Dr. Wm. Cooke's "Christian Theology"

¹ *Ibid.*

view this ought to stamp it with the deeper malignity and guilt, inasmuch as the strength of the evil principle manifested in the commission of any sin is shown to be great in proportion as the temptation to the commission of it is small.¹

4. The sin was greatly aggravated by the perfect nature they possessed. No cloud was upon the understanding. They had the power to master the appetite, and keep in subjection the otherwise mutinous inclinations of sensitive nature, and at the same time they were surrounded with motives and helps to retain their innocency. And yet, in spite of all, they dared to rebel, and thus ungratefully to requite the Author of their being and blessedness. On all right views of the character and government of God and the condition of man, that first act of human rebellion involved a combination of atrocious evils which led the way to deserved misery. And this is a consideration that ought to rescue the subject from the light and ungodly scorn with which it is often treated by the philosophers and scorners of this world.

V.—What was the import of the penalty annexed to the first transgression?

The penalty threatened was "death," and what this included may be gathered from the general meaning of the term as it is used in the Scriptures, and from the evils that fell on the guilty pair in the fulfilment of the ordained penalty.

1. That the threatening included the *dissolution of the body* is not often disputed (Gen. iii. 19). Driven from the tree of life, the virtues of which were probably ordained to be the natural means of preserving the body in undecaying vigour, they were now subject to the wastings of disease and the decay of age; and finally the sentence was to be executed—"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But, viewing the phrase *to die* in the light thrown upon the subject by the principles of the Gospel, we regard it as comprising what is technically called—

2. *Spiritual death.* This "consists in a separation of the soul from communion with God, who is the source of spiritual life, and is manifested by the dominion of earthly and corrupt dispositions and habits, and an entire indifference or aversion to spiritual and heavenly things." This separation from God Adam sustained in the day, the hour, he ate the forbidden fruit; and of this he gave immediate proof, presently showing by his behaviour that the love of God was extinguished in his soul, which was now alienated from the life of God." He was now under the power of servile fear, so that he fled from the presence of the Lord. Yea, so little did he retain even of the knowledge of Him who filleth heaven and earth, that he endeavoured to "hide himself from the Lord God" (Gen. iii. 8); so had he lost both the knowledge and the love of God, without which the image of God could not subsist.

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., p. 83; Pope's "Compendium of Theology," part iv. sec. 1, 2, 3.

In the room of this, he had sunk into pride and self-will, the very image of the devil; and into sensual appetites and desires, the image of the beasts that perish.¹

3. But the highest sense of the term "death," in the Scripture, is the punishment of the soul in a future state, both by loss of happiness, a separation from God, and by a positive infliction of Divine wrath (Rom. vi. 23; James i. 15). And to this curse Adam became exposed by his fall; and nothing but an intervention of mercy, so mighty and so majestic as to satisfy the demands of justice, could save the progenitor of our race from the pangs and horrors of this "second death."²

VI.—Why was the full and immediate infliction of the penalty arrested?

An economy of grace and restoration was at once introduced, and even before a sentence of punishment was pronounced, the revelation of a Saviour was given, and a charter of redemption was unfolded (see Gen. iii. 15). "The import of this prediction appears from various allusions of Scripture to have been, that the Messiah, who was in an eminent and peculiar sense 'the Seed of the woman,' should, though Himself bruised in the conflict, obtain a complete victory over the malice and power of Satan, and so restore those benefits to man which by sin he had lost."³ How far this promise of mercy was understood by our first parents we are unable to determine. It was, however, sufficient to banish despair, encourage hope, and become the foundation of repentance and confidence in the Divine mercy through the intervention of the Divine Redeemer. As expressive of his confidence and hope, Adam at once gave to his wife a new name—Eve, that is, *Life*—because she was to be the mother of that Living One who was destined to give life to the world.⁴ It is evident, also, that animals were very soon offered to God in sacrifice through faith in the promise of a Saviour,⁵ and that there was one appointed place where a visible

¹ Wesley's sermon on "The New Birth."

² "But Dr. Taylor is sure only temporal death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. 'For death is the loss of life, and must be understood according to the nature of the life to which it is opposed.' Most true; and the life to which it is here opposed, the life Adam enjoyed till lost by sin, was not only bodily life, but that principle of holiness which the Scripture terms 'the life of God.' It was also a title to eternal life. All this, therefore, he lost by sin; and that justly; for death is the true wages of sin,—death both temporal, spiritual, and eternal." Wesley on "Original Sin." Pelagians and Socinians hold the view of Dr. Taylor, namely, that temporal death was the full amount of the curse which came upon Adam. This point is argued at length by Wesley on "Original Sin," and in sermonic Theology, vol. ii., chap. xi.; in Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xviii.; and in Dwight's "Theology," sermon xxviii.; and in Pope's "Compendium of Theology."

³ Strenuous objections have been made to this view, in order to get quit of the doctrine of so early and significant a promise of a Redeemer. See those objections answered in Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xviii.

⁴ This is undoubtedly the correct sense of the passage, and is defended in Dr. Smith's "Book of Prophecy," pp. 132, 133; Dr. W. Cooke's "Theology," etc.

⁵ The animals, with whose skins Adam and his wife were clothed, must have been slain as sacrificial victims, since no permission was given as yet to use them

symbol of the Divine presence was fixed, before which the humble worshipper might present himself, his offering, and his prayer.¹

VII.—Is Adam to be regarded as a mere individual, the consequences of whose conduct terminated in himself? Or is he to be regarded as the federal head and representative of mankind?

The federal relation of Adam to his descendants is not stated in the history of the fall. But the testimony of other parts of Scripture on this subject is so explicit that all attempts to evade it have been in vain.

1. The point is proved by the parallel drawn by the Apostle between the first and second Adam—the parallel lying chiefly in this one point, that each acted a public part, standing for others, and not for himself merely—a part from which important results were to arise to those whom they are considered respectively as representing. The point of parallelism is noticed in general terms in Rom. v. 14, where Adam is called, with evident allusion to his public representative character, “the figure,” “type,” or “model” of “Him that was to come;” and it is especially brought out in Rom. v. 18, 19, and 1 Cor. xv. 22, 47.

2. The point is proved by the fact that the threatenings pronounced upon the first pair have taken effect on all their posterity as well as themselves (Gen. iii. 16-19).

3. The point is proved by the fact that the Bible declares that sin, death,² and all penal evils, came into the world through Adam. (Rom. v. 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 22).³

VIII.—How can the righteousness and fairness of such a federal relation be vindicated?

If it be proved that it existed by the appointment of God, we are sure of the justice of the arrangement, whether it be manifest to our reason or not. “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” But since men have wickedly impeached the equity of the Divine procedure in this matter, we may reverently consider facts which, even to our beclouded understandings, prove Him to have acted under the direction of His infinite rectitude and love.

for food. Hence we infer that the first promise was immediately followed with special directions for the worship of God, through those offerings which were calculated to adumbrate the great sacrifice, which, in the fulness of time, was to be offered by the promised Seed. Only on this principle, viz., that God had revealed His will that He would be approached through the medium of animal sacrifices, can we explain why Abel's sacrifice was accepted and Cain's rejected.

¹ This visible symbol of the Divine presence, or shekinah, was appropriately called “the presence of the Lord” (Gen. iv. 16). It was doubtless the same with that radiant flame which turned every way, or which revolved upon itself (Gen. iii. 24), and was like the glory which afterwards filled the temple. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel were probably offered before this celestial brightness; for when Cain was rejected, it is said that he “departed from the presence of the Lord.”

² It is not meant that there was no death upon this planet before the advent and fall of Adam, for that animals in profusion died long ages before that period is undoubted; but that the sin of Adam brought death to his race.

³ Read Wesley on “Original Sin;” Watson's “Theological Institutes,” part ii., chap. xviii.; Wardlaw's “Systematic Theology,” vol. ii., chap. xii.

1. "Although we are far from intending to lay it down as a position that the procedure of the infinitely just God is to be vindicated by any analogy to the procedure of men, yet it may not be undeserving of notice that, even amongst men it is no uncommon thing when there is good on the one hand and evil on the other, for covenants or agreements to be entered into which involve a man's posterity even to the latest generations. One man may offer to another certain benefits, to be perpetually secured, on certain prescribed and accepted conditions, to himself and his children, while all are to be forfeited by both himself and them, and certain opposite evils incurred, on his failing to fulfil the stipulated conditions. No one, on such failure, would feel entitled to complain of the offerer; nay, his generosity might, and might justly, be commended, however much the infatuation of the originally engaging party might be the object of wonder and condemnation."

2. The connection between Adam and his posterity is in perfect harmony with the analogy of God's procedure in His providence. Instances often occur in which both good and evil arise to posterity from the conduct of parents; consequences result, both bodily and mental, moral and physical, affecting health and character and situation.¹ It is vain to say that this can be accounted for from natural causes; for to speak of natural causes as operating without God's permission or concurrent will is absolute Atheism. He could, but does not, prevent the results which arise to children from the conduct of their parents. And if we say there is unrighteousness in the relation which Adam sustained to his posterity, we must also assert that the whole course of Providence has been, and is in this respect, a series of unrighteous dealings. But who would dare thus to charge God foolishly?

3. The connection between Adam and his posterity must always be considered in relation to both sides of the alternative. When men complain of the arrangement which made the state of all mankind to depend on Adam, they invariably fix on that aspect of the case which regards man as guilty, and as involved through the original offence in misery and ruin and death, overlooking entirely the opposite blessedness and life which would for ever have been insured to Adam and his descendants had he stood.² Of this side of the case there is no complaint, and yet the principle is the same in both.

4. Nor should the federal union between Adam and his posterity be viewed apart from the evangelical provision of mercy which was concurrent with it, and which included, in like manner, both him and the whole race of men. The redemption of man by Christ was not

¹ And thus God is said to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children (Exod. xx. 5) in the sense that He does not interfere with natural laws to prevent the effects of the views, and crimes, and improvidence of parents, the necessary results of such laws being that progeny and descendants suffer.

² Many divines do not believe Adam to have been immortal before he fell. Pope says, "It may be doubted whether immortality was part of the indestructible image [in which man was created]. It is God who only hath immortality."

an after-thought, brought in by man's apostasy; it was a provision; and when Adam fell, involving his race in sorrow, pain, and death, mercy revealed "the second Adam, through whom all might recover whatever they had lost through the first; nay, and recover it with unspeakable gain; since every additional temptation they feel, by that corruption of their nature which is antecedent to their choice, will, if conquered by grace, be a means of adding to that 'exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' This single consideration totally removes all reflections on the Divine justice or mercy, in making the state of all mankind so dependent on the behaviour of their common parent; for not one child of man finally loses thereby, unless by his own choice; and every one who receives 'the grace of God in Christ' will be an unspeakable gainer. Who, then, has any reason to complain, even of having a nature inclined to evil? seeing, the more opportunities he has of fighting, the more of conquering; and seeing, the greater is the difficulty of obtaining the victory, the brighter is the crown of glory."¹

IX.—What is original sin?

The term "original sin" is not to be found in Scripture, and appears to have been first introduced by St. Augustine in his controversy with the Pelagians. It is sometimes called "birth sin." In the Articles of the Church of England it is thus defined: "Original sin is the fault and corruption of every man, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and, therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." More briefly and fully it is defined by Dr. Hannah, as "the transmission of hereditary guilt and depravity to all the natural progeny of the first sinning pair."

The subject thus divides itself into two branches: original or hereditary guilt, and original or hereditary depravity.²

X.—What are the principal heresies with which we are brought into contact in considering this subject?

1. *Pelagianism*. This system derived its name from Pelagius, a British monk, who, at the commencement of the fifth century, went to Rome, Jerusalem, and other places, propagating his opinions, and gaining disciples. He taught that what was commonly believed respecting the corruption of human nature as derived from our first parents was not true; that the consequences of Adam's sin were confined to his own person; that men are now born as pure and innocent as Adam was when God created him, but that, being fallible, they fall into sin through the force of example; that death is natural to our physical system, and is in no sense the penal consequence of sin; and that men can, by their own power, renovate themselves, and reach the highest degree of holiness. Augustine,

¹ Wesley on "Original Sin," part iii., sec. vi.; Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., chap. x.

² See Pope's "Compendium of Theology."

the celebrated Bishop of Hippo, was the most prominent and successful opponent of this heresy. It was strongly condemned by various councils; the Roman Emperor issued an edict, banishing its leaders from his dominions, and thus the evil was arrested.¹

2. *Socinianism*, denying the atonement of Christ, rejects also the doctrine of original sin, and maintains substantially the same views concerning human nature as those taught by Pelagius.

3. One of the most learned and powerful defenders of the *Pelagian* heresy in modern times was *Dr. John Taylor*, of Norwich, a Nonconformist, who flourished in the first half of the last century. He was a thorough Arian, well acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, "a man of unusually strong understanding, joined with no small liveliness of imagination. He had likewise an admirable command of temper, and wrote in a smooth and pleasing, yet a manly and nervous style." All these talents he exerted to the uttermost for the defence of the purity and innocence of human nature, and all the cognate errors connected with that theory. Jonathan Edwards's work on "Original Sin" was in refutation of Dr. Taylor's views; and so was the masterly treatise of John Wesley, entitled "The Doctrine of Original Sin, according to Scripture, Reason, and Experience," which, next to his "Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion," is the largest and most elaborate of all his original publications.

XI.—What is the meaning of the word "guilt" as used in this controversy?

The word is sometimes employed to express *personal culpability*; and Augustine, with others in more modern times, have gone so far as to apply the term in this sense, teaching that, through the federal union of Adam with his posterity, what was done by him is to be considered as having been done by them, each and all of them, in him; a notion which alike contradicts our personal identity, our moral consciousness, and the principles of the Divine government revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. The word "guilt" is also employed to express answerableness in the law or *exposure to punishment*. In this sense the word is used Matt. xxvi. 66; and must be so understood in relation to this subject—an *obligation to suffer punishment for the sin of our first parents*. The doctrine, therefore, may be thus stated: "That the sin of Adam, who stood as the representative of his posterity, involved the whole race of mankind

¹ At a later period, a system of doctrine was advanced, to which the name of Semi-Pelagianism was given. It embraced the Pelagian tenets with various modifications. This system obtained extensive patronage, for it could not be so easily arrested as the other.

It has been common in modern times for the zealous advocates of absolute predestination to apply the term Pelagian to those who hold general redemption and the conditionality of the evangelical covenant, whereas nothing can be more unjust. No man was more orthodox on these points than the great Arminius; but some who entered into his labours and bore his name, after his decease, departed from the truth. Among others we may mention Curcellæus, Limborch, and Le Clerk, as men whose leanings towards the Pelagian heresy are as obvious as they are to be lamented.

in his sentence of condemnation; subjecting them, with himself, to the penal consequences of his fall."¹

XII.—What is the Scripture testimony by which this doctrine is supported?

Read carefully Rom. v. 12-21, the sum of which passage is this, that by one man's disobedience, his posterity are "made," *katestátthesan*, constituted, accounted, dealt with, as "sinners," "judgment" having come upon them all to "condemnation" (see also Eph. ii. 3).

XIII.—Do not the facts of human history corroborate the testimony of Scripture?

They do; for (1) all men, without one solitary exception, are subject to the natural and moral evils which resulted from Adam's apostasy. Adam, by his sin, was exposed to the calamities and sorrows of this life, to temporal death, and to eternal ruin. And all his posterity have to endure the same pain, toil, disappointment, anxiety, and bodily death. This is a fact, independent of the statements of the Bible; and since it is allowed that we thus suffer for Adam's sin, and *that* by the sentence of God—is not the consequence evidence that we are, "by nature, children of wrath"? (2) The other fact is, that infants, as well as adults, are subject to sufferings the most severe, diversified, and protracted, which not unfrequently result in death. They have "not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression"—*i.e.*, they have not been guilty of actual, personal sin; must they not, then, be regarded as implicated in the "guilt" of the original head? as suffering and dying as a part of the race for which he stood the representative?

XIV.—Is such a consequence of the defection of our first parents in accordance with the ordinary proceedings of the Divine government?

It is; for though that government never makes one man accountable for the sins of another, it yet permits the effects of one man's transgressions to involve sufferings and woes upon others. Thus, the prodigal entails want and disgrace upon his offspring; the licentious parent—the victim of intemperance and lust—not only vitiates his own constitution, but transmits disease and wretchedness to his posterity. A wicked ruler sometimes plunges whole nations into misery, and the consequences are felt for generations. So a man, in violating the laws of his country, may involve his posterity in disgrace and civil penalties. If he commit treason, his estate is taken from him, and his children become disinherited. All such facts illustrate the penal consequences of our connection with the first transgressor.

¹ It is necessary here clearly to state, that there is "no ground for the assertion that the sin of Adam was imputed to his posterity." Arminius says, "I do not deny that it is sin, but it is not actual sin. . . . We must distinguish between actual sin and that which is the cause of other sins, and on that very account may be called sin." See note at end of Rom. v. in the "Critical Commentary," where the opposite view is expressed.

XV.—Does not this doctrine shut up our race to absolute despair?

It would if considered in itself. But the same Scripture which tells us that "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," tells us also that Christ, who made Himself the federal head of fallen men, has, by His vicarious obedience to death, procured "the free gift," which "came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 18). This "free gift," "the gift by grace," refers to the whole benefit given by the abounding grace of God through the obedience of Christ. And this is pronounced to be co-extensive with the curse. It follows, therefore, that all children dying in infancy are adjudged to life. They are not, indeed, born justified and regenerate; but they are born under "the free gift;" and since they are incapable of a voluntary rejection of it, they receive the full benefit, which effectually cures the spiritual death and corrupt tendency of their nature, and then passes to its issue, "justification of life." In the case of adults, "the free gift" comes upon them, in its effects, very largely, independently of anything they do. They are favoured with the influences of the Holy Spirit, the means of grace, and the offers of mercy. In a word, "justification of life" is offered to them, it is pressed upon them; they are clearly instructed in the means by which, even considered as *personal* offenders, they may obtain it. If they yield and embrace the offer, then the end, for which "the free gift came" upon them, is attained; and they fail of it only by rejecting it.¹ In reference to the heathen, if it be asked to what extent and with what results they have received "the gift by grace which is by one man," we answer, God knoweth. That they do receive it is certain (Rom. ii. 12-16); and "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," they will be dealt with righteously according to the circumstances in which they have been placed.

XVI.—Is not this original and innate depravity to be considered as forming part of the penal consequence of Adam's sin?

The doctrine is, "that the whole race, descending by ordinary generation from the fallen first progenitors, inherit from them a morally tainted and vitiated nature; a nature in which there is no inclination to do anything truly good, but which, as soon as its dispositions or tendencies begin to unfold themselves, shows itself evil in the production of evil thoughts, words, and actions."

One part of the curse threatened to disobedience, as we have seen, was death—death spiritual—that moral state which arises from a separation of the soul from God, the great source of spiritual life. The sin of Adam incurred this penalty, and the penalty was inflicted. God executed to the full His threatening. He withdrew from the soul of Adam. The spiritual life of that soul sank by inevitable consequence, and our first parent fell under

¹ See Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xviii.

the full power of spiritual death—a mere rational animal, devoid of spiritual light and life, devoid of holy affections and heavenly desires, a prey to guilt and remorse, and a victim to a legion of unholty passions and propensities. And since Adam was a public person, a representative, this state of death, of separation from God, has passed on to his descendants, who, in their natural state, are therefore said to be “dead in trespasses and sins,” aliens from God, and therefore filled with evil. This is by some divines called, with great aptness, a “depravation arising from a deprivation.” And it is of great importance that this point be well understood and carefully maintained; inasmuch as we are sometimes charged with teaching that the corruption of our nature arises from some evil quality infused or implanted by some positive cause or influence. It is said, with some show of reason, that such teaching makes God directly the author of sin. But no such teaching can be justly laid to our charge. We maintain that the depravity of the heart of man arises, not from the infusion of evil into the nature of man by God, but from that separation of man from God, that extinction of spiritual life, which was effected by sin, and the consequent and necessary corruption of man’s moral nature. “Hereditary depravity,” therefore, arises from “hereditary guilt.”

XVII.—What proof have we that human nature is morally depraved?

1. It is directly affirmed in such passages as these: Gen. viii. 21; Job xv. 16; Prov. xxii. 15; Eccles. ix. 3; Jer. xvii. 9; Matt. xv. 19; Rom. viii. 5-9; Gal. v. 17-21; 1 John v. 19.

2. It is clearly implied in those passages which affirm the universal need of regeneration (see especially John iii. 3). The new birth is a spiritual and moral change, a change of heart, a change of principle and disposition. And, if it be so that “a man,” *i.e.*, any man, any one of the entire race, stands in need, not of reformation only, but of entire renovation, does it not follow that human nature is naturally, radically, utterly degenerate?

3. It is proved by the conduct of children as soon as they are capable of moral action (Psalm lviii. 3; Prov. xxii. 15). No child unspotted by sin, except the “child born” for our redemption, is ever mentioned in the records of history. And among the thousands of children whom we have known, have we ever seen *one* whom we could conscientiously pronounce to be free from evil dispositions, evil affections, and evil conduct? Their education may have been the best, and the example set before them the purest, but pride, anger, stubbornness, self-will, etc., in varying degrees, attest the existence of a natural inherent tendency to evil.

4. It is proved by the mighty and continued struggle that has to be maintained where men determine to renounce evil and to

¹ This doctrine is clearly set forth in Watson’s “*Institutes*,” part ii., chap. xviii.; by Edwards, “*On Original Sin*,” part iv., ch. ii.; by Wardlaw, in his “*Systematic Theology*,” and a host of theologians.

walk with God. See how that struggle is described in Gal. v. 17, but especially in Rom. vii. 15-24. It matters not that a man may have the help of godly companionship and of religious ordinances; he yet finds that the greatest watchfulness, the most earnest prayer, and the most thorough decision are requisite to the successful cultivation of the principles and habits of holiness. Who can account for this, except on the principle that man *is* by nature corrupt and sinful, averse to that which is good, and prone to that which is evil?

XVIII.—Is this depravity of human nature universal in its prevalence?

1. This is affirmed in Psalm xiv. 2, 3, liii. 1-3; Isa. liii. 6; Rom. iii. 9-12; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. ii. 2, 3; 1 John v. 19.

2. It is confirmed by the history of our race, which is little else but a continuous record of the licentious workings of human depravity,—of lust, pride, malice, selfishness, and contempt of God. Everywhere we see mankind alienated from their Maker. The laws, the writings, the conversations, the very religions of the world prove that enmity to God, and rebellion against His government, are the characteristic marks, not of any individual, not of any particular people, but of universal man, in every age and every part of the world.

XIX.—Is this depravity of human nature total in its influence?

Let the question be understood. We do not mean to ask, is human nature in every instance as thoroughly depraved as it is possible for it to become? Nor do we ask, has every man a disposition inclined to every form of sin? To these questions a negative answer would immediately be given. The question is, has the contagion spread itself through the entire man? Has it touched and vitiated every power and every faculty, "spirit, soul, and body," leaving no part pure? And this the Scriptures directly assert in the fullest manner (see Gen. vi. 5; Rom. vii. 18).

XX.—Is this depravity received by hereditary transmission from Adam?

In plainest terms, it is referred to Adam's apostasy as its origin (Rom. v. 12, 19). He was not only the first that sinned, but in consequence, and as the effect of his having sinned, sin or sinfulness was derived from him to the race of mankind. "They received from him the infection." Hence, we see the meaning of Gen. v. 3. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image;" not in the image of God, in which himself was created, but "in his own likeness," depraved and sinful in his nature. From that time, every one born into the world has inherited this innate corruption. This view evidently formed part of patriarchal theology, and was adopted by Zophar (Job xi. 12); by Job (xiv. 4); by Eliphaz (xv. 14); and by Bildad (xxv. 4). The same doctrine was announced by David

(Psalm li. 5, lviii. 3); and was confirmed by the Saviour's declaration (John iii. 6, 7), in which He teaches that the fleshly character, or what St. Paul calls "the carnal mind," is inseparably connected with the birth of man. Thus moral depravity is natural and hereditary, a part of man's moral constitution from his birth.

XXI.—If men are thus naturally and totally depraved, what shall be said of the apparent virtues and excellences that we see amongst unconverted men?

We cannot admit that they disprove the statements of the Bible as to the ruined and degenerate state of man.

1. "Many of the so-called virtues are but vices in disguise; as when courage, patriotism, continence, and beneficence spring from pride, ambition, selfishness, or other corrupt motives."

2. "Generally these apparent excellences are associated with other qualities, which convict the heart as corrupt before God. The chastity of Lucretia was connected with the sin of suicide; the fidelity of Regulus with implacable enmity to Carthage; the temperance of Cato with envy, parsimony, and cruelty; the generosity of Fabricius with military ambition; and the wisdom and virtue of Socrates ended in an act of idolatry."

3. "It is a fact, too, which cannot be denied, that men have constitutional evil tendencies; some are more powerfully bent to one vice, some to another. Whether it results from a different constitution of the mind that the general corruption should act more powerfully in one direction in this man, and in another in that, or from the temperament of the body, or from some law impressed by God upon a sinful nature, such is the fact; and it gives a reason for the existence of much negative virtue in society."

4. Nor should it be forgotten that in every unrenowned man, beneath much which we confess to be lovely and of good report, there lurks a heart altogether indisposed to yield itself up to its Maker, and fully determined to follow its own bent, and obey its own impulse; and when men follow a natural bent, and are not actuated by a principle of devotedness to God, it makes no difference what the bent is—whether it be turned towards things that procure the applause of society, or towards those which are visited with its censure, it equally coincides with that innate depravity which is the result of the fall, and therefore brings them all under one and the same emphatic condemnation; they are "in the flesh," and "cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 8).

5. And let it be also remembered that though men may be unregenerate, they are not left under the full, uncontrollable power of depravity. Every man is interested in the benefits procured by the death of Christ, and is favoured with a measure of the Holy Spirit; and that His gracious influence should so far operate, and so far be yielded to, as to produce some holy fruit, is only what we

* Dr. Wm. Cooke,

* Watson.

might rationally expect (1 Cor. xii. 7). If, therefore, there is found in him "some good thing towards the Lord God of Israel," and something of moral excellence in his dealings with men, this is the effect of grace, not of nature; it is to be attributed to the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit, to His incipient workings in the heart. He is teaching, striving, and convincing, for the purpose of bringing the heart in penitence and faith to Christ; and if not "resisted," "grieved," "vexed," the issue will be a "death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." "But in most cases this struggle, this striving with man, this standing betwixt him and death, cannot fail to correct and prevent much evil, to bring into existence some 'goodness,' though it may be as 'the morning cloud and the early dew,' and to produce civil and social virtues, none of which, however, are to be placed to the account of nature."¹

The subject of this chapter has been as fruitful of controversy as any within the compass of theology. In England the first man of eminence who excited general attention by writing against the orthodox view of "Original Sin," was Dr. Jeremy Taylor, who flourished in the first half of the seventeenth century. He was a man of vast erudition, of a rich and eloquent imagination, a voluminous writer, and a high churchman. His doctrine was attacked with superior ability and effect by Dr. Jeanes, a Puritan minister. About the same time Anthony Burgesse published a folio volume on "Original Sin," in which he "asserted and vindicated" that doctrine "against the old and new adversaries thereof." It is now scarce and dear, but it is a storehouse of information on the subject of which it treats. This is the largest work on "Original Sin" that ever appeared in English. In the early part of the eighteenth century there was a great decay of piety among the English Nonconformists, connected with a sad defection from the creed of their Puritan and Nonconformist ancestors. Various attempts were made to resist these pernicious innovations in doctrine; and among others who wrote in defence of original sin was Dr. David Jennings, the fellow-labourer of Dr. Doddridge. He was the author of a very able tract on the subject; but as it was published anonymously it is not now generally known. But the most distinguished writer on the occasion was Dr. Watts, who published "The Ruin and Recovery of Man." It is an eloquent and an argumentative work written in a tone of great candour and moderation. It contains, however, some peculiar opinions, indicative of infirmity of judgment. He thinks that brute creatures have not the same sensations of pain that men have, and that the children of the ungodly are annihilated. These works were followed, as we have before stated, by Mr. Wesley's "Treatise on Original Sin," in answer to Dr. John Taylor. It is replete with argument,

¹ Rev. R. Watson; see also Mercein's "Natural Goodness,"—a remarkable book by an American Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

clear, forcible, and convincing. Mr. Samuel Hebden and President Edwards also wrote against Taylor with great zeal and ability. Mr. Fletcher's "Appeal," which relates to the same subject, is perhaps the most finished of all his writings. On the question of Hereditary Depravity it is perhaps the most useful treatise in the English language. Mr. Holden's book on the Fall of Man is not a treatise on original sin, but a defence of the literal interpretation of the Mosaic account of the transactions which took place in the garden of Eden, in opposition to those Rationalists and Neologists, who would resolve the whole into allegory and fable. Every man who aspires to proficiency in theological knowledge should read this able volume.¹

¹ Rev. T. Jackson's MS. Lectures.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ATONEMENT.

I.—In what light should we regard the death of Christ?

The Scriptures teach that "the death of Christ was vicarious and propitiatory; and that by it a satisfaction was offered to the Divine justice for the transgressions of men, in consideration of which, pardon and salvation are offered to them in the Gospel through faith." The following passages are a mere specimen of those that might be selected to show how the doctrine of atonement, as thus explained, pervades the whole of the inspired volume: Isa. liii. 5, 6, 7, 12; Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; John i. 29, vi. 51; Rom. v. 6-9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. i. 4, iii. 13; Eph. i. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Heb. ix. 14, 26, 28, vii. 27; 1 Peter ii. 24, iii. 18; 1 John i. 7, ii. 2; Rev. i. 5, 6, v. 9. If such passages as these do not convey the ideas of substitution and atonement, is it possible by human language to convey these ideas at all? What other words and phrases would we select, if it were our special desire to express them more distinctly?

II.—What are the views adopted by those who deny the orthodox doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ?

1. *The Socinian view* is, that the death of Christ, like that of any other martyred prophet, was a sealing of His testimony with His blood; that is (for the phrase can mean no more), an attestation of His sincerity in the claims He had advanced, and the doctrines He had delivered to men. According to this view, His *dying for our sins* means simply that it is by the doctrine which His death attested that we obtain forgiveness of our sins, and that His death was thus eminently for our benefit. They add to this, that in His sufferings and death He left us an example of fidelity, patience, meekness, etc.; and that we are saved by His death, inasmuch as that it is by the moral influence which His benevolent and self-denying example exerts upon our hearts that our hostility is subdued, and we are reconciled to God. It should be a sufficient answer to this theory that the Apostles, in writing of Christ's death, never refer to it as a confirmation of doctrine, and never, either in this manner or as an example of virtue, connect it with the salvation

of man. The whole system is perfectly gratuitous, without the least shadow of foundation in the Book of God.¹

Somewhat different from this is—

2. *Dr. John Taylor's view*, as set forth in his "Key to the Apostolic Writings," and his "Scripture Doctrine of Atonement." He teaches that "the end of Christ's coming into the world was to do the will of God—to perform solid, substantial obedience; and that it was His righteous, kind, and benevolent actions, His obedient death, or the sacrifice of His love and obedience, which made atonement for the sins of the world; so far, and in this sense, that God, on account of His goodness or perfect obedience so highly pleasing to Him, thought fit to grant unto mankind, whom He might in strict justice have destroyed for their wickedness, the forgiveness of sin." This scheme divests the death and blood of Christ of everything properly sacrificial and propitiatory, and resolves all that is taught in the New Testament on that subject into symbol, figure, and allusion. It is a melancholy illustration of that artifice by which the terms of Divine revelation are deprived of their appropriate meaning, and are modelled so as to fall in with the theories of those who are more anxious that the Bible should speak their language than that they should speak the language of the Bible. We need not shrink from understanding Scripture terms in their plain and proper import when they represent the death of Christ as an atonement or propitiation for sin. If the unnumbered passages in which these terms are found are to be resolved into mere figures of speech, the Bible is the most confounding and misleading book in the world.

We must also refer to what may be called—

3. *The Broad Church view*, as advocated by Professor Maurice, Jowett, Rev. F. W. Robertson,² and others of that school. They admit that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, but only a sacrifice of self-will—that self-will which is the root of all evil in man.³ His

¹ Socinians and Unitarians deny the necessity of an atonement or substitution for sin, on the ground that the essential benevolence and compassion of God must have prompted, and that His supreme dominion must have enabled Him to forgive sins without any atonement or satisfaction; and that there was nothing in His nature, government, or law, which threw any obstacle in the way of at once exercising His sovereign dominion in accordance with the promptings of His compassion, and extending forgiveness to all upon the conditions of repentance and reformation.

² For a full statement and refutation of the teachings of this school Dr. James Rigg's able volume, "Modern Anglican Theology," should be read.

³ Mr. Maurice's words are these: "The Gospel shows Him who is one with God and one with man, perfectly giving up that self-will which had been the cause of all men's crimes, and all their misery."

I have mentioned the name of Mr. Robertson in connection with this defective teaching, and it is greatly to be deplored that a man whose sermons are so attractive, and have obtained so large a circulation, should be the advocate of views so inadequate and unscriptural on the subject of the atonement. His views are thus stated and criticised by an able writer in the *London Review*, No. xxxiii.: "Christ was the eternal idea or type of humanity, 'the reality of human nature.' He was representative man. Whatever He did during His incarnation was done by us in Him. In this sense He stood in the place of us all; and recognising the law of sacrifice as the great law of being, by His absolute sub-

endurance of punishment was His perfect willingness that the loving God's wrath against the unlovely should continue to work on among men, until all unloveliness disappears; and that He, becoming one of them, should not be specially exempt. Hence sacrifice in Christ and sacrifice in man is one and the same thing, viz., the abandonment of self-will, the adoption of the Divine. The idea of His expiating guilt by making Himself a true and proper sacrifice of atonement is denounced; and, in fact, neither the obedience which He renders, nor the cross which He bears, is, in any sense whatever, the procuring cause of man's redemption.¹

III.—By what line of argument can we prove the necessity of an atonement?

By this: God is the moral governor of the universe. He has called into existence creatures, who are, by the constitution of their nature, fit subjects for moral government. He has given to them a law—"a copy of His own eternal mind, a transcript of His own Divine nature." That law is enforced by penal sanction: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. iii. 10). "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. xviii. 4). They have broken that law; and are, therefore, brought under His judicial displeasure (Psalm v. 4, 5, vii. 11; John iii. 36); and threatened with "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power" (Psalm ix. 17, xi. 6; Mal. iv. 1; Matt. iii. 12; Rom. i. 18; 2 Thess. i. 7-9). All the attributes of God—not His holiness and justice and truth alone, but even His goodness (considered as embracing and providing for the general well-being of the universe)

mission to the will of the Father—a submission which, because it was perfect, involved the necessity of suffering to death,—He grappled with and vanquished the evil which tyrannised over our nature, and made us virtually partakers of His triumph. . . . He was our sacrifice, not because He died on the cross, but because His entire self-surrender as 'the realised idea of our humanity, the idea of man created,' represents the sacrifice of us all in the like submission of ourselves to God. Not His death, not His blood-shedding was the sacrifice for sin. It was His entire devoting of Himself to the Father's will. God was satisfied with the offering of Christ, because 'for the first time He saw human nature a copy of the Divine nature, the will of man the Son perfectly coincident with the will of God the Father.' And this work of Christ was the work of humanity. In Christ thus made perfect, God 'saw humanity submitted to the law of self-sacrifice,' and 'in the light of that idea He beholds us as perfect, and is satisfied.' Now against all this we most earnestly protest. The New Testament knows nothing of Christ as 'the idea of humanity,' and mankind as 'atoned' to God in Him in the sense here intended. It is true it speaks of Him as our substitute, and it represents men as dying with Him, buried with Him, risen and alive with Him. But there is not the smallest evidence that any such mystical blending of our personality with His personality, as the Platonising view supposes, was ever dreamt of by the sacred writers; and, what is absolutely fatal to its pretensions, while there is no one passage in which the blessings of salvation are connected with human nature as such, they are invariably described as flowing to men from the active grace of the Holy Ghost, and as the immediate result of a personal faith in Christ. It is not redeemed man, as such, that dies with Christ and lives in Him; but redeemed man repenting towards God and believing in His Son."

¹ Dr. Candlish's examination of Maurice's "Theological Essays." For the views of Dr. Bushnell, McLeod Campbell, and others, see Hodge's "Systematic Theology."

—require that the penalty should be executed. Not to exact the penalty would be to repeal the law, to reduce its sanction to an empty threat unworthy the veracity of God, and to lower His government in the eyes of all the intelligent universe. *Men may repent*, but this produces no change in their legal relation to the God whom they have offended. They are offenders still, are equally guilty of all for which they stand charged; and there is nothing in their penitence which would make it morally right and fit in the Supreme Being to forgive their offences against His government. *They may amend their lives*; but present obedience can only fulfil present obligation; it can have no retrospective influence, nor in any way cancel the offences of former years. If God is to extend forgiveness to the guilty, it must be in a way that will satisfy the claims of infinite justice, and thus maintain in their full dignity, free from every charge of imperfection and mutability, the character of the Governor, the rectitude of His administration, and the sanction of His law. There is, therefore, no hope for sinful man unless it can be found in the atonement of Christ. There is present to him no method of salvation but by repentance and reformation, and he must cover his face in despair, and go down to the darkness of hell without possibility of escape.

IV.—In what way is the need met by the death of the Lord Jesus?

He entered into a covenant with the Father to become the surety and substitute of the guilty—to bear the curse of the law on their behalf—to die the just for the unjust. In order to this, it was necessary that He should possess a truly human and mortal nature, and that, principally, that He might be made subject to a penal death. At the same time, He must be free from every sort of taint or depravity, otherwise His suffering would be for Himself exclusively, and even to Himself could be of no judicial advantage. He must also be independent of all the obligation under which every creature is laid, else the benefit of His suffering will be confined to Himself. Now, all these qualifications were found in the person of Christ. He was really and essentially God; but for the suffering of death He was “born of a woman” (Gal. iv. 4); was “made flesh, and dwelt among us” (John i. 14; Heb. ii. 14); and yet, while assuming our humanity, He provided for its freedom from hereditary taint (Luke i. 35). As a Divine Being, He was also perfectly independent of all extrinsic obligation, and whatever He did resulted from His spontaneous benevolence towards man (John x. 17, 18). The justice of God could make no exception to such a victim. He accordingly “gave Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God” (Eph. v. 2). The accomplishment of His work was a passion with Him, and He represents Himself as in pain till He should have fulfilled the design of His love (Luke xii. 50). When the awful scene of His sufferings was immediately before Him, He evidenced the same free consent to be the victim

for our transgressions (John xii. 27, 28). Amidst inconceivable opposition and crowds of unspeakable horrors, this grand principle upheld Him till He hung upon the cross. There, for our sakes, "it pleased the Lord to bruise Him." He made "His soul an offering for sin" (Isa. liii.). "In inflicting the sentence against transgression on the voluntary and all-sufficient Surety, Jehovah, while He clears the sinner, does not clear his sins; although clothed with the thunders of vindictive justice against transgression, He wears to the transgressor the smile of reconciliation and peace; He dispenses the blessings of mercy from the throne of His holiness; and while exercising grace to the guilty, He appears in the character—equally lovely and venerable—of 'the sinner's friend and sin's eternal foe.' In this way, then, all the ends of *public justice* are fully answered. The law retains its complete, unmitigated perfection; is 'magnified and made honourable;' the dignity and authority of the government are maintained and even elevated; all the perfections of Deity are gloriously illustrated and exhibited in sublime harmony; while the riches of mercy are displayed for the encouragement of sinners to return to God."¹

V.—Is there any objection to the use of the word "satisfaction," as applied to this subject?

Objections are sometimes alleged against the use of this word, but, as appears to us, without reason. As used by orthodox writers, it is clearly synonymous with the word atonement (or reconciliation), and may be thus explained: "The death of Christ *satisfied* Divine justice, in that our sins deserved death; but as Christ was both God and man, and perfectly righteous, there was an infinite value and merit in His death; through which, as undergone for our sakes and in our stead, Almighty God exercises His mercy in the forgiveness of sins, consistently with His justice and holiness."²

VI.—What is the exact meaning of the word atonement?

The word atonement is pure English, and literally signifies to be *at one*. As used in theology, it refers to the death of our Lord Jesus as the means by which God and man become *one*—restored to a state of friendly relationship. The word is often found in the Old Testament—the Hebrew word *kaphar*, of which it is a translation, signifying primarily "to cover," "to overspread;" it comes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify *to atone, to appease, to pacify, to procure favour*, because the effect of these is to cover,

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy," disc. vii. It has sometimes been said by theologians that we know not the *vinculum* or bond of connection between the sufferings of Christ and the pardon of sin; this, therefore, they place among the mysteries of religion. But this appears to arise from obscure views of the atonement, for the *vinculum*, or connection of those sufferings with our pardon, appears to be matter of express revelation. It is declared that the death of Christ was "a demonstration of the righteousness of God," of His righteous character and His just administration, and therefore allowed the exercise of mercy without impeachment of justice, or any repeal or relaxation of the law. Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xx.

² Wesleyan Catechism. Old edition.

or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offences. In this secondary sense it is used in such passages as the following: Gen. xxxii. 20; Prov. xvi. 14; Ezek. xvi. 63; Numb. xvi. 46, 47. In accordance with this meaning of the word, the Septuagint renders it by *exilasko*, "to appease," "to make propitious," the very word which is employed in the New Testament with regard to the object of the Saviour's death (Heb. ii. 17); and which, as a noun (*hilasmos*), occurs in 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10.¹

VII.—In speaking of the death of Christ as an atonement for sin, are there not certain popular errors that we must carefully avoid?

There are. The following must be prominently mentioned:—

1. *That Christ's death is a literal payment of a debt.* This is one of those illustrative figures frequently used by Antinomian writers, which, while it suits in some points, will not bear close application in others without leading into pernicious error. That sins are compared to debts is true, and the comparison is natural. We owe obedience to God, which we have failed to render, and every sin is an accumulation of unpaid debt. But the cancelling of a debt of judicial obligation is very different from the payment of a debt of money. A debt of property may be paid by ourselves or by another, and all future obligation is cancelled, but we never can pay up obedience which we have failed to render. The obedience of one moment can only stand for itself, and cannot cover the debt incurred by the disobedience of another moment. Moreover, a debt of obedience can never be paid for us by another; it is, from its very nature, intransferable. Hence, the Scriptures never represent the death of Christ as a pecuniary or commercial transaction, the payment of so many pounds or talents by one person for so many pounds or talents owing by another. Our relation to God is that of sinners to an offended Judge and Sovereign, and not merely that of pecuniary debtors to a creditor. The atoning act of Christ consisted not, therefore, in paying a civil debt, giving precisely what the original obligation required, but in suffering "the just for the unjust." It was a *satisfaction*, the rendering of something in the place of what is due, with which the Lawgiver is content. Nor did it cancel all future obligation, as would the payment of a debt for an insolvent debtor. As a criminal, he before merited punishment; as a criminal, he no less merits it now. But, since God has graciously accepted of the atonement, he *may* be pardoned consistently with the honour of the Divine government and the public good. And if, on the exercise of penitent faith, he should be forgiven, he will acknowledge himself to be an everlasting debtor to the grace of God. The atonement of Christ, then, ought not to be regarded as proceeding on the principles of commu-

¹ It will be remembered that the word atonement disappears from the Revised Version of the New Testament where it was found only once (in Rom. v. 11). It is now rendered reconciliation.

tative or commercial justice. All that can be said is, it answered a purpose with respect to the sinner, similar to that which the payment of a debt answers with respect to the debtor. The debtor is acquitted in the one case, the sinner in the other. Beyond this point the analogy vanishes.¹

12. *That Christ's death is an exact equivalent for the punishment of man's sin.* This view of the atonement is held by some avowedly. Their idea is that the sufferings of Christ possessed just as much virtue as is sufficient for the salvation of all who shall be saved, whose precise proportion of punishment he is conceived to have borne, according to the guilt even of each particular sin. "From such a minutely calculating process the mind revolts with loathing. There is so much in it of mercantile reckoning, of the balancing of a debit and credit account, of a pounds-shillings-and-pence satisfaction, that we have never been able to contemplate it with patience. We regard it as distressingly derogatory to the infinite dignity of the atoning sufferer, and to the consequent infinite value of His sacrifice."² The only true sense of the phrase that the sufferings of Christ are an equivalent for the penal sufferings of sinners, is, not that He suffered the precise quantum of pain which they deserved to suffer, but that His sufferings equally availed in satisfying Divine justice and in vindicating the authority of the law; that they were equivalent, in the estimation of the righteous Governor, to the punishment of the guilty; equivalent, in effect, to a *legal* satisfaction, which would consist in the enforcement upon the offenders themselves of the penalty of the violated commandment.

3. *That the death of Christ necessarily secures the salvation of all for whom it was offered.* This it does not. "It is an expiation for all men, but an acquittal for none." It puts them into what divines call "a salvable state;" but its benefits can only be applied according to the terms or conditions that God has appointed. In case of those conditions not being complied with, men fall under the full original penalty of the law. They reject the one Saviour whom God has provided: there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; and they are, therefore, left to the malediction of the law, without obstruction to the exercise and infliction of Divine justice (John iii. 16-18, 36).

VIII.—By what course of argument is it proved that Christ's death was really vicarious?

1. *By those passages of Scripture which speak of Christ as a propitiation for sin* (1 John ii. 2, iv. 10; Rom. iii. 25). The word used in the two former passages is *hilasmos*; in the last, *hilasterion*; both are from the verb *hilasko*, "to propitiate," "to appease," "to atone," "to turn away the wrath of an offended person." The noun is often used by the Seventy, and signifies, in their use of it, a sacrifice of atonement (Lev. vi. 6, 7; Numb. v. 8; Ezek. xlv.

¹ Dr. Wardlaw. Watson's "Institutes."

² Dr. Wardlaw.

27, xlv. 19). The same signification it has, and can only have, as used by St. John. The word *hilasterion* is used only twice in the New Testament, in Rom. iii. 25, and Heb. ix. 5. Its proper meaning is the *propitiatory* or *mercy-seat*, as it is rendered in the latter passage.¹ According to this, the mercy-seat under the law was a type of Jesus Christ, and of the effects of His atoning sacrifice. As it was on the mercy-seat that Jehovah, the God of Israel, manifested Himself to His worshipping people, and showed Himself propitious; so is it in or through Jesus Christ, the true *hilasterion*, that God reveals Himself as the God of grace, hears our prayers, and dispenses His mercy. And as, under the law, God was propitious to those only who appeared before His mercy-seat with the blood of their sin offerings (Levit. xvi. 2, 3, 11-16); so under the Gospel dispensation He is accessible to sinners, as supplicants for mercy, only as they come to Him through faith in that blood of sprinkling, which is shed for the sins of the world.

The passages, therefore, which speak of our Lord as a "*propitiation*," directly refer to His vicarious sufferings as the means by which the Divine Being was rendered propitious or favourable to guilty men.

2. By those passages which speak of Christ as a ransom for mankind (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 1 Tim. ii. 6). The word in the first two of these passages is *lutron*, which signifies the price paid for the deliverance of a captive. The word in Timothy is *antilutron*, which denotes the ransom paid for the life of a captive by giving up the life of another person²—the idea involved in both words being that of substitution or satisfaction. The *lutron* in the case of a man is "the precious blood of Christ," who "came to give His life a ransom for many." In accordance with this view, we are said to be *redeemed* by Christ. The Greek word is *lutroo*, as that which signifies redemption is *apolutrosis*, both derivatives from *lutron*, ransom. And this redemption is by "a price" (1 Cor. vi. 20), even "the precious blood of Christ" (1 Peter i. 18, 19; Eph. i. 7; Rev. v. 9; Acts xx. 28). By this are we redeemed from bondage and everlasting death, and the blessings we had forfeited by sin are bought back for us. The Divine favour, adoption into God's family, a restoration to His image, an inheritance among the saints in light, and even the immortality and glory of the body—all these blessings were lost, but are restored through the Redeemer's death. They are our "purchased possession to the praise of His glory." We know not how the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus could have been declared in more explicit or more forcible language.

3. By those passages which speak of Christ as a substitute for mankind. He is set forth as having died "for us"—and suffered "for us;" the prepositions used in such cases are *anti* and *uper*,

¹ For proof that this is the meaning of the term, see Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy," disc. vii.

² Dwight's "Theology," sermon lvi. Dr. Angus's "Bible Handbook," p. 181.

the former meaning "instead of," and the latter "on behalf of," "for," and "instead," both clearly implying *substitution* (1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. i. 4; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Heb. ii. 9; 1 Peter iii. 18). It is admitted that the Greek prepositions used in these quotations are sometimes to be rendered "on account of." But instances are not few in which they can only be interpreted in the sense of "instead of," and "in the place of;" *e.g.*, John xi. 50; Rom. v. 6-8; Matt. ii. 22, vii. 10. And if that sense is rejected in passages which speak of the death of Christ, the reason must be drawn from the contrariety of the doctrine to some other portions of Scripture; whereas not one passage can be produced which denies that Christ suffered and died in the place or stead of guilty men. The doctrine of *substitution* could not be more properly or more forcibly expressed than it is in such texts as are now adduced.

4. *By those passages which speak of reconciliation and the making of peace between God and man as the design and effect of Christ's death* (Col. i. 19-22; Rom. v. 10, 11, see R.V.; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Heb. ii. 17). The word translated "reconciliation" is in the original Hebrew and Greek *precisely* the same as that which is rendered atonement, ransom, and propitiation. Our translators evidently regarded the words as expressing the same meaning, and as teaching the same doctrine, and therefore they employed any of these terms indifferently to convey the meaning of the inspired writers. Thus, then, to reconcile is *to atone*, to *propitiate*, not man, but that holy Being against whom our sins have been committed; and this was accomplished by a substitutionary victim.

The Socinian objection is, that when, in the New Testament, reconciliation is spoken of, it is not the reconciliation of God to sinners, but of sinners to God; as in 2 Cor. v. 18-21, it is said, "He hath reconciled us to Himself." To this we reply: First, If this were true with regard to this particular word, it is also true that words and phrases which are, in their meaning, perfectly equivalent with reconcile and reconciliation are used respecting the state of God's regard towards sinful creatures—as when He is said to be "pacified," and to have His "anger turned away." The doctrine for which we contend, therefore, is, untouched. Secondly, In Scripture, the verb to reconcile is used when the person said to be reconciled is not the offended party, but the offender; in which case it manifestly signifies, not the removal of enmity in the heart of him who is said to be reconciled, but the averting of displeasure, and the obtaining of favour in the bosom of him to whom he is reconciled; *e.g.*, Matt. v. 23, 24. Here the brother is the aggrieved party, and therefore to be reconciled. Yet it is not said, "Reconcile thy brother to thee," but "Be reconciled to thy brother." The former, however, is what is meant. Gain thy brother; make peace with him. (See also 1 Sam. xxix. 4.) Here Saul was the offended party; so that David's "reconciling himself to his master" properly means reconciling his master to him, propitiating him. Thirdly, The same thing is clear from the

passages quoted in 2 Cor. v. 19. God's "reconciling the world to Himself" is explained by "not imputing their trespasses to them," and means, therefore, bringing them by forgiveness into a state of favour and acceptance with Him. So in Rom. v. 6, 10, "reconciliation to God by the death of His Son" is inclusive of, and identical with, being "justified by His blood."¹ The whole doctrine is this: God is reconciled "by Jesus Christ," who was made a sin-offering for us; the legal barrier to our pardon is thus removed. But, in order that the reconciliation may be consummated, our enmity of heart must be laid aside, the weapons of our rebellion cast away, and with penitent faith we must yield ourselves to God.

IX.—Have we anything in the teachings of Christ Himself as to the atoning, the propitiatory, character of His death?

This has been strangely denied in some of the more recent attacks on this momentous truth.² But to us it appears that, from the first, the death which He looked forward to and spoke of was more than that of a martyr; was something quite other than that of the patriot, or the warrior. His language, to speak after the manner of men, was that of one whose whole soul was permeated with the idea of sacrifice. As interpreted by the current traditions of the schools of Palestine, that reference to the "serpent lifted up" (John iii. 14) could suggest no other thought than that of one who, identifying Himself with sin, bore the penalty of death, and so became the source of life and healing to mankind. We find the same truth ever and anon welling forth, not so much in set and formal teachings as in utterances of pregnant meaning, called forth by seemingly casual occasions. The disciples dispute which should be the greatest, and He rebukes them with the truth, that the Son of man came to give His life a ransom for—in the place of—many (Matt. xx. 28). The multitude throng around Him, that they may eat of the loaves, and He tells them of the "flesh" and "blood" which "He will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 51-55). As the Good Shepherd, He giveth His life for the sheep (John x. 11). That "lifting up" is the condition of His "drawing all men to Him," partly, indeed, as with the cords of a man, through the marvellous attraction of His patience, meekness, agony; but partly, also, as with the cords of an everlasting love, and the power of a Divine act (John xii. 32). From the first, He had proclaimed the forgiveness of sins as the great work which He came on earth to accomplish; had wrought signs and wonders to bear witness that He had power to forgive them (Matt. ix. 5, 6; Mark ii. 5, 7, 10, 11; Luke v. 23, 24); but as the hour of His death drew nigh, He declared that His blood was "shed for many," *i.e.*, for all men, "for the remission of their sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28). As Moses had sprinkled the blood of the victims upon the people, baptizing

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy," disc. vii.; Dr. Angus's "Bible Handbook," p. 182.

² *E.g.*, in the "Essays and Reviews."

them, as it were, into the covenant of Sinai, so His blood was to be the sign and token of a new covenant, making the first old; differing from the first in pointing, not to a law written on tables of stone or the pages of a book, but to one written on the tables of men's heart's; but, like that, resting on the idea of sacrifice.¹ If we interpret the life of Christ by His own words, we cannot reduce Him to the level of a legislator, or a teacher, or a reformer, or a restorer of a theocracy. The idea of sacrifice is latent or patent throughout His whole work. The teaching of St. Paul and St. Peter, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the beloved disciple, is but the natural development of His teaching.²

X.—What evidence do we derive from the institutions of the Jewish law of the substitutionary or propitiatory character of the death of Christ?

One of the most striking facts connected with the ceremonial law is the singular prominence given to the shedding of the blood of victims. Animal sacrifices had, indeed, a place in man's worship immediately after the fall. We trace them also through the antediluvian and patriarchal ages. But of the Mosaic ritual they formed a very prominent part, and that by the direct appointment of God. Now, nothing is more clear than this: while some of these sacrificial rites were primarily eucharistic, *the grandest and most eminent of them were strictly expiatory*; they were appointed by the Lawgiver as an atonement for sin. *This was true of the daily oblation* (Exod. xxix. 38-42), from which the pious Hebrew would learn that the favourable regard of God was to be obtained only by a perpetual substitution, and that no single day could be blessed except so far as it was hallowed by the shedding of blood. Still more impressively was the doctrine of expiation taught at *the great annual solemnity* (Levit. xvi.). This was a season of peculiar humiliation (vers. 29, 31). The high priest, clothed in his sacerdotal robes (ver. 4), first killed a bullock in behalf of himself and family (vers. 6, 11); and having in his hand a censer full of sacred fire, he entered into the immediate presence of God, sprinkling incense on the censer, and sending up a cloud of perfume between the cherubim (ver. 12, 13); he then sprinkled the blood of his own sin-offering before the mercy-seat (ver. 14), and having thus "made an atonement for himself and for his house" (ver. 6), he proceeded to perform similar rites for the people. Two goats had been previously chosen for this service, one of which was appointed by lot to die (vers. 7, 8); its blood was sprinkled before the Lord, as that of the bullock had been sprinkled (ver. 15). The propitiatory service was then extended to the tabernacle and altar, the blood of the bullock and of the goat being sprinkled as before, and thus the

¹ In the "new covenant" of Matt. xxvi. 28, there is a manifest reference, on the one hand, to that of which Jeremiah had spoken (xxx. 31-34), and to the "blood of the covenant" with which Moses had sprinkled the people when they pledged themselves, to obedience (Exod. xxiv. 6-8).

² "The Boyle Lectures for 1866," by Rev. E. H. Plumptre, M.A.

place was purified from the pollution which it had contracted from the sins of the worshippers (vers. 16, 18, 19). The living goat was then brought forward, the hands of the priest were laid upon its head while he confessed the sins of the people, thus representing the transfer of guilt, and the animal was led away into a land uninhabited, "bearing the iniquities of the people" (vers. 21, 22).¹ In this impressive ceremony we have contrition, propitiation, confession, the transfer of guilt, and the bearing it away, and each brought out with such distinctness and particularity as to preclude the confusion of ideas and all probability of mistake. And we might adduce many other instances of sacrificial offering under the Jewish ritual, and it would be manifest that, although the victims, "whose blood was brought into the sanctuary for sin," could not by any virtue of their own take away the guilt of transgression (Heb. x. 4), yet they are *propitiatory* in their nature, and they procured, when duly offered, the remission of its temporal consequences. The general idea of *atonement* pervades and characterises the whole.

*That the Levitical sacrifices were also types admits of clearest proof; i.e., they were prepared and designed by God to prefigure the true atonement that was to be made for sin in the fulness of time. This is expressly declared in Heb. x. 1, where the Apostle, discoursing on the "sacrifices" of the tabernacle, calls them "a shadow of good things to come;" now, as a shadow corresponds exactly to the substance which occasions it, so do the ordinances of Judaism describe, by adumbration, the grand new covenant propitiation. In Heb. ix. 8-12, the same Apostle tells us that "the first tabernacle," with "the gifts and sacrifices" offered therein, was "a figure" of "a greater and more perfect tabernacle," and of "His own blood," with which our Lord "obtained eternal redemption for us." And a considerable part of that epistle proceeds on the assumption, that in Christ is fully realised and accomplished all that the Levitical law foreshadowed and predicted. This connection is so intimate, that the very names of the victims offered under the law are transferred to Christ. He is called *thusia*, "a sacrifice" (Eph. v. 2); *hamartia*, "a sin-offering" (2 Cor. v. 21);² *hilasmos*, a "propitiation" (1 John ii. 2); *hilasterion*, "a propitiatory or mercy-seat" (Rom. iii. 25); *prosphora*, "an offering" or oblation (Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 14); *apolutrosis*, "redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30); *lutron*, "a ransom" (Matt. xx. 28); *antilutron*, "a ransom price" (1 Tim. ii. 6). Now, these are the very terms which, in the Septuagint, are applied to the sacrificial victims of the Mosaic dispensation. Of course, the application of these terms to Christ is, in the highest sense, proper, for they are applied to Him by the Spirit of Truth; and while they mark His connection with the Levitical institution, they clearly evince the atoning object of His*

¹ Compare with Isa. liii. 6, 11; John i. 36.

² Revised Version, "Thou who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf," i.e., a sin offering for us.

death. His death could have had no relation whatever to the Levitical immolations and offerings, if it had no sacrificial character. And nothing could be more misleading and even absurd than to apply those terms which were in use to express the various processes and means of atonement, if the Apostles and Christ Himself did not intend to represent His death strictly as an expiation for sin. Admit that the ceremonial law was a system of shadows, Divinely adapted to foreshow and prepare the world for Christ, and this at once imparts meaning, consistency, and glory to the whole; and affords additional proof that He who was thus typified was the grand universal sin-offering for the world.

XI.—Are there not certain collateral arguments which support the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ?

There are; for so deeply is the doctrine wrought into the texture of Scripture, that we meet with it at every turn; and there are many facts that are utterly inexplicable except on the principle that Christ died as an atoning sacrifice.

1. *One argument is derived from the long series of prophecies that foretold His coming.* "To Him give all the prophets witness." They were endowed with extraordinary powers of inspiration that they might feed the desire, and animate the hope, and strengthen the expectation of His appearance in our world. So numerous were these predictions, and so wide their influence, that long before He "dwelt among us" He had become "the Desire of all nations," and holy men "waited for" Him in holy expectation of the great blessings which His advent would procure (Luke ii. 25, 26). Now, is it credible that God would thus raise up men endowed with prophetic vision to "testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ," and to describe His person and offices, if He were nothing more than a Divinely authorised teacher and a martyr for the truth? It was because He was a Saviour, bringing "remission of sins" to the guilty, that holy men of God were thus moved by the Holy Ghost to speak concerning Him (Luke xxiv. 44-47; Acts x. 43). Such a person, anointed to so great a work, had never visited our world before. He stood alone, the object of the world's hope and joy and trust, and on this account was worthy of the lofty strains in which the prophets indulged when they testified of Him.

2. *Another argument is derived from the messenger who prepared His way before Him.* Isaiah and Malachi had predicted that He would be heralded by a heaven-sent messenger (Isa. xl. 3; Mal. iii. 1),—a prediction that was accomplished in John the Baptist. But why should Jesus of Nazareth be honoured with a forerunner who, by his life and preaching, should prepare His way amongst men? Moses and Elijah had entered on their work without any such herald; and if He were no greater than they—if His work were no greater than theirs, it is strange that such a preparation was made for His approach. But the matter is explained if we

admit that Christ was to be an atoning sacrifice for the sins of men. It was needful that all eyes should be turned to Him as the great Mediator of a covenant of peace, and therefore God, in condescending mercy, raised up John to do this work; and while he preached the baptism of repentance, he again and again proclaimed the near approach of "the Christ," "that prophet," "a man which" (said he) "is preferred before me; for He was before me" (John i. 20, 21, 30). Afterwards, looking upon Jesus as He walked, he exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God," etc. (John i. 29); it was a wonderful saying, eloquent of the universal redemption of our race. Thus, from his lips flowed the first announcement of Christ as having now appeared in full maturity of manhood, to prosecute the mighty work of putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. "The law and the prophets were until John;" but, standing as he did on the frontier of the new dispensation, and proclaiming with such clearness as this the fulness of the atonement, He was the greatest among them that are born of women (Matt. xi. 11).

3. *A third argument is derived from the extraordinary circumstances connected with His birth.* Before He was born, the angel of the Lord announced Him as not merely a teacher, but a Saviour from sin (Matt. i. 21). To sustain this character, He must Himself be "holy, harmless, undefiled." He was therefore "conceived of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i. 20, Luke i. 35), and His human nature preserved from the taint which it would have inherited in the ordinary course of generation. At the moment of His birth the angel of the Lord again proclaimed Him to the world as a Divine anointed Saviour, whose coming amongst men was "tidings of great joy" (Luke ii. 10, 11); and when brought in infancy to the temple, the spirit of prophecy came on a devout and aged man, and he gazed upon the child in rapture and reverence, exclaiming, "Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation" (Luke xii. 30). The hypothesis which reduces our Lord to the level of a human teacher and martyr, deprives all these circumstances of their meaning and glory; but assuming that He is the grand new covenant propitiation, all is clear, consistent, God-like.

4. *A fourth argument is derived from the intensity of our Lord's sufferings.* We have read the histories of certain martyrs and confessors, and have been struck with the undaunted courage with which they met death, even when surrounded by everything that could agitate our nature. How different was the demeanour of Christ when anticipating death! So intense and bitter was His agony, that He casts Himself on the ground—sweats, as it were, great drops of blood—utters the most touching and thrilling complaints—entreats, with pathetic earnestness, that, if it were possible, He might be spared the anguish. What account do we give of this? With a conscience void of offence, with a reward of surpassing splendour actually in view, with powers undecayed and sensibilities untouched through any bodily infirmity, you expect to behold in Him the finest exhibition of collectedness and courage

ever furnished by an individual of our race. And if He had died in His individual capacity, it must have been so. But receive the great doctrine that Christ "bare our sins in His own body on the tree," and the scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary are such as we might expect. A mountain of iniquities is upon Him—He is standing in the place of criminals—justice is exacting from Him the penalty of the law, and the light of God's countenance must for a while be hid from the Being on whom the vials of wrath are rapidly descending. This is the explanation of the agonising groans, the deep and affecting exclamations, the intense and overpowering agonies; "the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

5. *A fifth argument is derived from the appointment of the Lord's Supper.* This sacrament was appointed as a memorial of Christ's death (Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 26); and as such was to be observed by His followers to the end of time. But if He were nothing more than an eminently righteous man, who submitted to death in order to confirm the doctrines which He taught, why should we have a religious rite to bring His death continually before our minds? Why not, in a similar way, show forth the death of other saints and other martyrs? His own words render the explanation. The blood that He shed ratified and confirmed the new covenant, and procured "remission of sins" for the many who deserved to die (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28). On any other supposition than that of Christ's dying as a sacrifice—dying in order to make expiation—the ordinance is a useless superstitious ceremony. But admit the supposition, and the sacred institution is worthy of Him who appointed it, and worthy of reverent observance by every believer till the Lord come.

6. *A sixth argument is derived from the total cessation of animal sacrifices.* By the destruction of Jerusalem the whole system, as appointed by God, was swept away for ever. The most splendid temple in the world, the most venerable priesthood, the most complicated and costly system of sacrifice—all are suddenly blotted out from under heaven, never more to be restored; and it is worthy of note that the hand of God was as remarkably distinct in the destruction of the religious polity of the Jews, as was His commandment in its origin. Whatever may have been the reason for this amazing alteration, it is certain that it was in some way connected with the work of Christ (see Daniel ix. 24-27); and the question arises, what has Christ done that the whole of the Jewish religion should be thus at once abrogated? The only reply that can be offered is, that He has effected all that the sacrifices of the law were designed to effect. He has done that at once which they were for many ages employed to do. He has so effectually accomplished His work, that no priesthood, no animal offering, no shedding of blood, will ever again be necessary (Heb. x. 1-14). Messiah has been cut off, but not for Himself, and has therefore caused the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.

XII.—By what arguments can we prove that the sacrifice of Christ was complete and available as an atonement for sin?

1. *This is proved from the infinite dignity and value of the sacrifice.* Who was it that gave Himself for us? "It is *Christ* that died." He whose name is "Emmanuel," God over all, blessed for ever. This glorious Being incarnate was the victim for our transgressions. His "precious blood" was the price of our redemption; and the dignity of His nature—His personal and moral excellences as God, as well as man—have impressed His atonement with a virtue adequate to all which the guilt of perishing millions required, and Divine justice demanded on our behalf.

2. *It is proved by the resurrection of the Saviour.* Had His sacrifice been faulty or inadequate, His body could never have risen from the tomb. The law would have detained its captive, and we could have had no hope of salvation from the sufferings and death of our surety. But we hear a voice saying, "Let the prisoner go free;" and in a moment the chains of death are snapped asunder, and God the Father, in the exercise of His glorious power, opens the door and delivers the illustrious captive. Here is the proof that God has accepted the sacrifice of His Son as perfectly sufficient and valid. It proclaimed, with a voice as audible and piercing as though the words had been uttered by angelic messengers, that man's redemption was complete, and every debt had been boldly met and discharged, and that our Great High Priest had finished the work that had been given Him to do. That deserted sepulchre was the Father's broad seal to the spotless character, the perfect work, and the all-sufficient sacrifice of His Son; and we may plant our feet upon the vacant tomb, and utter the challenge of the Apostle: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right of God" (Rom. viii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 4-20).

3. *It is proved by the fact that Christ is "set forth" by the supreme authority of God the Father as the object of faith and the ground of acceptance* (see Rom. iii. 25). "God was the sovereign whom our sins had offended, and at whose mercy we consequently lay. He alone, when His creatures had fallen by their iniquity, had a right to determine whether any remedy should be provided for them; and if any, what that remedy shall be. If *He*, therefore, has made known a ground of hope for the guilty, we cannot surely wish for firmer security, or for any higher warrant or encouragement to rely on that ground with unshaken confidence." And this He has done in the glorious Gospel, where "God hath set forth" Christ as the all-sufficient "propitiation," through faith in whose blood we may "receive remission of sins that are past." This, therefore, is our reply to every sceptical objection, and every unbelieving fear: the propitiation of the cross is revealed and sanctioned by the highest authority in the universe as a "sure foundation" for the faith and hopes of mankind. "Other foundation can no man lay." We need no other. In resting our hopes

here we are safe; for, "he that believeth on Him shall not be ashamed."

XIII.—What are the principal objections which Socinian writers allege against the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ?

OBJ. 1. *That the whole of this scheme of atonement is unnecessary,—a useless encumbrance,—for that God might, with perfect propriety, forgive sinners upon their repentance, without any such additional consideration.*¹ This objection savours not a little of presumption; for how can creatures like us pronounce upon the plans and arrangements of God, or decide that certain ends of the Divine government might have been equally well attained by other means than those which the all-wise God has seen fit to adopt? Far wiser and more becoming would it be to conclude, that what God has done is the only thing that could be done consistently with His own infinite wisdom, and rectitude, and love. And with regard to *repentance*, there is nothing in the analogy of Providence that would lead us to infer its sufficiency to obtain forgiveness. It does not, in the present experience of mankind, remove the consequences of sin; it neither restores health injured by intemperance, nor property wasted by profusion, nor character dishonoured by an evil practice; neither does it ward off from the criminal, in human courts, the punishment which his crimes merited. And what right have we to suppose that in the moral government of God it could either annihilate the guilt of what is past, or commend the rebel to the favour of his offended God? "Reason, to say the least of it, can arrive at no certain conclusion on this subject, and it becomes us to submit with grateful humility to the way of acceptance made known in the Gospel. Repentance is inseparably connected with forgiveness; but it is not its procuring cause, its meritorious ground. *This* is to be found only in the perfect obedience and atoning death of the Son of God."

OBJ. 2. *That it is manifestly unjust to permit the innocent to suffer for the guilty.* This objection lies not only against the doctrine of atonement by the vicarious sufferings of Christ, but against the views held by the objectors themselves. Do they not admit the spotless innocence of our Lord? Do they not admit that He suffered both in body and in mind? Why, then, does He suffer? Their answer is, to confirm the truth of His testimony, and to set before us an example of patience. Well, then, even on this view He suffered *for us, i.e.,* for our good. Let them answer, therefore, their own objection. "If it be just in God to allow the innocent to suffer for these ends, why should it be unjust in Him to allow the innocent to suffer for another and greater end, even for the end which we allege to have been the true cause of these sufferings? Can it be *just* in

¹ This theory was first taught by Abelard, twelfth century, who resolved the attributes of God into benevolence and the liberty of indifference. He held that sin could be abolished, and the sinner received into favour, by the simple volition of God.—Hodge.

God to inflict sufferings on the innocent for an *inferior* end, and yet *unjust* in Him to inflict the same sufferings on the same person for an end *obviously and incalculably superior?*"

But the justice of the arrangement is vindicated by the absolute voluntariness, and the supreme right of self-disposal, of the suffering substitute. He was a willing sufferer. This He Himself acknowledged (John x. 17, 18). And He had, what no creature has, the sovereign right of self-disposal. "He died therefore because, having Himself the supreme power of life and death, from His boundless benevolence to man He willed to die; and thus in this substitution there was a concurrence of the Lawgiver, and the consent of the substitute." No right was invaded, and where could injustice lie?

And besides this, the scheme included a provision of ample reward to the suffering substitute. We might find it difficult to show how the sufferings of the innocent for the guilty could be reconciled with justice, if those sufferings involved the irreparable destruction of our compassionate Redeemer. A reward must be affixed to His work, in order to preserve the equity of the transaction; and as His love and condescension were transcendent and unparalleled, it seems only fitting that His reward should be of the most signal and eminent order. By the prospect of this reward He was animated amidst His humiliation and suffering (see Heb. xii. 2). And when His work was "finished," He was "highly exalted" in mediatorial glory (Phil. ii. 5-11; Rev. iii. 21; Heb. i. 3, 4); honoured, according to the fitness of His claims, in the enjoyment of the purest bliss (Heb. i. 9), in the discharge of the highest functions (John v. 26, 27, and 22, 23); and appointed to dispense the blessings of redeeming mercy for the restoration and happiness of His creatures (Psalm lxxii. 11, *et seq.*; Isa. lii. 13-15, liii. 10, 11). These were the rewards given by the Eternal Father to Christ Himself, in honour of His redeeming work. And as He sits enthroned in the highest heavens, having received "a name which is above every name," adored by all the ranks of angels and of glorified men (Rev. v. 8-14), and scattering abroad the riches of His grace—who can say that the scheme of which He is the exalted Mediator involves essential injustice?

OBJ. 3. *That the doctrine of the atonement is repugnant to the benevolent character of God.* It is strange that this objection can be urged against the doctrine, when the Bible—God's own Word—points to the atonement as that which, above everything, illustrates and magnifies the benevolence of God; *e.g.*, Rom. v. 1; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10. The fact is, it was love to man that prompted "the unspeakable gift." It was love "that delivered Him up for us all;" *that* infinite gift and *that* vicarious suffering being the most direct and satisfactory proof of infinite love. But then, it was love in perfect harmony with justice, truth, and holiness. The Mediator is made a sin-offering for us, that the sinner may be saved from wrath without any compromise of the rectitude of the Divine administration or the truth of Divine denunciations. The theory which

denies the atonement sets aside the claims of justice, and extols the love of God at the expense of other attributes. The Gospel exhibits the love of God, but in perfect consistency and harmony with all the attributes of His nature; and the provision of mediation and atonement for the purpose of preserving inviolate the sacred rights of government can never appear unamiable, except to a creature whose judgment is biased, and who is thence misled into mistaken and unfounded conceptions.

OBJ. 4. That our salvation is described as being a "free gift," according to the riches of His grace" (Rom. v. 16; Eph. i. 7); and, therefore, cannot come through a satisfaction made to Divine justice. What is meant by the term here used? A "free gift," a gift of grace, is a gift unmerited by them on whom it is bestowed; the term "free" being applicable to the mode of its bestowment, not the mode of its being *procured*. Now, in this sense, every blessing, though procured for us by the Saviour's blood, is the free gift of sovereign grace. We can give no equivalent for it. It is a perfect gratuity. But it would never have been bestowed at all, had it not been for the death of Christ. And it is remarkable that the same texts which describe salvation as a "gift," connect it with the atonement as its price or procuring cause (Rom. iii. 24, 25, v. 20, 21, vi. 23). There is nothing incompatible in the ideas of propitiation and grace. If we bestow a gift upon a fellow-creature, it is free to *him*, whatever it may have cost *ourselves*. And be it observed, that when grace provided the atonement, it provided it for the purpose of rendering the further exercise of the same grace in receiving, pardoning, sanctifying, and eternally blessing sinners, consistent with the honour of the Divine name, with the glory of Jehovah's character and government. This being its design, grace continues to characterise all its results. Beginning, middle, and end, from eternity to eternity, all is grace. There is grace in the origin, and grace in the execution, of the plan of redemption; and grace in the bestowment, on account of it, of all the blessings of salvation.¹

The reader may be interested in the names and character of the principal Socinian leaders whom England has produced. We have referred to *Dr. John Taylor*, of Norwich (see pp. 148, 154, 157). *Dr. Joseph Priestley*, who also flourished in the middle of the last century, was a Dissenting minister, and in many respects was an estimable and able man. His brilliant discoveries in chemistry have invested his name with a halo which otherwise it would not have possessed.

¹ The reader is referred for a fuller treatment of the subject of this chapter to Hodge's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., pp. 469-543, 563-591; Pope's "Compendium of Theology," vol. ii., pp. 263-313; Cunningham's "Historical Theology," vol. ii., pp. 248-369; Smeaton's "Doctrine of the Atonement as taught by Christ Himself;" Crawford's "Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement." But we call special attention to Dale, "On the Atonement," 7th edition, as the ablest and most useful volume which has been published on this subject; it should be read by every student. Also Randall's "Substitution, a Treatise on the Atonement," should be read.

But his character as a theological controversialist was irrecoverably lost from the time that Bishop Horsley wrote his "Controversial Letters." *Gilbert Wakefield*, who was for some years a clergyman of the English Church, was contemporary with Priestley, and an advocate of his errors. He excelled in classical literature, but in nothing else. He was a zealous propagator of the principles of the French revolution. He wrote against the Divinity and atonement of Christ, and the public worship of God. *Theophilus Lindsey*, born 1723, at one time excited considerable attention as a Socinian leader. He was a Yorkshire clergyman. For some years he used a Liturgy, the leading doctrines of which he did not believe; and when he resigned his living, he was extolled by his friends as a moral martyr. The most respectable man, beyond all comparison, among English Socinians is *Dr. Lardner*, whose labours in defence of the general truth of Christianity are beyond all praise. In his "Credibility of the Gospel History," he has raised a battery in defence of the Gospel which Infidelity has not even attempted to demolish; but in his sermons he has lamentably failed in telling what the Gospel is. Those sermons are cold and freezing, a perfect contrast to St. Paul's Epistles. These men are the most prominent of English Socinians. In their theological views all, excepting Lardner, were rash, changeable, and profane; and their publications rather tend to produce a general scepticism than to stir up devout affections.

Among the works that have been written in defence of the atonement the reader is referred to Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xix., xxii.; Dr. W. Cooke's "Christian Theology;" Hare's "Preservative against Socinianism;" Treffry's "Letters on the Atonement;" Lessey's "Four Sermons on the Priesthood of Christ;" Wardlaw's "Systematic Divinity," vol. ii.; Wardlaw's "Discourses on the Socinian Controversy." The following valuable works are more rare: "Discourses concerning the Sufferings of Christ," by Bishop Stillingfleet, a man of universal theological reading and an able reasoner. "Harmony of the Divine Attributes in the Work of Redemption," by Dr. W. Bates; this book abounds in rich and varied imagery, and is replete with sound Divinity and devout feeling. "The History of Redemption," by President Edwards, explains the nature of redemption, its various benefits, and traces the arrangements of Providence with respect to this great work. "The Origin of Primitive Sacrifice," by Faber, in answer to Mr. Davidson. The "Discourses and Dissertations on Atonement and Sacrifice," by Bishop Magee, contain a library of information, but the arrangement of the book is bad, and the spirit of the writer haughty and malignant. "Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ," by Dr. Pye Smith, are chiefly critical. "Treatise on the Doctrine of Atonement," by Jerram, is entitled to high praise, and adapted to popular use. Dr. Owen's work "On the Epistle to the Hebrews" is full of powerful argument.¹

¹ For the opinions here recorded the writer is indebted to the MS. Lectures of Rev. T. Jackson.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

I.—What is the Calvinistic view of this question?

There are various modifications as held by those who bear the general name of Calvinists. *The Hyper-Calvinists* contend that the sufferings of Christ possessed just as much virtue as is sufficient for the salvation of all who shall be saved, and no more. And that, as Christ stood in the room of the elect only, He bore their sins exclusively, and all others are shut out from the possibility of salvation by the sovereign decree of heaven. *Another class of Calvinists* admit and plead for the unlimited sufficiency of the atonement; that is, they believe it possessed an intrinsic value sufficient for the salvation of the whole world. But they contend for restriction in the atonement as arising from what they denominate "its destination:" the worth of the atonement is infinite, absolute, and all-sufficient; but it was offered for a certain number only. These will certainly be saved, and all others will as certainly perish. *Moderate Calvinists*, so called, hold the atonement to be universal—a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, but by Divine purpose restricted in its application to a definite number of individuals, whom in His own good time God effectually calls, and whose full salvation is alone secured by the bonds of the eternal covenant. The three views, therefore, may be thus stated: (1) The atonement was neither offered for all, nor was it sufficient for all; (2) The atonement was sufficient for all, but it was not offered for all; (3) The atonement is sufficient for all, and was offered for all, but is by God's sovereign pleasure limited in its application to "the elect."

II.—What is the Arminian or Wesleyan view of this subject?

That our Lord Jesus Christ did so die for all men as to make salvation attainable by every man that cometh into the world. This view is not to be confounded with that of the Universalists, viz., that all men will be ultimately saved. Arminians, though maintaining universal redemption, agree with Calvinists as to the matter of fact that some will be lost: but they deny that this will arise from any sovereign purpose of God, contending that if men

are not saved the fault is entirely their own, lying solely in their own unwillingness to accept the salvation offered to them, or to receive it on the terms on which it is presented.

III.—What are the leading arguments in support of this view?

1. The first argument is derived from the fact that there is not one passage in the Scriptures which says that Christ did not die for the salvation of all, or which limits the efficacy of the atonement to any select number of the race; not one in either the Old Testament or New, uttered by prophet or apostle, which either teaches the doctrine in plain language, or which even implies it.

2. The doctrine is proved from those passages in which Christ is said to have died for the "world" and for the "whole world" (John i. 29, iii. 16, iv. 42, vi. 51; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 14). The Calvinistic reply to these passages is, that by the world is meant the "elect world." But (1) there is no such phrase in the whole Bible, nor can the restriction be admitted by any just rule of interpretation. (2) The term "world" is never applied to the elect or to the people of God; on the contrary, they are always distinguished from "the world" (John xv. 19, xvii. 14-16). (3) The world, as distinguished from the people of God, are spoken of as the objects of the Saviour's death (1 John ii. 2).

3. The doctrine is proved from those passages in which Christ is declared to have died for "all men," and for "every man" (1 Tim. ii. 6, iv. 10; Heb. ii. 9). It is impossible to take the universal terms that are here employed in any limited sense. But in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 the Apostle assumes and takes for granted the universality of Christ's atonement; the fact that Christ "died for all" was regarded as a fact so thoroughly undisputed and indisputable that he employs it to prove the deplorable condition of the entire race.

4. It is proved from those passages in which the efficacy of Christ's death is declared to be co-extensive with the effects of the fall (Isa. liii. 6; Rom. v. 15-18).

5. It is proved from those passages which declare that Christ died, not only for those who are saved, but for those who do or may perish (Rom. xiv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 11). In accordance with these texts the apostates, who are doomed to the "sorer punishment," are declared to have once had a saving interest in "the blood of the covenant" (Heb. x. 29).

6. It is proved from those passages in which the Gospel is announced as good tidings to "all people," and to "every creature" (Luke ii. 10; Mark xvi. 15). If it be true that there are many Gospel hearers for whom Christ never died, and to whom, therefore, salvation is as much an impossibility as it is to devils, the Gospel certainly cannot be good news to every creature. Its name is a lie upon its nature. It is bad news to many a one; for its rejection adds a fearful aggravation to their doom, whilst it never told, as

it never could tell, that Christ had any regard to them in the sacrifice of the cross.

7. *It is proved from those passages which make it the duty of all men to repent and believe the Gospel, and which place them under guilt and condemnation for refusing to do so* (Mark xvi. 16; Luke xiii. 3, 5; John iii. 18). If the atonement of Christ had been *partial*, the requirement to believe in Him could not be *universal* without the most obvious injustice. If there be one for whom Christ died not, to command him to believe in Christ as his Saviour is to command him to believe what is not true; and to command him to believe "unto salvation" is a delusion, for salvation was never provided.

8. *It is proved from those passage which invest the ambassadors of Christ with an universal commission, and which present invitations and promises the most free and unrestrained* (Mark xvi. 15; Matt. xi. 28; John vii. 37, 38; Rev. xxii. 17). On the principle of a limited atonement, all these passages are unintelligible and contradictory; but admit an universal atonement, and they are full of beauty and harmony.

9. *It is proved from those passages in which men's failure to obtain salvation is placed to the account of their own opposing wills, and made wholly their own fault* (Ezek. xxxiii. 11; Matt. xxii. 3, xxxiii. 37; John v. 40; 2 Peter ii. 1). From these texts the conclusion is inevitable, that the sole bar to the salvation of those who are lost is in themselves, and not in any such limitation of Christ's redemption as supposes that they were not comprehended in its efficacy and intention.

10. *It is proved from those passages which assert the universality of the resurrection of the dead.* There was no provision for a resurrection in the covenant made with Adam. There was provision made for uninterrupted life upon condition of obedience, and for unmitigated death in case of disobedience. Adam fell, and universal death is the consequence. But "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). Since, then, all shall experience a resurrection of their bodies, because of the work of the second Adam, is it not abundantly manifest that all have a connection with Christ, and that the work of Christ has a bearing upon all, and that it was therefore undertaken and achieved in behalf of all? If there be some for whom Christ did nothing at all, how comes it to pass that they are to be raised again because of what He did?¹

IV.—Are there not passages of Scripture which seem to intimate that the propitiation is limited to those who shall be saved?

Let us look at them.

John x. 15 is often adduced to prove that Christ died for none but the sheep. "But the consequence will not hold; for there is

¹Watson's "Institutes;" Arthur's "Did Christ die for All?" Morison's "Extent of the Propitiation."

no inconsistency between His having died for them that believe and also for them that believe not. Christ is 'the Saviour of all men,' but 'especially of them that believe,'—two propositions which the Apostle held to be perfectly consistent." The same remarks apply to such texts as Acts xx. 28, and Eph. v. 25, 26. His having "purchased the Church" and "given Himself for the Church" is certainly no proof that He did not love and give Himself for the world; and especially when the statement is so clear that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2).

John xvii. 9 is urged in proof that all, excepting the "elect," are shut out from the redeeming love of Christ. The meaning of the passage is, however, made obvious by the context. Christ, in the former part of His intercessory prayer, prays exclusively, not for His Church in all ages, but for His disciples then present with Him, as appears from verses 6-9; then, in ver. 20, He prays for all who in the future should believe on Him through their words; and the ultimate object of His prayer for them is, that the world may be brought to the belief of the truth (vers. 21-23). Thus "the world," in its largest sense, is not cut off, but expressly included in the benefits of this prayer.

Rom. v. 15 is regarded as an evidence that the "all men" of other verses in the chapter is used in a limited sense, inasmuch as the free gift is here specified as extending only "unto many." But there is no force in this remark. All men are many, though many are not in every case all. But that the term "many" is taken by the Apostle in the sense of all, appears from the following parallels: "Death passed upon all men"—"many be dead." "The gift by grace hath abounded unto many"—"the free gift came upon all men." "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners"—here the "many" must mean "all men"—"so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous"—here the "many" is equally extensive, referring to mankind collectively as receiving the "justification to life" through the obedience of Christ. In the light of this passage must Matt. xx. 28 and xxvi. 28 be explained.

V.—How can we reply to the objection that, "if Christ died for more than those who will be saved, He has died in vain for many"?

In this objection it is assumed that the terms on which He offered Himself up were, that all for whom He suffered should be saved. Is this ever hinted in Scripture? Never. But we are clearly informed as to the conditions and terms of His atoning death: "So must the Son of man be lifted up, that *whosoever believeth* in Him should not perish," etc. (John iii. 15). "He that believeth shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16). If that failed, Christ has been "lifted up" in vain; but that will never fail; and, therefore, though "he that believeth not shall be condemned,"¹ He is not "dead in vain."

¹ Revised Version.

"This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one that seeth the Son, and *believeth on Him*, may have everlasting life" (John vi. 40).

But if it be still insinuated that it seems to affix a stigma on God to suppose that He should use means for the salvation of sinners which ultimately prove ineffectual, we have to say, that on this principle God's glorious character would be covered with stigmas. Is He not daily using means with sinners in His providence, and in the invitations, exhortations, warnings, winnings, wooings, examples, and commandments of His word? Are these means always effectual? Was the preaching of Christ and His apostles never ineffectual? How short-sighted is man! How can *we* know that a thing is really in vain, because, forsooth, it may not answer the end which we would have expected? Can *we* grasp, as with an infinity of intellect, all the possible bearings of any one work of the Almighty? He has made the way clear for *all* to be saved by giving His Son to die for all; and now He invites all, He commands all; and if all do not comply, still the glory of His boundless love is magnified and most illustriously displayed by the very fact, that none have been excluded from salvation but by their own folly.

VI.—How can we reply to the objection that, "if Christ died for the ultimately unsaved, it is unjust in God to make them pay the penalty of their sins again"?

This objection arises from what we have already shown to be a radically mistaken view of the atonement. It supposes the atonement to be a literal payment of a debt. The Bible never in any instance describes it under this idea. Christ did not pay the sinner's debt in the sense in which the objector understands that phrase. It is only in a loose sense that the death of Christ may be thus spoken of. He did a something in consideration of which it is now quite consistent with God's character as a moral Governor, provided the sinner believe, to remit his debts; whilst it is by no means inconsistent with His character, provided the sinner will not believe, to exact the whole to the uttermost farthing. The unbeliever refuses to accept of Jesus as his surety; Divine justice, therefore, says, "Pay Me that thou owest;" and because he has nothing to pay, he is delivered over to the tormentors.

VII.—The Calvinistic doctrine of a limited atonement is based upon certain views concerning the election of grace. What are these views?

They are thus given in the "Westminster Confession of Faith." "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto eternal life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. . . . Those of mankind that

are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." The same views of absolute, unconditional election and reprobation are taught with great earnestness in Calvin's "Institutes," in the sixth article of the Synod of Dort, 1619; and in the Confessions of the French Reformed Churches, 1558; and of the Churches of Piedmont in 1665. A definite number are declared to be elected to eternal salvation, and the rest of mankind are reprobated, and predestinated to eternal destruction. It is just to remark, however, that many of our Calvinistic brethren have now avowedly renounced the doctrine of unconditional reprobation, and would rejoice to see it wholly extirpated from the Church of God.¹

VIII.—What are the teachings of Arminian and Wesleyan writers on the doctrine of election?

They find three kinds of election, of choosing and separating from others, mentioned in the Scriptures.

1. *There is the election of individuals to perform some particular and special service.* In this sense the word is applied to the priests

¹ There have been two leading schemes of predestination, generally known by the names of Supralapsarianism and Sublapsarianism. The Supralapsarian theory is, that God has absolutely decreed to save some and condemn others, and to do this without having any regard in such decree to righteousness or sin, obedience or disobedience, which could possibly exist on the part of one class of men or the other, but simply to glorify Himself, as having a supreme right to do what He will with the work of His hands. The Sublapsarian contends that God, in His decrees, considered the human race as fallen and corrupt, and on this account obnoxious to malediction; but out of this lapsed and accursed state He determined to recover some, for a declaration of His mercy; but He resolved to leave the rest under malediction, for a declaration of His justice, and at the same time to glorify His sovereignty in saving any, when He might have left all to perish.—Watson's "Institutes;" and Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

under the law (Deut. xxi. 5; 1 Sam. ii. 27, 28); to kings and rulers (Psalm lxxviii. 70); to prophets (Jer. i. 5); and to the apostles of Christ (Luke vi. 13; John vi. 70; Acts ix. 15). But this election implied nothing in reference to their final destiny.

2. *There is the election of nations, or bodies of people, to eminent religious privileges.* Thus the family of Abraham was selected from all the other nations to constitute the visible Church of God, to receive special revelations of truth, and to preserve among men the knowledge, worship, and obedience of the true God. Hence they are spoken of as His "chosen" or "elect" people (Deut. iv. 37, vii. 6, x. 15; Psalm xxxiii. 12; Isa. xli. 8, 9, etc.); and as He brought them out of Egypt, invited them to the honours and happiness of His people, and, by many express declarations and acts of mercy, engaged them to adhere to Him as their God, He is said to "call" them, and they were His "called" (Isa. xli. 8, 9, xlviii. 12, li. 2; Hos. xi. 1); and as He had distinguished them from all other nations, and sequestered them unto Himself, they are styled His "peculiar" people (Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18). But it ought to be specially observed that all these privileges, blessings, and honours belonged to *all* the children of Israel without exception; that they were the effect of God's free grace, without regard to any prior righteousness of theirs (Deut. ix. 4-6); that they were granted to the sons of Abraham for the good of all the nations of the world (Gen. xii. 3, xxii. 18; Exod. ix. 16, xv. 14; Lev. xxvi. 45; Numb. xiv. 13-15); and that there was nothing in those privileges to ensure their absolute and final blessedness; great numbers of them fell under Divine vengeance for their sin (Exod. xxxii. 8, 27, 28; Numb. xi. 1-6, 33, xvi. 2, 3, 32-35, 41, 49, xxi. 5, 6), and were excluded from the benefit of the promise (Heb. iii. 7, etc.).

Under the Christian dispensation, the term "election" is also occasionally applied to communities—all those who have embraced the Gospel, even by profession, being called by the same appellations which had before been applied to the Jews. They, as a people, had been deprived of election and Church relationship of every kind for their rejection of Christ; and their privileges were transferred to believing Gentiles, who were called into that Church relation and visible acknowledgment as the people of God which the Jews had formerly enjoyed. And wherever they were found in a collective body, professing allegiance to Christ, and maintaining the ordinances of Christianity, the terms and distinctions which had so long been given to the visible Church were applied to them, and applied with the same latitude as they were before applied to the Jewish people. It was this calling and election of Gentile believers to the privileges of the Church of God that constituted "the mystery which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets" (Eph. iii. 1-7). It was this that aroused the indignation of the Jewish people (Matt. xx. 1-16, xxi. 33-46), and which St. Paul so elaborately defended in

the ninth of Romans.¹ And as the arrangement to bring believing Gentiles into the Church of God was no casual arrangement, but formed a part of God's original plan, they are said to be "the called according to His purpose" (Rom. viii. 28), and to be "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world" (Eph. i. 4).² In all these passages there is not the most distant reference to an unconditional election to eternal life.

3. *There is a personal election—the election of individuals to be the children of God and the heirs of eternal glory.* Under the Jewish covenant there was, as we have seen, the election of an entire nation in virtue of their natural descent from Abraham. Under the Christian covenant, natural descent is disregarded, and faith in Christ is all in all. Every penitent believer, therefore, whether Jew or Gentile, is chosen in Christ to enjoy all the privileges of grace here, and the glories of heaven hereafter. And to each one is applied the phrases which were borrowed from that collective election of which we have spoken,—“the elect of God,” “chosen of God,” “chosen in Christ.” This personal election is explained in two passages: First, in 1 Peter i. 2, where believers are said to be “elect *through sanctification of the Spirit*.” They are not elected, being unsanctified and disobedient, in order to be sanctified by the Spirit. But they are elected *through* the sanctification of the Spirit. Their election is, therefore, strictly conditional; and though it takes place “according to the foreknowledge of God,” it is an act of God done in time, and is intended to result in ever-increasing obedience, and in the daily enjoyment of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Second, in 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14, where the elect ones are said to be chosen “from the beginning,” *i.e.*, from the very first reception of the Gospel in Thessalonica,³ “through

¹ See Dr. A. Clarke's "Commentary" on this chapter. Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xxvi. See also Beet on Rom. ix. 6-13, 30-33.

² This passage, which is so often quoted as one of the leading proofs of the doctrine of personal, unconditional election, has no reference whatever to that subject. The entire epistle proves that the subject of the Apostle's discourse is the collective election of the whole body of Christians. Let the text be read as Mr. Fletcher suggests, and the meaning of the inspired penman will be placed with great clearness before the mind: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath blessed us (Jews and Gentiles, who do not put the word of His grace from us, and reject His gracious counsel against ourselves) with all spiritual blessings in heavenly (things) in Christ; according as He hath chosen us (Jews and Gentiles) in Him before the foundation of the world, that we (Jews and Gentiles) should be holy and without blame before Him in love (as all Christians ought to be): having predestinated us (Jews and Gentiles) unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will; by which He hath made both (Jews and Gentiles) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; making in Himself of twain (that is, of Jews and Gentiles) one new man (that is, one new ecclesiastical body which is at unity in itself, though it is composed of Jews and Gentiles who were before supposed to be absolutely irreconcilable). Eph. ii. 14, 15. (And this He hath done) to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us (Jews and Gentiles equally) accepted in the Beloved," etc.—Fletcher's "Works," vol. iii., pp. 302, 303.

³ This is the interpretation which Mr. Watson puts upon the expression "from the beginning;" and he says, "When Calvinistic commentators interpret the clause to mean election from eternity, they make a gratuitous assumption which has nothing in the scope of the passage to warrant it."

sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," to ultimate, eternal, and glorious salvation, "whereunto," *i.e.*, to which sanctification and faith they were called by the Gospel. Certain it is, that sanctification and belief of the truth cannot be the ends of election, if they are the means of it, as they are here said to be; and we may therefore conclude, that the personal election of believers is a choice into the family of God of persons already believing and obedient. It does not, in the least degree, imply an exclusion of others from like precious blessings; nor does it render their final salvation irrevocably secure; they are still in a state of probation, and their election, through unbelief and misimprovement, may be rendered void, and come to nothing; they are, therefore, to give diligence to make their calling and election sure (2 Peter i. 10). And since God would have all men to be saved (1 Tim. ii. 4), and will in nowise cast out any that come to Him (John vi. 37), the number of the actually elect may be indefinitely increased. And as true believers may "turn back unto perdition," and be "cast away," the number of the elect may be indefinitely diminished.

From these remarks it will be seen that we regard the eternal, absolute, unconditional election of a set or determinate number of men to everlasting life as an invention of man, which is utterly destitute of support from the word of God; and that we regard the election of grace as God's choice of those who believe the Gospel to all the privileges and blessings of present salvation, and to the hope of eternal life through Christ Jesus. The former doctrine is productive of the following evils: (1) It tends to perplex and confuse the mind, and renders all certainty on the subject of salvation impossible; (2) It tends to make the confident presumptuous, and the fearful and timid melancholy and despairing; (3) It is at variance with the plain invitations of the Gospel, which are made to all men; (4) It greatly destroys human responsibility, and appears unfavourable to personal solicitude and earnestness concerning religion; (5) It invests the Divine character with the awful charge of partiality; and (6) Seems to render the judgment-day unnecessary. On the other hand, personal, conditional election, or the election of character, (1) Is in harmony with all the Divine attributes; (2) Is in unison with the commission to preach the glad tidings of the Gospel to all men; (3) Involves men in circumstances of individual responsibility; (4) Is favourable to personal holiness and Christian diligence; and (5) Accords with man's responsibility, and the necessity for the judgment-day.

IX.—Can the following passages be fairly interpreted in agreement with this doctrine of conditional election?

Matt. xxii. 14.—The parable clearly explains this passage. A king made a marriage feast, and invited many to partake of the provision; but those only were chosen (approved) who, having

accepted the invitation, put on the wedding garment, and were thus fitted to commune with the king and his guests. So, "many are called" by the Gospel,—invited, admonished, besought to come to the feast of mercy; but such only are "*chosen*" to enjoy the blessings of grace and of glory who obey the call, become obedient to the truth, and walk in holiness of life. And these are "few," indeed, compared with the "many" who are called by the Gospel ministry. This is the only true interpretation of the passage; and it fully establishes the doctrine of conditional election; for it shows that men are "*chosen*" to inherit the blessings of grace and glory, not by mere sovereign decree, but in virtue of their compliance with the call of the Gospel. If they are not among the "*chosen*," the fault is their own, and they will be "speechless" with guilt when brought to the bar of the Eternal King.

Acts xiii. 48.—Calvinists regard this text as teaching that those in that assembly who were foreordained or predestinated by God's decree to eternal life, believed under the influence of that decree. What does the word *telagmenoi* (which we translate *ordained*) mean? Certainly it included no idea of *pre-ordination* or *pre-destination* of any kind. The verb *tallō* or *tassō* signifies to *place, set, order, appoint, dispose*: hence it refers to the disposition or readiness of mind of some that were in the congregation, such as the religious proselytes mentioned in verse 43. The Jews contradicted and blasphemed; the religious proselytes heard attentively, and received the word of life; the one party were utterly indisposed, through their own stubbornness, to receive the Gospel: the others, destitute of prejudice and pre-possession, were glad to hear the truth; they, therefore, in this good *state and order* of mind, believed. Those who seek for the plain meaning of the word will find it here.¹ Hence Doddridge paraphrases the text thus: "As many of those who were present as were, through the operation of Divine grace upon their hearts, in good earnest *determined* for eternal life, and brought to a resolution of courageously facing all opposition in the way to it, believed, and openly embraced the Gospel." And in his comment he says: "I have chosen the word '*determined*' as having an ambiguity something like that in the original. The meaning of the sacred penman seems to be that all who were deeply and seriously concerned about their eternal happiness openly embraced the Gospel."²

X.—What are the principal objections to the Calvinian doctrine of the absolute and unconditional reprobation or rejection of certain persons from eternal salvation?

1. *The first and greatest objection is that no such doctrine is to be*

¹ Dr. A. Clarke *in loco*. Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xxvi.

² See "Family Expositor."

found in the Bible. If Scripture taught this tenet of reprobation—taught that God has bestowed existence upon myriads whom He has irrevocably determined to give up to endless perdition—we should be compelled to receive it as a tremendous token of the sovereignty of the Most High. But why, in the absence of the words of inspiration, men should gratuitously fasten such a doctrine on their systems it is difficult to imagine.

2. *It is directly opposed to all the revealed attributes of God:—*To His *love*, which is said to extend to the "world" (John iii. 16), and in virtue of which He is "not willing that any should perish" (2 Peter iii. 9); to His *justice*, for it represents Him as destroying His creatures without any avoidable fault of their own—destroying them by the simple rule of His own sovereignty; to His *sincerity*, for, according to this scheme, while He sends the "good news" to "every creature," accompanied with earnest invitations to embrace it, He has decreed that huge multitudes shall be unalterably excluded from all share in its benefits; to His *veracity*, for He declares that "He is loving to every man" (Psalm cxlv. 9), and "is no respecter of persons" (Acts x. 34); and how can this be true when, by virtue of His own irresistible decree, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned? Thus the doctrine "destroys all His attributes at once. It overturns both His justice, mercy, and truth; yea, and represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust."

3. *It has a manifest tendency to destroy holiness*, for it wholly takes away those first motives to follow after it, so frequently proposed in Scripture, the hope of future reward and fear of punishment, the hope of heaven and fear of hell. A man may justly say, "If I am ordained to life, I shall live; if to death, I shall die; so I need not trouble myself about it." In this way does the doctrine tend to shut the very gate of holiness.

4. *It directly tends to destroy our zeal for good works.* How can you run to snatch men as brands from the burning when you believe they are appointed thereunto from eternity? If you know that they are either elected or not elected, your advice, reproof, or exhortation is as needless and useless as our preaching. It is needless to them that are elected, for they will infallibly be saved without it; it is useless to them that are not elected, for with or without it they will infallibly be damned; therefore, you cannot, consistently with your principles, take any pains about their salvation.

5. *It also tends to overthrow the whole Christian revelation.* The point which the wisest of the modern unbelievers labour to prove is, that the Christian revelation is not necessary, knowing that if it be not necessary it is not true. Now, this point you give up; for—supposing that eternal, unchangeable decree—one part of mankind must be saved, though the Christian revelation were not in being; and the other part of mankind must be damned, notwithstanding that revelation. And what would an infidel desire more? In

making the Gospel thus unnecessary to all sorts of men, you give up the whole Christian cause.¹

XI.—But are there not certain texts which give countenance to the doctrine of unconditional reprobation?

The following passages are often quoted with that view:—

Rom. ix. 13.—“Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.” But no such doctrine is implied here; for, first, it is not Jacob and Esau personally who are spoken of, but their posterity, as appears from Mal. i. 2, 3² and from the entire drift of the Apostle’s discourse.³ Secondly, the term “to hate” does not mean to abhor, but to regard with a less degree of favour, as is proved from Luke xiv. 26, compared with Matt. x. 37. The meaning of the passage is, God had certain benevolent purposes to accomplish, a dispensation of religious privileges to establish, and He preferred the seed of Jacob to that of Esau as the medium through which these purposes should be fulfilled. This He had a sovereign right to do. “So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy” (Rom. ix. 16). Abraham *willed* that the blessing should be given to Ishmael; Isaac *willed* that it should be given to Esau; and Esau *ran* to hunt for venison, that it might be regularly conveyed to him. But they were all disappointed; for God had originally intended that the blessing of being a great nation and a distinguished people should be given to Isaac and Jacob; and to this intention He adhered, for reasons sufficient to His own infinite wisdom. But though Jacob and his posterity were chosen from others to constitute the visible Church, and to be the progenitors of the Messiah, they were not on that account irrevocably saved, for to many of them He swore that they should not enter into His rest (Heb. iii. 11); nor were Esau and his posterity irrevocably damned, for many of them were devoted servants of the living God.

Rom. ix. 17, 18.—There are two points in this passage claimed

¹ Some of these arguments are taken from Mr. Wesley’s powerful and impassioned sermon on “Free Grace.” Dr. Southey has given a large extract from this sermon, and when the late Earl of Liverpool read it in the Doctor’s work, he declared that in his judgment it was the most eloquent passage he had ever met with in any writer, ancient or modern.—Jackson’s “Life of Charles Wesley.”

² It was not Esau in person that said, “We are impoverished,” neither were his mountains and heritage laid waste. This was only true of some of the Edomites, his posterity.

³ One proof that Jacob was loved and Esau hated was, “that the elder shall serve the younger,” which was never true personally. Jacob never did exercise any power over Esau, nor was Esau ever subject to him. Jacob, on the contrary, was rather subject to Esau, and was sorely afraid of him, acknowledged him to be his *lord*, and himself to be his servant (see Gen. xxxiii. 8, 13); and hence it appears that neither Jacob nor Esau, nor even their posterities, are brought here by the Apostle as instances of any *personal* reprobation from eternity. For it is very certain that very many, if not far the greatest part of Jacob’s posterity, were wicked and rejected by God, and it is not less certain that some of Esau’s posterity were partakers of the faith of their father Abraham.—Dr. A. Clarke *loc. loco*.

in favour of unconditional reprobation; namely, that of Pharaoh's being "raised up" (or, as it is supposed to mean, brought into existence) for the purpose of being a monument of Divine vengeance; and that of his being "hardened" by a direct influence from God. But in reference to Pharaoh's being "raised up," the original word *he-emadtica* has no reference to being born or brought into existence; it literally means, "I have caused thee to stand." Turn to Exod. ix. 15, 16, and the subject will be made plain. In the Hebrew the verbs are in the past tense, and not in the future, as our translation improperly expresses them. And if translated, as they ought to be, in the subjunctive mood or in the past instead of the future, the passage will stand thus: "For if now I had stretched out My hand, and had smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, thou shouldst have been cut off from the earth. But, truly, on this very account I have caused thee to stand, that I might cause thee to see my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."¹ Thus God gave this wicked king to know that it was in consequence of His special providence that both he and his people had not been already destroyed by means of the past plagues; but God had preserved him for this very purpose, that He might have a further opportunity of manifesting that He, Jehovah, was the only true God, for the full conviction both of the Hebrews and the Egyptians; that the former might follow, and the latter fear before Him. Judicious critics of almost all creeds have agreed to translate the original as above; a translation which it not only can bear, but requires, and which is in strict conformity to both the Septuagint and Targum.² There is, therefore, nothing in this text to countenance the notion that God had from all eternity appointed Pharaoh, and brought him into being to this end, that He might show His power in his destruction.

In reference to the *hardening of Pharaoh's heart*, all who have read the Scriptures with care know that God is frequently represented in them as *doing* what He only *permits* to be done. Pharaoh made his own heart stubborn against God, he hardened his neck against Divine reproofs (see Exod. viii. 15, ix. 34); therefore, God in His holy anger withdrew from him the influences of His grace and spirit, and gave him up to the blindness and hardness of his own heart; then he rushed on stubbornly in his course of haughty disobedience, became "a vessel of wrath, fitted" by his malice and disobedience "for destruction" (Rom. ix. 22), and at length was "suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy." Thus the sins of Pharaoh were his own voluntary acts; and his doom the result, not of any arbitrary decree, but of his wilful perversity and rebellion.

Isa. vi. 9, 10, compared with Acts xxviii. 25-27.—In the former passage the prophet is represented as the agent or cause of the people's impenitence. This, however, is a form of speech which obtains in the prophetic writings, by which the prophets are said

¹ See Revised Version *in loco*.

² Dr. Clarke on Exod. ix. 15, 16.

NORTHWESTERN NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
 Nampa, Idaho

to perform the thing which they only declare or foretell (of which see instances in Ezek. xliii. 3; Jer. i. 10); "Make the heart of this people fat," etc.; *i.e.*, declare it to be stupid and senseless, and predict the removal from them of the means of salvation which they have so long abused, so that they shall not "see with their eyes," etc. And this agrees with the parallel passage in the Acts, where the blindness and impenitence are represented as the people's own—a state they have brought upon themselves, and which is now to be punished by judicial blindness and obduracy. Our Lord gives the same meaning to the passage in Matt. xiii. 13-15: "Therefore speak I to them in parables, because they seeing, see not," etc.—in pursuance of the general rule laid down in verse 12, I do not give more knowledge to this people, because they use not that which they have already; and in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, hearing ye shall hear; all possible means will be given you; yet they will profit you nothing, because your heart is sensual, stupid, and insensible; your spiritual senses are shut up; yea, you have closed your eyes against the light, as being unwilling to understand the things of God, and afraid, not desirous, that He should heal you.¹

One other alleged support of Calvinistic reprobation must be mentioned:—

I Peter ii. 8.—It is admitted that our translation implies that the disobedient were appointed to be disobedient. But the original does not convey that idea. For the words in construction stand connected in this manner:—"The disobedient stumble against the word to which they were appointed." They were appointed to stumble against the word, but not to be disobedient. Now, to understand what the Apostle means by the disobedient stumbling against the word, let it be observed that he alludes to Isa. viii. 14, 15, where it is said, "And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and shall be broken;" consequently their being appointed to stumble must be taken in connection with the words, "and fall and shall be broken," which follow in the same sentence, and which, being well known to his Jewish readers, the Apostle supposed would naturally occur to them. On this supposition the meaning will be, that they were appointed to be broken as the consequence and punishment of their stumbling and falling, which meaning is confirmed by what our Lord said in explication of Isaiah's prophecy (Matt. xxi. 44).² Here, then, again, the doctrine of unconditional reprobation has no sanction. The people stumbled and fell through their obstinate unbelief; and thus their stumbling and falling, as well as their unbelief, were of themselves. In consequence of this they were appointed to be broken, God having appointed from all eternity, "He that believeth not shall be damned."³

Other texts might be examined, but we should find nothing that

¹ Wesley's Notes.

² Macknight's Epistles *in loco*.

³ Wesley's Notes, and Dr. A. Clarke *in loco*.

favours the Calvinistic theory of reprobation. The one great truth holds good, that Jesus Christ "by the grace of God tasted death for every man." God is sincere when He invites all men to come to Him for salvation, and expostulates with those who refuse compliance with His will. He means what He says when He solemnly swears by Himself, that He has no pleasure in their destruction. But while God is love, He is a God of justice, too; and if men continue to "resist the Holy Ghost," if they "will not come to Christ that they may have life," they shall be punished even here by the withdrawal of those gracious influences which they contemned and despised, and hereafter by the gnawings of the deathless worm and the scorplings of the quenchless flame. And under their sentence of condemnation they will be "speechless," confessing that God is just, and that they were the authors of their own ruin. This is the reprobation which the Bible teaches.

XII.—How should we understand the terms "to call," "the called," etc., which frequently occur in the New Testament?

1. *Sometimes "to call" signifies merely to invite to the blessings of the Gospel; "the called" are, therefore, the invited (Prov. i. 24; Matt. xxii. 14; Acts ii. 39; Rom. i. 5, 6; Gal. i. 6, 15, v. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14).*

2. *Sometimes "the calling" is not the invitation of men to partake of spiritual benefits merely; but an invitation of them to form a spiritual society, composed of the believing men of all nations, whether Jews or Gentiles, and to be formed into this fellowship for mutual benefit, and for the purpose of diffusing the benefits of salvation among men (Rom. viii. 30; 1 Cor. i. 9; Col. iii. 15). Those who accept this invitation, and join themselves to the Church by faith and baptism, are spoken of as "partakers of the heavenly calling" (Heb. iii. 1); and as "the called," because of their obedience to the invitation (Rom. ix. 24; 1 Cor. i. 24, vii. 18). As they were invited to this fellowship in accordance with God's original purpose as declared to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 4, 5), they are said to be "the called according to His purpose" (Rom. viii. 28). As the object of this Church state is to promote holiness, it is termed a "holy calling" (2 Tim. i. 9). As sanctity is required of all the members, they are "called to be saints" (Rom. i. 7). As the final result is to be eternal life, we hear of "the prize of the high calling" (Phil. iii. 14); "the hope of their calling" (Eph. i. 18, iv. 4); and of their being "called to His eternal glory" (1 Tim. vi. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Peter v. 10). And as this final result is ensured to none but the faithful (Matt. xxiv. 13; Rev. ii. 10), they are required to "give diligence to make their calling sure" (2 Peter i. 10).*

XIII.—What is meant by the phrase "effectual calling"?

It is a phrase in use among Calvinistic writers, by which they

mean an inward compelling of the mind to embrace the outward invitation of the Gospel, and to yield to the inward solicitations of the Spirit which accompanies it. But we find no ground either for the phrase, or for the doctrine which it expresses, in the New Testament. The "calling" of Scripture is, as we have shown, the invitation, and offer, and publication of the Gospel; a bringing men into a state of Christian privilege to be improved unto salvation, and *not an operation in them*. "Effectual invitation," "effectual offer," and "effectual publication," are turns of the phrase which sufficiently expose the delusiveness of the Calvinian idea.¹

XIV.—Does Rom. xi. 29 support the view that every one who is called must necessarily be obedient to the call?

No; the passage is often cited under that notion, but the context shows that it has no such intention. St. Paul is speaking of the unbelieving Jews, who, with regard to the Gospel which they had rejected, were enemies to God, on account of that grace which had admitted the Gentiles into His Church and family; "but as touching the election," whereby they were chosen and separated from all the people of the earth to be the peculiar people of God, they are beloved,—favour is in store for them for their fathers' sakes. "For the gifts" which God had bestowed upon them, "and the calling," the invitation with which He had favoured them, He will never revoke. In reference to this point *there is no change of mind in Him* (for this is the meaning of repentance as it applies to God), and, therefore, they may yet be restored to their original privileges, and enjoy every spiritual blessing with the fulness of the Gentiles.² Macknight's comment agrees with this: "The blessings which God freely bestowed on Abraham and his seed, and His calling or making them His people, God will never repent of; but will restore to his natural seed the honour of being His people, after the Redeemer hath turned away their ungodliness of unbelief" (Ezek. xvi. 60, 61, 62).

XV.—If the calling of the New Testament be, as now stated, an invitation, an offer, a publication of the Gospel, does not 1 Cor. i. 26 prove that that offer or invitation is limited, many of the "wise" and "noble" being excluded from its benefits?

Again we refer to the context, which shows that the discourse is to be understood, not of the Gospel call to salvation, but of the calling of the preachers of the Gospel, who were employed to convert the world. God chose not the learned, the mighty, and the noble ones of this world, to preach the Gospel, but illiterate and weak men, and men of low birth; and by making them successful in reforming mankind, he put to shame the legislators,

¹ Watson's "Institutes."

² Dr. A. Clarke.

statesmen, and philosophers among the heathens, and the learned scribes and doctors among the Jews, who never had done anything to the purpose in that matter. Hence, the words should be rendered, "ye see the calling of you, brethren, that not many wise men," etc., "*call you,*" i.e., into the fellowship of the Gospel.¹

¹ Macknight on the Epistles.

JOHN E. HILLY, Librarian
Northwest Nazarene University
Nampa, Idaho

CHAPTER IX.

REPENTANCE.

I.—What is the nature of evangelical repentance?

This question may best be answered in the words of some of our leading divines. Mr. Wesley's definition is given, as usual, in few and pregnant words: "By repentance I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment." It is thus defined in the "Second Catechism" (old edition) of the Wesleyan Methodists—the definition being taken, with one or two important verbal alterations, from the "Assembly's Shorter Catechism":—"True repentance is a grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby a sinner, from a sense of his sins and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it to God, with full purpose of, and endeavours after, future obedience." And thus by Rev. J. S. Pipe, in his "Dialogues on Sanctification": "Repentance is such a sight and sense of the evil of sin as leads you to loathe both it and yourself in the presence of God for having been guilty of it, attended by such unfeigned humiliation and contrition of spirit as constrains you to confess its evil, and to forsake it altogether." And thus by Dr. Wardlaw: Evangelical repentance is "that gracious contrition of spirit in which the heart is humbled and melted towards God, mercy implored from Him as a justly offended sovereign, and sin seen in its deformity, hated and forsaken." We shall see as we proceed how these definitions accord with the teachings of Holy Scripture.

The two Greek verbs which are alike rendered in our translation by the English word "repent," are *metamelomai* and *matanœō*; corresponding to which are two nouns *metameleia* and *matanota*, the former meaning "after-concern," the latter "after-thought."¹ And in every case of true and genuine repentance the ideas conveyed by both these words are fully and simultaneously realised. "After-concern"—*i.e.*, anxiety and concern on account of something that has been amiss; "after-thought," signifying such a change or alteration of mind as implies the return to right views, right feelings, and right conduct; or, as it is expressed by St. Luke, *the*

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 95.

coming to himself of a man who has been acting a foolish and criminal part.' See how this change of mind and "concern," deep, keen, trembling concern, are brought out in the Word of God: (1) In incidental descriptions of penitence (Psalm cxix. 58-60; Ezek. xxxvii. 31; Isa. lviii. 15, lxvi. 2). (2) In the prayers of penitent men (Psalm li. 1-4, cxxx. 1-4; Dan. ix. 4, 7; Ezra ix. 5, 6). (3) In the practical illustrations of penitence: Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13); the Ninevites (Jonah iii. 5-10); the Prodigal (Luke xv. 17-21); the Publican (Luke xviii. 13, 14); Peter (Luke xxii. 61, 62); Saul of Tarsus (Acts ix. 5, 6, 11). From the whole we conclude, in accordance with the definitions given above, that "the sinner that repenteth is one who is convinced of sin, humbled before God, and sorrowful on account of his guilt; who sincerely desires and resolves to lead a new life, and who, in pursuance of that desire and resolution, applies himself with full purpose of heart to the mortification of the sin which easily besets him, and earnestly seeks the promised salvation of God in Christ Jesus."

II.—St. Paul refers to two kinds of sorrow:—"Godly sorrow," and "the sorrow of the world" (2 Cor. vii. 10). How may they be distinguished?

"Godly sorrow" arises especially from the view of sin in its relation to God. The crime has been committed against *Him*; *His* law has been violated; *He* has been offended. Upon this point the attention is fixed with absorbing and overpowering interest, and from that arises the depth and pungency of the sorrow. See the language of David in regard to his great sin (Psalm li. 4). He could not have been insensible to the wrong done to Uriah, or to the laws of the land, or to the injury which his example would do to men. But the mind was turned from everything else, and fixed on the amazing offence regarded as committed against God. Hence the soul "turns to God" (1 Thess. i. 9), with humble confession (Psalm li. 3; 1 John i. 9); with earnest prayer for mercy (Psalm li. 1, 2; Luke xviii. 13); and with steadfast resolutions to go and sin no more (Prov. xxviii. 13; Psalm cxix. 59; Job xxxiv. 32). This is "repentance towards God." "The sorrow of the world" may involve the deepest regret for having sinned, but it has none of the elements of repentance mentioned above. *It terminates on the world*, and may be produced by the mere dread of punishment, or by the mere shame of detection, or by the loss and suffering and disrepute which the sin has occasioned. Hence, if the sin be forsaken, it is not because there is any deep sense of its intrinsic evil in the sight of God; there is no apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ; no real hearty turning to God; remorse, shame, fear—these are the emotions that stir within; and, as in the case of Judas, and many many more, such sorrow "worketh death," by producing the horrors of despair, or the guilt of suicide.

* Dr. Bunting, "Sermon on Luke xv. 10."

* *Ibid.*

III.—Is repentance, of itself, effectual in securing forgiveness?

The whole host of Deistical and Socinian writers,—all, in fact, who dislike the doctrine of the atonement,—maintain that from the relation which subsists between the Creator and the creature, there can be nothing needed, but that man, if he have offended, should repent; and that on his repentance, he is necessarily forgiven. There never was a theory which could draw less support, whether from reason, from experience, or from Scripture. *What are the teachings of human governments?* Whoever dreams when laws have been broken, of the criminal being forgiven just because he is contrite? He may be bitterly sorry for what he has done, he might promise never to repeat the offence, but all this avails nothing to the satisfying of justice, to the making amends to the violated majesty of the law; and the man is condemned, though with no suspicion that his repentance is insincere, and moreover, without any imputation on the judge of hardheartedness. What right can we have to suppose that what would be utterly ineffectual had we broken the laws of man, must necessarily be efficacious when set against the breaking of God's laws? *And what is the testimony of experience so far as there is a present administration of punishment?* Is repentance sufficient to turn away the penalties which follow in the way of natural consequences upon actions? If the constitution is injured by intemperance, will repentance restore it? If property is wasted by prodigality, will repentance recover it? If the character is stained by vice, will repentance purify it? And how can repentance suffice to avert future punishment, when thus manifestly inadequate to deliver us from present punishment? There are no grounds whatever for supposing repentance, by itself, sufficient to procure pardon. "If certain passages of the New Testament connect pardon with repentance, the connection there asserted is rather remote than immediate, and repentance must, in such texts, be considered as leading to, and terminating in, the faith of the Gospel, and as only then crowned with remission of sins. Since it is entirely for the sake of the atonement made by Jesus Christ that God justifies us, He fitly and righteously requires from us a distinct recognition and cordial reception of that atonement. Now, thus to recognise and receive the atonement is in no sense the province of repentance, but the work of faith. It is 'in Christ' that God is reconciling the world unto Himself. In order, therefore, to be reconciled, we must meet Him in His Son; and this we can never do, until to 'repentance toward God,' by which we confess, deplore, and renounce sin, we add that 'faith in our Lord Jesus Christ' by which we accept and claim Him as our Saviour."¹

IV.—Does repentance, as connected with salvation, precede or follow the exercise of faith?

It is very common with Calvinistic writers to insist on faith as

¹ Dr. Bunting, "Sermon on Rom. v. 1."

preceding repentance. *We believe that in the order of time repentance is exercised first.* "There is, indeed, a faith which precedes and induces repentance—a belief of the testimony of God concerning the evil and demerit of sin, and concerning His willingness to receive such as renounce sin and turn to Him. The former must be believed, or the sinner will see no need of repentance. The latter must be in some degree apprehended, or he will have no sufficient encouragement to repentance. But the belief which thus produces penitence is not the faith which justifies and saves him." Justifying faith has a direct and immediate reference to Christ crucified, and is consequent upon that penitential sorrow which mourns for guilt and cries for mercy. The jailor at Philippi was a real penitent when he was directed to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. John the Baptist observed the same order in the exhortation, "Repent ye and believe the Gospel" (Mark i. 15); and so did St. Paul in his preaching, whether to Jews or Greeks (Acts xx. 21), "testifying repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."¹

V.—Is there not a union of Divine and human agency in the repentance of a sinner?

There is; for repentance is distinctly stated to be the gift of God (Acts v. 31, xi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 25); and yet is commanded as the duty and act of man (Mark vi. 12; Luke xiii. 3; Acts viii. 22, xvii. 30). God, by His Spirit, applies the truth to the heart,—the truth concerning the claims of His government, the extent and spirituality of His law, and the love of the Lord Jesus. He unveils to the mind the number and aggravations of those sins that have been committed, and the exposure to everlasting wrath which the sinner has incurred. In this way He convinceth of sin, and gives power to repent. But the agency thus exercised is not that of compulsion—it is not such as to destroy the freedom of man, or in any way to interfere with the proper exercise of his powers as a moral agent. And in view of those powers he is commanded to repent, to yield himself to the influence of those views and feelings which the Spirit has awakened, to humble himself before God, to implore His mercy, and turn himself from his transgressions. If he does not repent, it is because he *will* not.

¹ The Plymouth Brethren (or the Brethren as they are sometimes called) are very defective in their teaching on the subjects of repentance and faith. For a discussion and exposure of their errors see "Plymouth Brethrenism Unveiled and Refuted," by Rev. William Reed, D.D., third edition; "Broken Reeds, or the Heresies of the Plymouth Brethren shown to be contrary to Scripture and Reason," by the Rev. E. H. Dewart, D.D., of Canada—a very able pamphlet; also *London Quarterly Review*, October 1866, vol. 27.

CHAPTER X.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

I.—What is justification?

To justify a person is a law phrase, denoting the action of a judge, who after a fair legal trial, declares a man innocent who was accused at his bar, and acquits him by a sentence pronounced in the hearing of the accuser and of the witnesses. The man passes out of a court free from all blame. The accusation has fallen to the ground. He is justified in the legal, proper sense of the term. And in this sense the word is often used in Scripture (Job xxxiii. 32; Deut. xxv. 1).

Evangelical justification has to do with man as guilty and ungodly. He is a convicted offender. A pardon, however, is granted, which destroys the connection between his conduct and its consequences. This is justification improper or secondary, and is the general meaning of the word as used in the Epistles of St. Paul. Hence the definition: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight, only for the sake of Christ." And the still fuller definition of Wesley: "The plain, scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins. It is that act of God the Father, whereby, for the sake of the propitiation made by the blood of His Son, he sheweth forth His righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of the sins that are past."¹

II.—How is it proved that justification is substantially the same blessing as pardon?

In a variety of passages, justification, pardon, forgiveness, remission of sins, and terms of a like import, are used synonymously (see Acts xiii. 38, 39; Luke xviii. 13, 14; Rom. iv. 5-8).

III.—But if pardon is substantially the same as justification, why is the latter term so frequently used in preference to the former?

Two reasons may be assigned:—

1. "The blessing in question is conferred upon mankind in a

manner which exhibits the righteousness or justice of God in equal prominence with His goodness and mercy." "The forgiveness of sin may be the act of mere mercy, not only without any respect to the dictates of justice, but in violation of its principles. Justification is an act of mercy, indeed, but of mercy in connection with justice, and under its control. It is mercy that pardons, but justice that justifies."² Here the grand doctrine of the atonement of Christ is brought into view. A Being of infinite dignity has become the voluntary and all-sufficient Surety for sinful men. He died the just for the unjust, sustaining the penalty of the law, and meeting the demands of justice; and on this account the law itself consents to the pardon of the offender, and God, in His official character of judge, shows mercy upon terms that are consistent with a righteous government. Thus, "grace reigns through righteousness." God "is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (1 John i. 9),—"just and the justifier of him that believeth" (see Rom. iii. 21-26).

2. *The blessing in question invests men with all the privileges of righteousness.* Pardon may signify nothing more than a remission of the penalty due to sin. Justification involves a restoration to forfeited immunities and privileges. The man is accounted righteous, and is treated as such—treated in relation to God and eternity as an innocent and holy being. It is as if a deed were put into his hand entitling him to be henceforth dealt with as one would be who had performed the whole condition of the covenant of life. The whole matter, then, may be summed up in the following language: "Justification is that act of God, viewed as our righteous and yet merciful Judge, by which, for the sake of the satisfaction and merits of Christ, embraced and applied to the heart by faith, He discharges the criminal at His bar, and treats him as a just person, in full accordance with the untarnished holiness of His own nature, and the inviolable rectitude of His administrations."³

IV.—What are the leading errors that are propagated with regard to this blessing?

1. *That of popery, which confounds justification with sanctification.* So the Council of Trent declares, that "justification is not only the remission of sins, but also the sanctification of the inner man." "In the modern semi-popery of the Oxford Tractarians the same heresy forms an article of its creed. Its writers sometimes identify justification with sanctification as one and the same thing; and at other times contend that the former includes the latter; or, as Mr. Newman preposterously expresses it, the term to justify means 'to count righteous, but including under that meaning to make righteous.'"⁴

That sanctification, which constitutes a man inherently righteous, is *concomitant* with justification, we know; that the two are *identical*

¹ Rev. T. Jackson.

² Hare, "On Justification."

³ Dr. Hannah.

⁴ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology."

we deny. The one relates to state, the other to character. "The one implies what God does *for* us through His Son; the other what God works *in* us by His Spirit. So that, although some rare instances may be found wherein the terms 'justified' and 'justification' are used in so wide a sense as to include sanctification also, yet, in general use, they are sufficiently distinguished from each other, both by St. Paul and the other inspired writers."¹

2. *That of Antinomianism, which speaks of justification as a sentence passed in the Divine mind from eternity.* There is nothing whatever in the Bible to support this hypothesis. Nowhere are sinners spoken of as justified till they believe the Gospel. Unless our faith, therefore, can be from eternity, our justification cannot be from eternity. It is the guilty who are pardoned, the ungodly who are justified (Rom. iv. 5). Whilst ungodliness and guilt remain, "so far are any from being justified, that they are 'under wrath,' in a state of condemnation with which a state of justification cannot consist, for the contradiction is palpable; so that the advocates of this wild notion must either give up justification in eternity, or a state of condemnation in time. If they hold the former, they contradict common sense; if they deny the latter, they deny the Scriptures."²

3. *That of certain Calvinistic writers, who teach that justification imports the imputation or accounting to us of the personal righteousness of Christ.* They put the matter thus: "Christ so represented the elect that His righteousness is imputed to us as ours; as if we ourselves had been what He was, that is, perfectly obedient to the law of God, and had done what He did as perfectly righteous." Hence their writings abound with such figurative expressions as "being clothed with the righteousness of Christ," "appearing before God as invested in it, so that no fault can be laid to our charge." And certain men, who turn the grace of God into licentiousness, go so far as to contend that since Christ has rendered perfect obedience for them, and what He did is accounted as done by them, they are under no real obligation of obedience, and can fear no penal consequences even from a course of the most flagrant vice. The following considerations are fatal to this theory:—

(1) "It is nowhere stated in Scripture that Christ's personal righteousness is imputed to us. Not a text can be found which contains any enunciation of the doctrine." Even the fourth chapter of Romans, where it has been supposed to exist in all its proofs, gives no countenance to the theory. It is repeatedly said, that "faith is imputed for righteousness;" but in no place here, that Christ's obedience to the moral law is imputed to any man.

(2) "There are many duties which the moral law requires, which Christ never fulfilled in our stead, and never could. We have duties of a domestic kind, which belong solely to ourselves, in the relation of parents, husbands, wives, servants, etc., in which

¹ Wesley's Sermons, No. v.

² Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xxiii.

relations Christ never stood. While, therefore, He furnishes grace to every true believer to fulfil these duties to God's glory, He has fulfilled none of them for us."¹

(3) "This doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man's justification from Christ's 'obedience unto death,' to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law; and leaves no rational account of the ground of Christ's vicarious sufferings. To His 'blood' the New Testament writers ascribe our redemption; and 'faith in His blood' is as clearly held out as the instrumental cause of our justification; but by this doctrine the attention and hope of men are perversely turned away from His sacrificial death to His holy life, which, though necessary, is nowhere represented as that on account of which men are pardoned."²

(4) The passages of Scripture which are appealed to in proof of this doctrine, when rightly interpreted, give it no support. Those passages may be divided into three classes:—

(a) The first class is of those which speak of the righteousness of God or of Christ: such as 2 Peter i. 1; Rom. i. 17, iii. 5, 21-26, x. 3; Phil. iii. 9. But none of these passages contain one word about imputation, or the most distant allusion to anything resembling it. That must be supplied by the lively imagination of the reader. Nor do they contain anything like a hint about justification by the imputation of active obedience. When in these passages the apostles speak of the righteousness of God, if it were allowed that the personal righteousness of Christ is what is meant by that phrase, they make no distinction between His passive and His active righteousness; yet this distinction is absolutely necessary to the support of the doctrine, which supposes that we are justified by His active, and not by His passive obedience or righteousness. But these passages do not speak of the obedience of the man Christ Jesus at all; they speak most plainly of the righteousness of God. It is true, one of the texts speaks of "the righteousness of our God and Saviour;" but this is not His righteousness as man, but as God—His Divine righteousness, which it is impossible to impute to a human being. What, then, is the meaning of "the righteousness of God?" The general meaning of it is, God's just administration of His own righteous laws. Of this general meaning, a particular application is often made; in which case it sometimes implies His justice in the punishment of impenitent sinners, but more frequently His justice in pardoning sin, through the atonement.

(b) The second class is of those which speak of our justification through Jesus Christ: *e.g.*, Jer. xxiii. 6; Isa. xlv. 24, 26; Rom. x. 4; 1 Cor. i. 30. But all that appears from these verses is that all our righteousness or justification is from God through Christ. It is not at all stated that we are justified by His obedience; nor that we are justified by His active, rather than by His passive

Dr. A. Clarke.

¹ Watson's "Institutes," part ii., chap. xxiii.; Hare, "On Justification," pp. 59-54.

obedience; nor that His obedience justifies by imputation. There is, indeed, one text in which St. Paul speaks of justification by the obedience of Christ (Rom. v. 18, 19). But here is nothing said of the active obedience of Christ as distinguished from His obedient suffering, and which might lead us to attribute the free gift of justification to the former, rather than to the latter. If the Apostle is supposed to speak here of the active obedience of Christ, as distinguished from His sufferings, His death is, of course, excluded from the work of justification; but this cannot be allowed in view of Rom. v. 9. As St. Paul has decided that we are justified by the blood of Christ, there is reason to suspect that he speaks here of His passive, rather than of His active obedience—His obedience unto death.

(c) The third class is of those which speak of imputed righteousness: e.g., Rom. iv. 3, 5, 6, 9-11, etc. But the word here rendered "imputed" is *logizomai*, which means to reckon, to account, but is nowhere used by St. Paul in such a connection as to imply the act of transferring, of taking from one to place to the account of another. In the texts alluded to, the Apostle never once intimates that it is the active obedience of Christ which is imputed to us for righteousness, but uniformly asserts that the faith of the person justified is imputed for righteousness. It does not appear, then, that there is one plain passage of Scripture for the support of this doctrine.¹

If it be asked, is there then no sense in which it may be said that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us? we reply, yes. Although the phrase has no foundation in Scripture, it is sometimes employed by Arminian and Wesleyan writers in a sense that is perfectly scriptural. Understanding "the righteousness of Christ," as including "what He did in obedience to the precepts of the law, and what He suffered in satisfaction of its penalty, which, taken together, constitute that mediatorial righteousness for the sake of which the Father is ever well pleased in Him," this may be said to be "imputed" to us when "*its collective merits and moral effects*" are so reckoned to our account that we are released from all guilt, and accepted of God.² Every one can see how wide the difference between this doctrine and that which teaches that the active righteousness of Christ is "personally imputed in its *formal nature or distinct acts*." But are not the remarks of Dr. A. Clarke worthy of consideration? "I am quite of Mr. Wesley's mind, that once 'we leaned too much towards Calvinism,' and especially in admitting in any sense the unscriptural doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ. I never use the distinction of righteousness imputed, righteousness imparted, righteousness practised. In no part of the Book of God is Christ's righteousness ever said to be imputed to us for our justification, and I greatly doubt whether the doctrine of

¹ Hare, "On Justification," pp. 55, 66.

² Dr. Bunting's "Sermon on Justification by Faith."

Christ's active obedience in our justification does not take away from the infinite merit of His sacrificial death." "That He fulfilled the moral law we know, without which He could not have been qualified to be our Mediator; but we must take heed lest we attribute that to obedience (which was the necessary consequence of His immaculate nature) which belongs to His passion and death."

V.—We find it frequently asserted in Scripture, that no man can be justified on the ground of his obedience to the law of God (Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 20, 28; Gal. ii. 16, etc.). What views have been propagated in opposition to this doctrine?

1. *Those of the Church of Rome.* Notwithstanding the ostentatious parade she makes of cross and crucifix, her principle, to all practical intents and purposes, is salvation by works. By prayers and penances, by fasts and vigils, by pilgrimages and privations, and last, not least, by acts of living or dying charity to the Church, she teaches, and has always taught, that men may earn the mercy of God, and purchase a right to heaven. "And so very far has the notion of merit been carried, that a man may not only have enough to serve for himself, and procure his own salvation and the opening of the gates of heaven to him by St. Peter, but even a redundant stock, which may be placed to the account of others, for their release from the pains of purgatorial fire, and their reception to the kingdom above. These redundant works are termed *works of supererogation*, being over and above what are required; certainly, the greatest conceivable height of absurdity as well as of self-righteous and presumptive arrogance."¹

2. *Those of the Unitarian School.* There are no writers who more clearly and boldly affirm that it is by works, and by works alone, that any man can find acceptance with God. "Repentance and a good life," said Dr. Priestley, one of the most learned of these writers—"are of themselves sufficient to recommend to the favour of God." And says Belsham, "The practice of virtue is always represented as the only means of obtaining happiness both here and hereafter." And Dr. Harwood affirms with honest, straightforward effrontery, "Other foundation can no man lay. All hopes founded upon anything else than a good moral life are merely imaginary." "This is sufficiently plain and sufficiently daring; the very terms of the inspired Apostle being borrowed for the purpose of making the contradiction the more pointed."²

Views such as these, however, being founded in the principles and tendencies of our fallen nature, are found in their full spirit among the members of Churches whose teaching is in the highest degree scriptural. It is the most natural of all things, when the horrible conviction rushes into the soul that we are lost, to try by obedience, or other works of righteousness that we can do, to

¹ Dr. Wardlaw's "Systematic Theology," vol. ii., chap. xl.

² *Ibid.*

make reparation for past iniquities, and to repeal the debt of obligation which we owe to heaven. And very often it is not till men learn by prolonged and painful and unsuccessful trials that they cannot be their own saviour, that their proud hearts allow them to stand at the gate of mercy, their plea for pardon being, not their own merits, nothing, nothing whatever but the precious blood of Christ.

VI.—When it is asserted that a man cannot be justified “by the law of Moses,” is the reference to the moral or only the ceremonial part of the Mosaic law?

Writers of the Socinian and Pelagian schools insist upon it that it is only the ceremonial law which is so peremptorily excluded from the ground of justification. But the entire tenor of St. Paul's reasoning on the subject is in direct opposition to any such limitation as this. Read Rom. iii. 19, 20, which teaches that “by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified.” The context shows of what “law” he is speaking; for he says concerning it: (1) That it proves “all the world” to be “guilty” and condemned; but as a great proportion of the world had never been under the ceremonial law, they could not be condemned nor humbled by its teachings or its rites. It is the moral law by which Jews and Gentiles stand convicted before God. It also says: (2) That “by the law is the knowledge of sin,” which is true only of the moral law. It (and not the ceremonial law) shows what sin is, and how men have deviated from the righteous demands of God. Read also Rom. iii. 31. Here “the law,” without the deeds of which a man is justified, is said to be established through faith. Now, it is acknowledged that the ceremonial law is abolished, and that the obligations of the moral law remain unaltered. It is the latter, therefore, that is established by faith, because this faith works by love, and love is the principle of obedience. The course of the Apostle's argument throughout shows that the one subject before his mind was the moral law—the rule of moral conduct which God had given to both Jews and Gentiles: to the former in their own Scripture; to the latter in that law written in their hearts by His own Spirit. And by this law, Divine authority declares that neither Jews nor Gentiles could be justified.¹

VII.—How is it proved that men cannot be justified by the works of the law?

1. *This is evident from the fact that the law has been broken.* It is a fundamental maxim of all legislation, that “the doers of the law shall be justified;” in the legal sense of the word, they are proved to be innocent, acquitted from the charge of guilt; and in order to our sustaining a plea of justification by our own doings, or works, or deservings, we must prove a “continuance in all things written in the book of the law to do them.” This is abso-

¹ See Wesley's Sermons, No. v.; Hare, “On Justification,” pp. 91, 92.

lutely and peremptorily required. "He that doeth these things" perfectly and unceasingly "shall live by them." But how is it possible that we should stand on such a plea as this; we, who instead of continuing in all things required by the law, should perhaps discover, if we were to weigh ourselves in the balances of the sanctuary, that there is scarcely one of the ten commandments which we have not broken, either in its letter or its spirit? No, all such are under the curse (Gal. iii. 10). The broken law condemns them, but can never justify, unless we could fancy so self-contradictory an anomaly as that of a law which admitted the violation of itself, and justified the breaker as well as the keeper of it. Here is the self-evident truth, "a broken law never can by possibility justify the breaker of it; *i.e.*, never can pronounce *him* guiltless by whom its requirements have been broken. And while we cannot pronounce him innocent, it makes, at the same time, no provision for the pardon of the guilty."

2. *It is evident from the fact that whatever we do in the way of righteousness we render no more than is absolutely due to God.* If we had ability to commence a course of obedience, and henceforth keep the whole law, present obedience cannot atone for past transgression. It would be no more than the discharge of duty, and after all leave us unprofitable servants. Thus the guilt we had contracted would remain unexpiated, and the sentence of death unrepealed.

3. *It is also evident from the fact that if we could claim acceptance on the ground of obedience, we are not able to perform it.* We are "without strength," "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in us," possessed of the carnal mind, which is "enmity against God," "in the flesh," and, therefore, "*cannot* please God." To a guilty nature, then, the ground of justification is not, and cannot be, his own obedience or "the works of the law."

VIII.—What is justifying faith?

"It is not a mere assent to the general truths of the Gospel, nor a mere belief of its essential doctrines (James ii. 19), but a personal trust (Eph. i. 12, 13; Rom. xv. 12¹) in the sacrificial blood of the Son of God (Rom. iii. 24, 25; Gal. ii. 20), exercised in a penitent state of heart (Mark i. 15), and productive both of peace of conscience and of inward and outward holiness" (Rom. v. 1; James ii. 14-17). Mr. Wesley explains the subject thus: "Justifying faith implies, not only a Divine evidence or conviction that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for *my* sins, that He loved me and gave Himself for me."² Dr. Bunting presents us with a very comprehensive view of the subject in his sermon on "Justification by Faith." Justifying faith has respect in general

¹ The Revised Version has "hoped" instead of "trusted," and "hope" instead of "trust," in these passages.

² Rev. T. Jackson.

³ Wesley's Sermons, No. v.

to all that Christ is set forth in the Gospel as doing and suffering, in order to our redemption and pardon. But it has respect in particular to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The acts or exercises of this faith seem to be three. It includes—

"(1) The assent of the understanding to the truth of the testimony of God in the Gospel, and especially to that part of it which concerns the design and efficacy of the death of Jesus as a sacrifice for sin.

"(2) The consent of the will and affections to the plan of salvation; such an approbation and choice of it as imply a renunciation of every other refuge, and a steady and decided adherence to this.

"(3) Actual trust in the Saviour, and personal apprehension of His merits.

"On the whole, may it not be said that the faith to which the privilege of justification is annexed is such a belief of the Gospel, by the power of the Spirit of God, as leads us to come to Christ (Matt. xi. 28), to receive Christ (John i. 12), to trust in Christ (Eph. i. 12), and to commit the keeping of our souls into His hands, in humble confidence of His ability and willingness to save us?" (2 Tim. i. 12.)

IX.—What is meant by St. Paul's expression, "faith is counted" or "imputed for righteousness"?

Rom. iv. 5, 22.—The simple meaning is this: that being destitute of any *legal* righteousness to merit God's favour, our faith in Christ is accepted in its stead. "As God 'made Christ to be sin for us,' that is, treated Him as a sinner, punishing Him for our sins: so He counteth us righteous, from the time we believe in Him; that is, He doth not punish us for our sins; yea, treats us as though we were guiltless and righteous."¹ Observe, there is nothing here to support the Antinomian idea, that faith supersedes the necessity of holiness.²

X.—Is it true that "faith is the gift of God"?

This has been strenuously denied, but, as appears to us, by a grievous oversight of the plain teachings of Holy Scripture. Peter's faith in the Divine Sonship of his Master was attributed to the direct teaching of the Father (Matt. xvi. 16, 17). The coming of a soul to Christ, which is but another phrase for believing in Christ (John vi. 35, 36, 37), is attributed to the drawing of the Father (John vi. 44). And in three different passages St. Paul describes faith as the gift and the operation of God (Eph. ii. 8; ³

¹ Wesley's Sermons, No. v.

² Read Mr. Wesley's Sermon on "The Law Established through Faith," No. xxxv.

³ It is said by some that the expression, "*that not of yourselves,*" etc., does not apply to faith, but to salvation. The grammatical construction of the sentence shows that it refers to the whole preceding clause, and means, (1) *Your salvation* is not of yourselves—of your own power or merit; in all its branches, present and

Phil. i. 28, 29; Col. ii. 12). Hence we must ever maintain that faith in its grace and power is of God. In the words of Dr. Doddridge: "God, by the gracious influence of His Spirit, fixes our attention to the great objects of faith, subdues our prejudices against it, awakens holy affections in our souls, and, on the whole, enables us to believe, and to persevere in believing, till we receive the great end of our faith in the complete salvation of our souls." "But the grace or power to believe, and the act of believing, are two different things. Without the grace or power to believe, no man ever did or can believe; but with that power, the *act of faith* is a man's own. God never believes *for* any man, no more than He repents for him; the penitent, through this grace enabling him, believes for himself; nor does he believe necessarily or impulsively when he has that power; the power to believe may be present long before it is exercised; else, why the solemn warnings which we meet everywhere in the Word of God, and threatenings against those who do not believe? (See, for example, John iii. 18, 36.) Is not this a proof that such persons have the power, but do not use it? They believe not, and, therefore, are not established. This, therefore, is the true state of the case: God gives the power, man uses the power thus given, and brings glory to God; without the power, no man can believe; with it, any man may."¹

XI.—How are the teachings of St. Paul and St. James on this subject to be reconciled?

Compare Rom. iii. 28 with James ii. 24. Infidels, and particularly Voltaire, have employed these passages as proofs of the inconsistency of Scripture with itself. Luther, supposing that James taught a different doctrine to that of St. Paul, condemned the epistle as uninspired, and, therefore, unworthy of regard. If, however, we consider the object at which each was aiming, the apparent discrepancy between the two apostles will vanish. St. Paul, addressing the Pharisees, who trusted to their obedience to the law of Moses, proves that all men are guilty and condemned; and, therefore, that justification by law—justification on the ground of our own doings and observances—is a thing utterly and eternally impossible. St. James was combating the errors of the Antinomian, who argued that, if justification were by faith alone, we might be content with a bare speculative assent to Gospel truth, regardless of its influence upon the character and life. And he replies by showing that no faith can save, unless it be of that genuine character which will evidence itself by works of evangelical obedience. While we are justified by faith, it is by

eternal, it is from God as a free, undeserved gift. Just so, (2) *your faith* whereby you receive salvation is not of yourselves; you can neither believe of yourselves without supernatural light and grace; nor can you, by works done while you are in unbelief and unrenewed, deserve that God should give you faith. Your faith as well as your salvation is of God.—See Benson *in loco*.

¹ Dr. A. Clarke, Note on Eph. ii. 8.

faith, "which is never alone, though it alone justifieth; which is not *solitaria*, although it is *sola* in this work," as our old divines speak. But there is a greater difficulty in the statement which follows, where Abraham is said to be not justified merely by a faith which produced good works, but actually "justified by works;" while St. Paul, referring to the very same case, says, "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory" (Rom. iv. 2). The true solution of the difficulty appears to be, that the two inspired writers speak of different justifications. The one treats of the justification of a sinner, by which he means his pardon and acceptance by God; the other treats of the justification of a professed believer, where the word is understood very nearly according to its legal import, namely, as the declaration, manifestation, or satisfactory proof of a person's being what he really is. The former of these justifications is by faith, the latter by works; both are equally necessary, both mutually consistent. Let us see, then, in what manner each apostle employs the case of Abraham, as illustrating his point. St. Paul refers to the time when Abraham was justified as a sinner, before he was circumcised; and *that* justification was by faith alone (see Gen. xv.; Rom. iv.) But "when he offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar," which was about forty years afterwards, he appears in the character of a believer, and his justification at that time, of which St. James speaks, regarded him in that capacity, and is said to be "by works." And by those works "the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness" (James ii. 23). What, then, is meant by any part of Scripture being fulfilled? If it be a *prediction*, it is fulfilled when it receives its accomplishment; but if it be *the affirmation of a matter of fact*, it is fulfilled when the affirmation is established by evidence. St. James, therefore, declares, that when Abraham performed that signal act of obedience in offering Isaac, he gave undeniable evidence that he had been justified by faith. The truth of it was manifested; he was *proved* to be what he had been previously *declared* to be.

There is thus a perfect harmony of principle between St. James and St. Paul. They speak by the same Spirit; they say the same things. And there is nothing which it is of higher importance to bear in mind, than that, while as sinners we are justified by penitent faith in the precious blood of Christ, our faith must itself be justified or shown to be genuine by our personal obedience. Abraham was "justified by works," when by works he was proved to have been "justified by faith." His faith "wrought with his works," for in them its efficient power was exercised and displayed; and "by works was faith made perfect;" it was carried out, as it were, to the extreme limit of its practical exercise, and shown to be a faith worthy of the father of the faithful.¹

¹ See Dr. Wardlaw's "Miscellaneous Sermons," No. v.; Hare, "On Justification," p. 3; Watson's Works, vol. vi., p. 316; vol. xi., p. 234.